

## READING BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN: ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPRESENTATIONS AND COUNCIL RESPONSES

Respondent	Section of Document	Summary of Response	Reading Borough Council response
Aviva Life and Pensions UK Ltd	General	<p>Our client fully supports the objective and principle of putting in place an updated Local Plan that will help to continue to bring about positive change in the borough.</p> <p>Bearing in mind many of the current land uses across the Borough and their income generating nature, the challenge for the delivery of this plan for RBC is to ensure that it contains enabling planning policies in order to present an incentive for landowners and developers to want to embrace change and realise the aspiration of the Plan and to avoid where possible inactivity and CPO.</p> <p>As such, we consider that the plan's preparation needs to be based on updated and robust assessments of issues such as housing, employment, retail and town centre uses before detailed policies are drafted. The plan, once adopted must be capable of delivery and present an integrated vision collectively based on individual land owners and developers which generates sufficient profit/income when compared to the current site operations, to make it a worthwhile enterprise to progress.</p>	Noted.
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	General	<p>The council does not have detailed comments to make at this stage. However, we would like to take the opportunity of highlighting the need to fully take into account the impact of future proposals on the borough's strategic road network, most notably the A33 corridor which is a primary link between the settlements of Reading and Basingstoke. Whilst the borough does not immediately adjoin the administrative boundary of Reading Borough Council, there is significant economic movement between authorities as Reading is both an employment and retail destination for residents of the borough.</p>	Noted. Work on transport modelling is underway, and this will include examining the implications for the A33 corridor.
Ian Campbell	General	<p>In the event that satisfactory long term housing supply provisions cannot be agreed with Reading's neighbours and there is as a result locally an impasse between neighbouring councils there is no considered and tenable plan to then seek government intervention to</p>	It is not considered at this stage that national government intervention will be required. The four authorities of the Western Berkshire Housing Market Area are making good progress on

		<p>resolve a locally and nationally unacceptable stale-mate. If this interpretation too is correct it will due to a failure of local leadership. Or, if Reading Council do have a practical policy in place to ensure they can deliver a sustainable local plan for the national interest, with if need be the intervention of the government, there is no mention of it. Which is the case?</p>	<p>considering options for growth in the wider area.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Any site allocations within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b will need to be sequentially tested in accordance with paragraphs 100 and 101 of the NPPF. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites with a lower probability of flooding.</p> <p>The exception test in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 100 and 102 will also need to be applied to any site allocations where necessary. If you do have sites within Flood Zone 3a and they are more vulnerable, sites within Flood Zones 3a and 3b which are in the 'essential infrastructure category or highly vulnerable and within Flood Zone 2 then you will need to be sure that these site pass the exception test at this stage sure you can be sure that the sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>There are three tables in the PPG you will need to be aware of when formulating your flood risk policy and looking at options for site allocations. Table 1 'Flood Zones' sets out the different types of flood zones 1,2, 3a and 3b. Table 2 'Flood Risk vulnerability classification' sets out which type of development falls within each vulnerability. Table 3 shows which of these vulnerabilities are acceptable in each flood zone. Please note that Table 3 should only be used after the application of the sequential test and the development will also have to have a satisfactory flood risk assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Any development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 has been subject to the Sequential Test and, where necessary, the Exceptions Test.</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth in Reading without careful consideration of mitigation measures. It is important that the Local Plan provides the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place.</p>	<p>Noted. Work on transport modelling is underway, and this will include examining the implications for strategic road network.</p>

		<p>When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We will support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort. Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the M4.</p> <p>In general we are supportive of the approach set out in the consultation document. We will continue to engage with all parties to develop the Local Plan.</p>	
Kidmore End Parish Council	General	The Council has no concerns about the content of the published documents.	Noted.
Mayor of London	General	We stressed the importance of collaboration in our response to your Duty to Co-operate Strategy. Reading is the largest city in close proximity to the west of London with a substantial level of economic activities and significant attractiveness for inward investment. Reading sits within the 'Western Wedge' Coordination Corridor extending from west London into the Thames Valley. These corridors are recognised in Policy 2.3 of the London Plan for the co-ordination of planning and investment. Within this context it may be useful to explore relevant economic linkages with London further.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has continued to liaise with the Mayor of London under the duty to co-operate.</p>
Oxford City Council	General	Whilst we have no comments to make at this time, we look forward to a continuing dialogue regarding the similar issues affecting both Oxford and Reading as outlined in our letter dated 5.11.2015 at the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Stage.	Noted.
South Oxfordshire & Vale of White Horse District Councils	General	On behalf of both South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils, I confirm that we have no comments to make about the Issues and Options stage of the local plan.	Noted.
Tilehurst Poor's Land Charity	General	At this stage, we do not comment on the detailed development management policy criteria (including affordable housing provision) but our client reserves their position to do so within subsequent iterations of the emerging development plan as their emerging proposals for the	Noted.

		site evolve.	
Wokingham Borough Council	General	This is an early stage of the Local Plan process and more detail will be provided at the next stage of the process. Reading Borough Council therefore needs to take into consideration the impact of the Local Plan on Wokingham Borough Council in terms of housing, cross-boundary movement, infrastructure, jobs and transportation. Wokingham BC therefore requests that Reading Borough Council continues to consult with Wokingham Borough Council as work on the Local Plan progresses, through the Duty to Cooperate.	Noted. These matters have been taken into account, and will continue to be considered throughout the process, in liaison with Wokingham Borough Council and other partners.
Wycombe District Council	General	We have no comments to make at this stage but would ask to be kept informed on future progress.	Noted.
Dr Megan Aldrich	Question 1	In a rapidly globalising world, the aim of 'multi-culturalism' is beginning to sound very dated and even slightly patronising; the old idea of 'ethnic minorities' has been completely overturned by mass migration from a variety of locations and under a variety of circumstances. This needs re-thinking.	It is considered that reference to multiculturalism remains valid in a Reading context, and the reference is retained.
Aviva Life and Pensions UK Ltd	Question 1	Aviva welcomes the strategic vision that the Local Plan will continue to strengthen the role of central Reading and maintaining its role within the Thames Valley.	Noted.
John Booth	Question 1	Assessed levels of housing growth for Berkshire pose a great threat to environmental sustainability and quality of life. Every effort should be made to reduce these targets, particularly in the longer term.  Reading should be a hub for the TV, but its 'strength' in relation to other settlements should be set on long-term environmental sustainability criteria - reducing demand for travel, maintaining countryside and agricultural potential.	There is a clear, significant need for new housing in Reading, and improving access to this most basic requirement should remain a very high priority. Boosting housing supply is a requirement of national policy. Doing so within an existing urban envelope provides the best opportunity to provide homes in a sustainable manner.
John Booth	Question 1	Second Objective says new development should be accessible and sustainable - a key objective should relate to sustainability and carbon footprint of the entire area, not just new build.	The objectives have been amended to refer to the sustainability of both new developments and existing communities.
John Booth	Question 1	Accessibility is an issue - peak hour congestion seems to me to be at unacceptable levels. Objectives and policies need to tackle this before it gets worse. Volumes of traffic are just too high and are projected to increase further. Road pricing and carbon taxation should be applied and public transport services enhanced, roads should be made safer for cyclists, and planning rules applied to reduce demand for movement.	Accessibility is included as a specific objective.

The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 1</b>	The objectives make no reference to the need to support tourism in the Borough.	Agreed. The objectives reference visitors to the Borough and visitor facilities.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 1</b>	<p>There is an important omission. No information is provided which addresses a fundamental handicap unique to Reading. There is very little suitable land available within Reading's borders.</p> <p>Para.4.16 states it is too early to say whether provision (for development) will need to be made outside Reading, adding this should be considered as a last resort. There are two questions. Why is it too early? Why is it a last resort? Now is the correct time to think strategically, to think about and decide long term, sustainable objectives. Unfortunately there are also echoes of past short-sighted policies.</p> <p>The inconsistency between strategic long term needs on the one hand, the essence of sustainable development, and detailed site by site analysis in the draft Local Plan needs to be resolved. Now is the time. If discussions are going on with adjoining unitary and county authorities why, on such an important issue which will play a key role in deciding the future quality of life of the town's residents are all the options not to be open for consideration?</p> <p>The draft Local Plan shows there is no sub-regional strategic leadership. Successful town planning needs a long term visionary approach.</p> <p>There is ample unprotected agricultural land in Reading's adjoining unitary and county authority areas. A lack of consideration of such alternative locations means the Local Plan ignores the future: what happens after 2036? What about the needs of the next generation?</p> <p>In the eighties and nineties Berkshire County Council tried to slow down growth. In consequence it failed to plan far enough ahead. The result is what residents face today; time consuming road congestion; an incomplete public transport network; and unaffordable rents and house prices due to an inadequate stock of homes. Continuing the same short sighted policies today will make today's problems worse in the future,</p>	<p>Providing homes outside the local authority area in which the need arises is clearly regarded as a last resort under national policy, against which the Local Plan will ultimately be judged at Examination. This is why the Issues and Options states that it is a last resort.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document was developed against a background of a considerable amount of joint work with neighbouring authorities, which has resulted in the production of the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework, and this work continues. The work was not at a stage where it could be fully set out in the Issues and Options document. However, even in this context, the Council needs to follow statutory procedures and national policy in progressing with its Local Plan, and can still only work with the land that is within its control.</p>

		leading to a decline in the future quality of life of the residents.	
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 1</b>	<p>If the objectives remain unchanged then the new Local Plan will ignore important regional and sub-regional changes which now need to be considered. These are:</p> <p>a. London's residential overspill into east and central Berkshire. The draft Local Plan is silent on this point.</p> <p>b. Central Berkshire will have a unique land supply role to perform. Because much of the land in the rest of Berkshire is greenbelt or AONB, market generated pressured means demand from these areas is historically diverted to central Berkshire and Reading to provide the additional supply. There is no recognition in the draft Local Plan of this additional role Reading must fulfil in the core objectives list.</p> <p>c. The unaffordability ratio has grown since 2008. This is a clear measure of the housing supply failure. Will strict adherence to the SHMA numbers mean prices and rents will again become affordable? Current rates of price increase suggest this assumption may need to be reviewed.</p> <p>d. Impact on Reading's popularity due to opening of Crossrail in 2019. The draft Local Plan is silent.</p> <p>e. Impact on local demand pressures , if it happens, of a 3rd runway at Heathrow airport.</p>	<p>In terms of the points below:</p> <p>a. It cannot be for the authorities of Western Berkshire to arbitrarily determine that London will not meet its needs and that a portion of this should be accommodated in this area. It is for London to consider the extent of their unmet needs, and to make an approach. No such approach has been made.</p> <p>b. This needs to be considered in conjunction with neighbouring authorities, and the appropriate level is through the ongoing joint work, not the Local Plan objectives.</p> <p>c. The SHMA need figures have taken the affordability issues into account in generating the need figures. We cannot however guarantee that provision of these homes will return prices to historic levels, as this is dependent on a whole range of factors.</p> <p>d. The SHMA sets out in more detail the effects that Crossrail might have, but impacts on Reading are expected to be significantly lower than on London and on areas around stations to the east.</p> <p>e. The impact of a third runway at Heathrow will be extremely significant. However, there is some way to go in terms of the decision. Even at the most optimistic, it is not considered that any development will take place until late in the plan period. With the proposed statutory five-year plan review periods, there will be many opportunities to review the plan before that happens.</p>
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 1</b>	Those who attended the workshop were told the core strategy adopted in 2008, set. Over the last one and a half decades London, another area like the Thames Valley of fast growth and continuing strong	The Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to investigate how the issues of the area can be better resolved across local authority

	<p>development pressures, shows how strong regional leadership can bring good outcomes for its residents and increasing wealth to the nation. The current mayor has set up mayoral development corporations to fast track planning arrangements in 20 housing zones and to oversee the regeneration of vast railway sidings at Old Oak. City Hall, has gained new powers and provides a long term strategic input.</p> <p>The unitary local authorities of Berkshire, of north Hampshire, south Oxfordshire, northwest Surrey, and south Buckinghamshire are also, like London and regardless of their boundaries comprise a single economic entity. They too also need a long term strategic horizon. Forty years local and national failure show it is not one individual authorities can individually provide. Strategic governance is missing. Reading is the obvious authority to take the lead. It is the economic capital of the Thames Valley, and indeed of all the Home Counties to the west of London.</p> <p>Government policies that rely on localism are not consistent, as Reading's draft Local Plan demonstrates. There are four reasons why relying on localism is insufficient and will fail to deliver sustainable development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A twenty year Local Plan period in an area of strong growth cannot provide sustainable development. It is too short.</li> <li>• The 15 year London mayoral example shows what local strategic leadership can achieve.</li> <li>• Post war local experience shows that local authority co-operation does not come naturally, and has neither a long term perspective nor a visionary dimension.</li> <li>• The success of the Commission for New Towns was based on a national consensus about how to solve a national housing deficit problem. Success was based upon strategic, financial and long term policies which took several decades from conception to completion and saved the Treasury a lot of money.</li> </ul>	<p>boundaries. The Local Plan cannot resolve these issues on its own, and therefore it is not appropriate to respond to this in depth here.</p> <p>However, the reality is that a local plan, even within its own limitations, is a requirement if Reading is to help meet the needs for new homes and employment development, whilst at the same time balancing this against retaining the key elements that contribute to the character of the town.</p>
--	---	--

		From a long term point of view the Local Plan has nothing to say. This is not sustainable planning. In order to deliver sustainable development Reading Council must now consider whether to inform the government there is an epic problem which the government must resolve.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 1	On balance there should be no changes to the core objectives, however it feels as the reality of the seamless nature of 'Greater Reading' and the throbbing powerhouse of Wokingham Bracknell Reading Triangle, and the invisible imaginary boundary are ignored. By 2036 this approach will be even more dated, and ridiculous. Anachronistic legislative boundaries exist; strategic overview seems in short supply.	Noted. The four authorities within the Western Berkshire area have been working together to examine options for growth jointly, which led to the production of the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework in December 2016, which provides the context for the Reading Borough Local Plan. This joint work continues.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 1	Low energy use in all buildings	Noted. Achieving high standards of energy efficiency in all buildings is an expectation of the Local Plan.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 1	No more park homes	The Local Plan does not specifically plan for any park homes.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 1	All existing stock brought up to Minergie energy use standard	It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to upgrade the energy performance of existing homes.
John George Ltd	Question 1	We agree with the general thrust of the Council's objectives. It is noted that the Council are seeking good access to decent and affordable housing. Further comment is reserved until the detail of the policy is released, however affordable housing requirements should not stifle the viability of new housing, particularly smaller scale housing developments.	Noted.
James Lloyd	Question 1	More work needs to be done to look at how Reading can grow in a sustainable way. All the scores in the environmental appraisal are negative. Växjö in Sweden is the "greenest city in Europe" half the CO2 emissions per resident of Reading. They managed to halved the emissions without sacrificing growth: 90% increase per capita GDP over the same 20 year period. I think with a bit of research Reading would be able to match areas of growth against local natural resources that can be sustainable harvested.	The Council is seeking to achieve the most ambitious standards possible within the national framework that has been set. This includes requiring zero carbon homes for major new-build housing schemes and increasing the expectations for non-residential schemes.
London and Quadrant	Question 1	We agree that the core objectives remain appropriate and should be brought forward into the new local plan, but with the following	These can be seen more as means to achieve the objectives, rather than objectives themselves.



		<p>additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Increasing housing densities on allocated sites to help meet the Council's Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN)'</li> <li>• 'The introduction of taller buildings on allocated, sustainably located development sites to aid increased legibility and a high quality public realm.'</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst high densities and tall buildings are part of the picture, they do not form overall objectives in themselves.</p>
Elaine Murray	Question 1	<p>Housing strategy has to be linked to the provision of schools- primary and secondary. I can't see any comments or reference to education provisions strategy?</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan contains information on infrastructure requirements, including for education, and relevant policies support this.</p>
Eleanor Pitts	Question 1	<p>Reading could be courageous and try for sustainable development that prioritises values of citizenship and health. Running a genuine consultation that people can understand with the vision to plough a new furrow rather than following an old one would be brilliant.</p> <p>Prioritise healthy environments, clean air, sustainable living, good transport links, reverence for and support of the natural environment, carbon footprints in all aspects of life from food production to industrial output. Lead by example and encourage true participation in green issues. Protect and Retain green spaces.</p> <p>Reading is strong it now needs to be wise and think outside of the box that pushes economic progress over everything else. Become the place where people want to live rather the place where people come to work and shop.</p>	<p>Noted. Many of these elements are included within the Draft Local Plan. However, these issues must be balanced against the needs for new homes and for development that ensures economic growth.</p>
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 1	<p>There should be an objective for accessibility and sustainability of the whole of Reading, not just new development.</p>	<p>Agreed. The objectives now make reference to existing communities as well as new ones.</p>
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 1	<p>Needs to be recognition of the challenge of reducing existing (housing) stock impacts, not just new developments.</p>	<p>Objective 5 now also refers to the sustainability of existing areas.</p>
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 1	<p>Climate change mitigation and adaptation should be mentioned in this clause. Note that retro-fitting offers a good opportunity to consider adaptation measures (e.g. flood risk reduction and overheating) at the same time as implementing water and energy efficiency schemes.</p>	<p>Agreed. Objective 5 now refers to mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.</p>
Reading Football Club	Question 1	<p>The core objectives are considered to remain appropriate given the focus on supporting strategic development across the Borough. We</p>	<p>Agreed. Sport and recreation facilities as well as social and community facilities now referred to in</p>

		would consider it appropriate to consider the inclusion of references to the objective of delivering 'social and recreational facilities' to support community needs in appropriate locations over the Plan period in line with paragraph 156 of the NPPF.	objective 3.
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 1	Possibly refer to Climate Change Strategy Vision and Objectives.	Agreed. Reference has been made to the Climate Change Strategy in this section.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 1	Add something about improving air quality in the town	Reference to ensuring that Reading is a 'clean' community has been made in the objectives.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 1	Expand section on sustainable transport to ensure it includes pedestrian and cycling options	Agreed. Objective 7 now refers specifically to walking and cycling.
Tarmac	Question 1	Reading has long term growth requirements that will necessitate on-going collaboration with adjacent local authorities and the intelligent application of the "Duty to Co-operate". This imperative should be recognised in the list of bullet points in Section 2.2. An additional bullet point should be added to deal with this important point, as set out below.  "Ensure that Reading can continue to grow and fulfill its role as the hub for the Thames Valley by co-operation on long term spatial planning with the adjacent local authorities."	Agreed. Objective 4 refers to co-operation with the wider area as a whole, although the wording is different from that suggested.
University of Reading	Question 1	The core objectives remain relevant and appropriate, and align with national policy guidance contained within the NPPF.	Noted.
West Berkshire Council	Question 1	As per paragraph 31 of the NPPF, West Berkshire Council would wish to be involved with any improvements and the development of any transport measures and solutions particularly given that another objective is strengthening the role of central Reading as a hub for the Thames Valley. The economic domination of the Thames Valley within the sub region means that for West Berkshire, significant economic influences lie to the east. Commuting data highlights that 14% of West Berkshire's resident working population work within Reading – a significant single flow of outward commuting.	Noted. The Council will continue to liaise with West Berkshire Council on key strategic matters.
Evelyn Williams	Question 1	Changes to the last objective to something like: Improve social inclusion by taking positive steps to reduce social exclusion for all communities, residents, visitors and those working in Reading.	The final objective touches on more than social inclusion, and is worded to try to cover all of these elements.

Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 1</b>	Change the first objective to something like: Ensure that Reading meets the needs of residents, workers, visitors, those who study in Reading Borough, and the wider area for employment, housing, services and facilities.	It is considered that these elements are covered within objective 1.
BBOWT <sup>1</sup>	<b>Question 1</b>	Do not think that there should be any changes to the core objectives.	Noted.
Emmer Green Residents' Association			
Brian Jamieson			
Scott Versace			
Willowside Homes			
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 2</b>	If you create a plan up to 2036, you need to recognise that the pace of change in the world has accelerated to such an extent that within ten years it may be completely obsolete. The old planning approach of study - forecast - create a long-term plan may itself be nearing obsolescence.	It may be that the plan needs to be reviewed within ten years. However, the Council can only plan within the framework that exists, and the Government has clearly stated the importance of getting a Local Plan in place.
John Booth	<b>Question 2</b>	Reading should be thinking and planning very long-term - beyond 2036 - present trends are not environmentally or economically sustainable. But planning for constant growth rates for 20 years is not sensible - need to plan for a 'soft landing' with falling rates of new development.	The Local Plan must strike a balance between long-term, consistent planning, and what it is actually possible to foresee and plan for. Whilst visions, objectives and potentially longer-term strategies could go beyond 2036, the actual mechanics of the Local Plan would need to be so flexible to adapt to changing circumstances that they would ultimately be meaningless. The Government now intends to introduce statutory five-year review periods in any case. National policy is clear that all authorities need to plan for continuing economic growth.
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 2</b>	Agree that the plan period should be up to 2036	Noted.
Mrs Jenny Cottee			

<sup>1</sup> Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

Dr Antony Cowling			
Emmer Green Residents' Association			
Elaine Murray			
Viridis Real Estate			
Willowside Homes			
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 2</b>	<p>If Reading Council is to successfully plan for the future and exploit the opportunities above average growth creates from which Reading benefits, whilst mitigating and removing most of the problems above average growth also creates, the evidence of the last forty years shows there is a need is to plan more than one generation ahead. In fact we need to plan 40/60 years ahead. The minimum period to maintain policy consistency is 40 years. Long term delivery timetables will enable far better design solutions to be put in place. Creative design will be the key to turning an enduring problem into a successful solution. It needs consistent long term policies.</p> <p>If the planning horizon remains short-sighted the result will be much higher house prices and rents in real terms; local households will carry far more debt; residents spendable income will be less; travelling times will be longer; and the unprotected rural countryside of the Thames Valley will continue to be eroded, but on a piecemeal, unpredictable basis with minimal new social services to match the needs of new and existing residents.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must strike a balance between long-term, consistent planning, and what is actually possible to foresee and plan for. Whilst visions, objectives and potentially longer-term strategies could go beyond 2036, the actual mechanics of the Local Plan would need to be so flexible to adapt to changing circumstances that they would ultimately be meaningless. The Government now intends to introduce statutory five-year review periods in any case.</p>
Eleanor Pitts	<b>Question 2</b>	Need much longer than 2036 and not just for housing	
Reading Climate Change Partnership	<b>Question 2</b>	Reading should be thinking very long-term about sustainable development - well beyond 2036. Planning for a constant growth rate for 20 years is not sensible.	
James Lloyd	<b>Question 2</b>	Agree that the plan period should be up to 2036. It is essential that the Local Plan also is designed to meet the objectives set out in the Climate Act and need to there for have a time frame up to 2050. This	

		does not stop it being amended but will mean that it will set out a similar trajectory of 80% cuts in emission.	
Brian Jamieson	Question 2	Agree that the plan period should be up to 2036. Planning is essential, though some flexibility must be retained.	Noted.
Mount Properties Ltd	Question 2	Planning up to 2036 corresponds closely with the NPPF and time periods of key documents of the Council's evidence base (including the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016 - 2036) and will take account of the longer term requirements of the Borough and is therefore strongly supported.	
Reading Football Club	Question 2	A plan period of up to 2036 is considered appropriate given the requirements at paragraph 157 of the NPPF for plans to be drawn up over ideally a 15 year period. In addition, given the conclusions of the recently published SHMA, the plan period is considered entirely appropriate.	
Ropemaker Properties	Question 2	The plan period should be for a minimum of 15 years in accordance with paragraph 157 of the NPPF. Planning up to 2036 is therefore seen as appropriate.	
Tarmac	Question 2	Agree with 2036. This is an appropriate time period.	
University of Reading	Question 2	The intention to plan to 2036 is considered appropriate having regard to national policy guidance and the emerging evidence in respect of housing need, i.e. the recently published Berkshire SHMA which provides information up to 2036.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 2	Agree with 2036. Should have five year review periods.	Noted. The Government now intends to introduce statutory five-year review periods for all plans.
Evelyn Williams	Question 2	Agree with 2036. It would make sense, though to have a medium term rolling plan for 10 years, within the framework of the plan to 2036.	
Scott Versace	Question 2	Agree with 2036. As a resident who's concerned about the environment and sustainability I would hope that any plan the council seeks to put into place would consider these issues.	Noted.
Dr Megan Aldrich	Question 3	These figures for projected needs of housing may be nearing obsolescence. For example, if Britain votes to leave the EU in June, this would partially wind down demand for housing over the next five years. I don't think a community should tear itself apart on the basis of projections which may not have a direct relationship to rapidly evolving events. Reading should undertake what is sensible and desirable in	The Draft Local Plan seeks to meet as much of its need that it can accommodate within Reading's boundaries. This is 659 dwellings per annum, which falls midway between options 3.1 and 3.3. This figure has been arrived at after a thorough analysis of the potential of sites within the

		terms of development, and proceed accordingly. Undeveloped land should be a last resort, as once gone it can never be regained. Likewise development which threatens the character of heritage assets, which are constantly under threat in Reading.	<p>Borough to deliver new homes through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and represents as much as the Borough can realistically accommodate. It is approximately 95% of Reading's identified need. This process follows national policy closely.</p> <p>The remainder of the need would have to be accommodated elsewhere. The Council is liaising with neighbouring authorities to seek to identify how this remaining need will be accommodated.</p> <p>Ultimately, where a site with potential for housing development is suitable, and has some prospect of availability and achievability within the plan period, it is included. Densities are reviewed, and set at a level that will ensure efficient use of the land that is available. Major urban extensions within the Borough are not an option with the very significant flood risk constraints affecting the limited areas outside the settlement. Wholesale releases of employment land are also not possible, given the identified competing need for industrial and warehouse space.</p>
John Booth	Question 3	Agree with Option 3.2. Sustainability Appraisal shows more is worse. At least in the short term there appear to be plenty of consented and planned sites. In the longer term would like to see less development.	
The Butler Partnership	Question 3	Agree with Option 3.4. This is the only option that would accord with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, which requires Local Planning Authorities to significantly boost the supply of housing. The housing requirement should also be set as a minimum, in line with the said document.	
Mr Aaron Collett	Question 3	Option 3.4 reflects the best option for Reading, if you build more than the demand for houses, it will help first time buyers such as myself stay in the local area instead of moving away.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 3	Of the three provided option 3.2 is the most sensible. The alternatives would not significantly meet the housing need- far more radical measures are needed , but might well endanger the quality of life in Reading -'once lost gone forever'. We need a major housing development within travel to work distance of Reading not pin pricks.	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 3	Agree with Option 3.1. Economic factors have a bigger impact on plans than anything the council can do.	
De Merke Estates Ltd	Question 3	<p>There is a requirement through the NPPF and the PPG for a Local Plan to be 'positively prepared' by proposing strategic objectives which seek to meet objectively assessed requirements. Given this is one of the tests of soundness, the Local Plan must provide for an OAN of at least 699 dwellings per annum. At present, the SHMA has yet to be tested at Examination in terms of the appropriateness of the methodology in determining the OAN and the soundness of its findings. Therefore, the Local Plan should plan for this as the minimum requirement and engage with neighbouring local authorities through the Duty-to-Cooperate in order to ensure that that strategic priorities, including housing delivery, are address collaboratively and effectively.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for the housing need to reach in excess of 700 dwellings per annum to help deliver affordable housing within the area as advised within the PPG, and as a result the Local Plan should make</p>	

		<p>allowance for any additional housing requirement above the OAN considering the strategic priorities of the Borough over the Plan period.</p> <p>The issue of OAN and the most appropriate housing requirement for Reading is particularly pertinent given the constrained nature of the Borough and the manner in which it is physically able to accommodate housing growth that is quite significantly higher than that currently being planned for. It is entirely feasible that review of the spatial strategy will emerge as being essential to full delivery of the final figure.</p>	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>OPTION 3.2 is our preferred option, on the grounds that point 4.1 states "Reading Borough is a very small geographical area, most of which is already relatively densely developed"; therefore, there is a real danger of Reading overly stretching its resources and losing its character by too much housing development.</p>	
John George Ltd	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>We welcome the testing of all options; however Options 3.1 and 3.4 would be favoured.</p> <p>As a minimum, option 3.1 would ensure that the Local Plan complies with the NPPF paragraph 47, which states that LPA's should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.</p> <p>Option 3.4 should be considered in order to deliver higher levels of housing, including affordable housing. This approach is endorsed by the NPPF paragraph 47, which states that LPA's should "boost significantly" the supply of housing.</p>	
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Agree with Option 3.4. Provided the affordable housing objective is securely stitched into the Plan.</p>	
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Support Options 3.1 and 3.4. Meeting or exceeding the objectively assessed need for housing should be a priority objective for the Council and only 3.1 or 3.4 are suitable housing targets. Land at Hosier Street site can contribute significantly towards achieving this objective in a sustainable manner without developing green field land, provided that the appropriate strategy is taken towards the site's allocation.</p>	

James Lloyd	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Agree with Option 3.3. Reading needs more homes but this must not been done at the expense of green space. Any new urban planning needs to ensure access to quality green space. It is possible to increase density of the central reading with planning gain from brownfield that is not yet vacant.</p> <p>Reading plan could be more ambitious and actively follow a 'Smart Growth' approach of increasing housing density and prioritising pedestrian and public transport for new developments therefore minimising the environmental impact of any new developments.</p>	
London and Quadrant	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>We believe that the new Local Plan must follow option 3.1 as a minimum, identifying land to deliver the level of housing to meet the full OAN for Reading in line with the NPPF (paragraph 47).</p> <p>Reading has a very significant need for affordable housing that will continue to be strong across the plan period. We understand that Reading Borough Council has a current waiting list of 5,200 people who are in need of affordable housing. The SHMA also confirms that there is a net need for 406 affordable homes per annum over the plan period which means that the Council must continue to seek affordable housing wherever possible. The NPPG states that an increase in the total housing included in a Plan should be considered where it could help to deliver the required number of affordable homes.</p> <p>The only way in which the Council will be able to plan for a lower figure than its objectively assessed need is for some of its needs to be met outside Reading Borough. However given the constrained nature of surrounding authorities, this is unlikely to be a realistic prospect.</p> <p>We believe that there are suitable sites already identified within the existing local plans, which could accommodate this figure over the plan period, such as the Toys R Us and Homebase site located in the Kenavon Drive area.</p>	
Mayor of London	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>The Mayor welcomes the Council's approach to housing need set out in the SHMA. From a transport perspective connectivity and capacity of the strategic transport links with London will considerably improve. Great Western Mainline improvements with electric trains on Thames</p>	



		<p>Valley services will provide a very significant increase in peak capacity into London. At Paddington there will be an interchange with Crossrail as well as HS2 at Old Oak Common. Reading will also benefit from the Western Rail Access to Heathrow. The Council may wish to look closely at Option 3.4 and consider the potential intensity and scale of development capacity and opportunities in particular around its stations and bus corridors into stations in the light of these transport improvements during the further preparation of the Local Plan.</p>	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 3</b>	Prefer Option 3.2	
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>The Berkshire SHMA identified a need for 2,855 homes a year up to 2036 in the Western HMA. The identified need for Reading is currently set at 699 homes a year. OP supports an approach that meets this objectively assessed need, in accordance with paragraph 47, bullet point 1 of the NPPF. Delivering sufficient housing in the HMA is essential to support economic growth and Reading's status as the hub for the Thames Valley.</p> <p>Reading BC must ensure, however, that in setting the housing need for the Borough, it is set as a policy off unconstrained figure in order to meet the requirements of the NPPF in relation to creating a sound policy making process. This must be supported by an up to date evidence base.</p>	
Reading Football Club	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Option 3.1: There is a requirement through the NPPF and the PPG for a Local Plan to be 'positively prepared' by proposing strategic objectives which seek to meet objectively assessed requirements. Given this is one of the tests of soundness, the Local Plan must provide for an OAN of at least 699 dwellings per annum. At present, the SHMA has yet to be tested at Examination in terms of the appropriateness of the methodology in determining the OAN and the soundness of its findings. Therefore, the Local Plan should plan for this as the minimum requirement and engage with neighbouring local authorities through the Duty-to-Cooperate in order to ensure that that strategic priorities, including housing delivery, are address collaboratively across local authority boundaries.</p> <p>Option 3.2: Option 3.2 is not aligned with the PPG guidance which requires that the OAN is based upon 'fact and unbiased evidence' (PPG,</p>	

		<p>paragraph ID2a-004). It is contrary to further guidance within the PPG which considers that constraints should not be applied to the overall assessment of need, which includes 'historic underperformance'. Option 3.2 is not appropriate and should not be used as a basis for pursuing within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Option 3.3: Given that this is based on a constrained approach of considering the potential supply of land within the Borough to determine the OAN, this is not in line with PPG guidance (paragraph ID2a-004) and should not be adopted within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Option 3.4: Whether more than 700 homes is appropriate will be dependent on whether the SHMA findings are sound, which will be determined through the figures being examined as part of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>It is understood that the OAN of 699 dpa is based on a demographic-led scenario with upward adjustments to account for unmet need from London, economic need, and affordability. Therefore, there is an opportunity for the housing need to reach in excess of 700 dwellings per annum to help deliver affordable housing within the area as is advised within the PPG (paragraph ID2a-029). Therefore the Local Plan should make allowance for any additional housing requirement above the OAN accruing from affordable housing requirements and unmet need of neighbouring authorities, when considering the strategic priorities of the Borough over the plan period.</p>	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 3	<p>Prefer Option 3.3. Not sensible to offer a number that is set for 20 years since many things may change over this period. Reasonable to commence with the assessed need, but this needs to be reviewed regularly, at least every five years. Windfall sites should be included in the number of housing starts. Reading should seek changes to national legislation such that allocated land for residential development must be used within x years otherwise taken over by the council.</p>	
Rentplus	Question 3	<p>Based on the very significant need for affordable housing Option 3.4 is considered the best approach to significantly boost housing supply and to deliver higher levels of affordable housing within the Borough. To achieve this, the Council will need to look closely at the viability of</p>	

		<p>development across the Borough, including how new affordable housing tenures such as rent to buy homes can contribute to delivering viable schemes.</p> <p>As set out in the accompanying Statement, Government has pledged to deliver 400,000 affordable houses by 2020-21, with a focus on low cost home ownership that includes supply of “10,000 homes that will allow a tenant to save for a deposit while they rent.” As a rent to buy model Rentplus is already enhancing the affordable housing being delivered in other parts of the country, and would make a valuable contribution either as a standalone product or as part of the overall affordable housing offer to boosting the affordable housing supply to meet local needs.</p>	
Ropemaker Properties	Question 3	<p>Prefer Option 3.1 or 3.4</p> <p>In the first instance Reading should plan to meet its own Objectively Assessed Need as a minimum in line with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Issues and Options paper suggests that this would not be possible, however it has also recognised that to date detailed assessment has not been undertaken for all sites.</p> <p>Given the governments emphasis on building and delivering new homes, the Council should seek to maximise housing numbers on sites particularly within the City Centre where increasing the density of development is appropriate given the proximity to public transport, employment, retail and leisure opportunities. As part of a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal it will be appropriate to explore options which include delivery at much higher densities in the most sustainable locations. As part of these options it is entirely appropriate to expand the Tall Buildings Strategy. Land between Weldale Street and Chatham Street provides a suitable location for the expansion of such a strategy to enable the delivery of appropriate and high quality residential development at high density, whilst also delivering public realm enhancements.</p>	
Sonic Star Properties Ltd	Question 3	<p>Agree with Option 3.1. The Council should aim to achieve the full objectively assessed need in terms of housing. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear in this regard (paragraph 47). The Council</p>	

		should be proactive and positive in terms of proposed residential allocations and schemes in order to assist in meeting this identified target.	
Tarmac	<b>Question 3</b>	Agree with Option 3.4. Reading should seek to provide as much housing as possible in order to meet future demands and support the town's important role as the hub for the Thames Valley.	
Tilehurst Poor's Land Charity	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>We consider that it is necessary for RBC to use the development plan process (and the preparation of their evidence base) to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full OAN as required by the NPPF (paras 16, 47 and 156). We anticipate that this process is likely to lead to the identification of a range of appropriate and sustainable locations (including our client's site) to deliver residential development.</p> <p>We see no reason for the emerging Local Plan to pursue lower housing targets and therefore consider that Options 3.2 and 3.3 should not be considered pending a detailed assessment of the residential development potential of the Borough that will arise from this process.</p>	
University of Reading	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Option 3.1: To comply with the requirements of the NPPF and PPG, local authorities should positively prepare Local Plans (NPPF, paragraph 182). To achieve this the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development. However it should be noted that 699 dpa is the level of objectively assessed need determined by GL Hearn in the Berkshire SHMA (February 2016). GL Hearn's methodology is open to challenge and there is the potential that objectively assessed need for Reading is higher than 699 dpa. In this context it should be noted that one of the scenarios set out in GL Hearn's SHMA establishes housing need exceeding 1,000 dpa.</p> <p>Option 3.2: By basing future annual delivery on past provision, this would constrain the assessment of need, conflicting with the PPG (paragraph ID2a-004). The PPG states how the assessment of need should be based on the latest CLG household projections as a starting point, before making further upward adjustments based on demographic data, market signals, economic growth and affordable housing need. This option does not do this and should not be adopted.</p> <p>Option 3.3: This option is clearly based on a constrained approach,</p>	

		<p>based on available land, and should not be adopted.</p> <p>Option 3.4: If full unconstrained OAN for Reading is 699 dpa, this should be the figure that the Plan is based on. However if the Berkshire SHMA's methodology is not considered to provide full OAN, the figure may well be higher. Sensitivity testing in the GL Hearn SHMA includes a scenario which establishes demographic-led OAN of over 1,000 dpa, which suggests that provision should be made in excess of 700 homes per year. Notwithstanding this it is understood that the OAN of 699 dpa is based on a demographic-led scenario with upward adjustments to account for unmet need from London, economic need, and affordability. It does not include an upward adjustment for affordable housing need. Accordingly there is an argument to suggest that the Plan should increase the housing target beyond 700 dpa to help deliver affordable housing in line with the PPG (paragraph ID2a-029).</p>	
Scott Versace	Question 3	<p>Prefer OPTION 3.3. Whilst I understand it is essential for the local councils to ensure there are plenty of quality and affordable homes for residents, I believe this should not be done to the detriment of the environment in which we live. Also, I believe that using greenfield land for residential housing can lead to increased flood risk.</p>	
Viridis Real Estate	Question 3	<p>Agree with Option 3.4.</p>	
Evelyn Williams	Question 3	<p>At this point in time Option 3.1 is really the only one to go for, but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan must be within the constraints of services and infrastructure.</li> <li>• The plan should take into account the scenario that Reading's population will not continue to grow.</li> <li>• The plan should consider whether Reading has reached an optimal size now and does not and should not expand any further. Small is beautiful.</li> <li>• The homes to be built need to be the sort of homes that people who want to live in Reading want to live in. This may not be the same as the type of home that people who want to live in Wokingham would like.</li> </ul>	
Wiltshire Council	Question 3	<p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and</p>	

		<p>affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF. As such, Wiltshire Council would support option 3.1 in the consultation document to meet the full identified OAN from within the Reading Borough sub-HMA.</p>	
<p>Ian Campbell</p>	<p><b>Question 3</b></p>	<p>I agree this is a key issue and welcome the SHMA. On the other hand experience shows that trying to predict housing demand years ahead with numerical precision will fail. It is only possible to forecast housing trends in broad terms. It is not possible to forecast the actual timing or the actual numbers. The tone of the Local Plan Issues and Options document, with its focus on sites and unit number allocations strongly suggests the numbers are seen as the end point, not the starting point. This is a short sighted, unsustainable approach which will forfeit the infrastructure and community gains strategically planned growth can provide through 'land value capture'.</p> <p>The four Western HMA unitary authorities must decide where to put 57,000 new homes. In reality they face a much bigger decision. Unless long term growth pressures in the Thames Valley stop in 2036, in the following 20 years another 57,100 new homes must be built. To proceed the Council must persuade adjoining authorities to also think strategically. Taking account of the Eastern HMA, if Berkshire wants to plan for the next generation, land for 194,000 new homes will be needed within forty years.</p> <p>For these reasons I support Option 3.4 of question 3, which is to provide significantly more than 700 homes each year, but with the proviso that most of them are not built within the boundaries of Reading. It is the only solution to a recent problem and the only realistic way to stop the build-up of under-supply caused by builders and developers who decide to delay new supply in the expectation of higher prices in the future.</p> <p>There is no mention in the draft Local Plan of an intention by Reading Council to take advantage of Paragraph 52 of the NPPF. It recognises that local authorities may plan for the supply of new homes through larger scale developments such as new settlements or urban extensions. Nor is there any mention by the Council of new government proposals that local authorities should take a proactive approach to</p>	<p>See comments above regarding options for housing provision.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document was developed against a background of a considerable amount of joint work with neighbouring authorities, which has resulted in the production of the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework, and this work continues. The work was not at a stage where it could be fully set out in the Issues and Options document.</p> <p>The national policy position is clear in that an authority must look first within its own areas. This is why it is critical to consider the availability of specific sites at the same time as housing numbers are identified, to understand the actual capacity. It would be impossible for the Council to convince another authority to help to meet Reading's need, if the Council were unable to show that it had thoroughly examined opportunities within its own boundaries first.</p>

		planning for new settlements where they can meet the sustainable development objectives of national policy.	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 3</b>	We would regret the additional loss of greenfield land. We would not wish to see the loss of employment land as there need to be a careful balance between the provision of housing and a buoyant local economy providing employment for local residents. Local employment is more sustainable as it reduces residents' need to travel by private car. And we would not support an increased role for the use of garden land for housing, which we believe should continue play a very limited role, with careful consideration given to the appropriateness of any development proposals. Gardens, collectively, provide an important habitat for many wildlife species.	Please see responses in relation to Question 15.
The Englefield Estate Trustees of the Phillimore Successors Settlement	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>The Berkshire SHMA identifies the OAN for Reading as being 699 homes per year in the period 2013 to 2036. In accordance with the NPPF, the Local Plan must therefore, as a minimum, identify land for at least 699 homes per annum. However, the NPPF also requires Local Planning Authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and more particularly to seek to meet their objectively assessed needs "...with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid changes".</p> <p>The Berkshire SHMA identifies that the OAN of those Local Planning Authorities in the Eastern HMA are materially greater than for the Western HMA. Those authorities in the Eastern HMA are significantly constrained by the Green Belt, meaning that opportunities for meeting fully their OAN may be limited. As a result of these factors the authorities in the Western HMA may need to accommodate 'overspill' from the Eastern HMA.</p> <p>In this context the starting point for meeting the Borough housing needs is to identify sufficient housing for 699 dwellings per annum. However, as the need for Reading Borough to accommodate housing from the wider HMA is very likely, and to give sufficient flexibility to respond to changes associated with this, the new Local Plan should be seeking to provide significantly more than 700 homes each year in order to further significantly boost housing supply in Reading Borough and deliver higher levels of affordable housing. Consequently we support Option 3.4 as set</p>	<p>A considerable amount of cooperation has taken place across the area covered by the SHMA around housing needs. However, there is no clear understanding at this point of how much of the Eastern HMA's need cannot be accommodated within the HMA boundaries. It must also be noted that the Western Berkshire HMA is not the only HMA adjoining the Eastern HMA. It is for those authorities to examine the degree to which the Eastern HMA can accommodate its own needs, and make an approach to other HMAs if necessary. This should include assessing the potential for Green Belt release.</p> <p>In terms of the figure that the Draft Local Plan plans for, this is in any case considered to be the level that the Borough can realistically accommodate. If the Western HMA were to plan for growth from other areas, it would not be possible for this to be within Reading Borough in any case.</p>

		out in Question 3 of the consultation document.	
Mr Guest	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>To meet the objectively assessed need RBC will need to fully address the scope for residential development from other sources of land, including existing employment areas.</p> <p>We consider that it is necessary for RBC to use the development plan process (and the preparation of their evidence base) to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full OAHN as required by the NPPF. We anticipate that this process is likely to lead to the identification of a range of appropriate and sustainable locations (including our clients site) to deliver residential development.</p> <p>We see no reason to seek lower housing targets and therefore consider that Options 3.2 and 3.3 should not be considered pending a detailed assessment of the residential development potential of the Borough that will arise from this process.</p>	<p>The Council has assessed the potential for all sources of land to contribute to housing supply. However, it must be noted that the NPPF also requires an objective assessment of the need for economic development uses. This assessment, in the Central Berkshire EDNA, finds a very high level of need for industrial and warehouse space. As such, wholesale release of employment areas will do little to assist in accommodating overall development needs.</p>
Highways England	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>The Local Plan sets out a variety of target number of dwellings per annum (600 - 700+) to deliver within the Local Plan period, 2013 to 2036. We look forward to working with you in order to ensure that as the preferred approach emerges, that it is deliverable in transport terms.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Mount Properties Ltd	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Prefer Option 3.4. The SHMA identifies an objectively assessed need of 699 dwellings per annum. The NPPF states that the Council should plan positively for housing and economic growth, maximising the opportunities that are available. In order to support growth and to contribute towards the significant affordable housing need within the Borough, the Council should seek to significantly boost housing supply above the 699dpa identified within the SHMA and identify sufficient sites to meet this need.</p> <p>The Consultation Paper states that in order to provide 699dpathere would be a need to find 'new' sites for around 4,500 dwellings to 2036. However, in calculating the 'existing' sites the Council has included dwellings expected through planning permissions and sites being discussed through pre-application discussions. Limited weight can be placed on these sites as it is unlikely that all of these will come forward for development. Furthermore, a greater than normal non-</p>	<p>The figure of 4,500 was an interim figure for discussion within the Issues and Options in any case, and has been superseded by more detailed work through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. The HELAA looks in more depth at the suitability, availability and achievability on a site by site basis.</p> <p>It is not agreed that the fact that some allocated sites have not yet come forward is a reason to change lapse rates. The RCAAP and the SDPD both run to 2026, and some of these allocations were always expected to be longer term. In the case of the SDPD, it was only adopted five years ago. It is hardly surprising that not all allocations have come forward.</p>



		<p>implementation rate must be applied to allocated sites carried forward from the existing development plan in recognition of the fact they have not already been developed. On this basis, and given that the Councils should be seeking to deliver a housing target above 699dpa, the number of new dwellings that the Council need to identify is likely to be significantly greater than 4,500 dwellings identified in the consultation paper.</p> <p>In meeting this housing need the Council must ensure that efficient use is made of sites, particularly previously developed land within the settlement. Maximising the potential of sites through supporting increased densities, whilst ensuring a high standard of design is still achieved, will assist in the Council's delivery of housing.</p>	<p>The Local Plan considers densities carefully, and looks to maximise the potential for new homes whilst balancing it against the need to avoid significant detrimental effects on surrounding areas.</p>
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Should subsequent work demonstrate that there is insufficient capacity within Reading to accommodate the objectively assessed needs, the County Council would encourage the Borough Council to first look to neighbouring councils within the Western Berkshire Housing Market Area to accommodate the unmet need.</p> <p>South Oxfordshire district - within the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area - is under pressure to find additional sites to meet its own increased housing needs figure identified in the Oxfordshire SHMA 2014. In addition, the district is likely to be expected to take on a significant element of Oxford's unmet housing needs (working assumption of 15,000 homes).</p> <p>In the event that South Oxfordshire was expected to also find land for unmet need from Reading, Oxfordshire County Council would have concerns both in terms of the requirements for supporting strategic infrastructure and the likely environmental impacts.</p>	<p>The Council is currently discussing how the unmet need can be approached within the Housing Market Area. At this stage, there is no proposal to seek to export this need to South Oxfordshire. These conversations are ongoing.</p> <p>However, it must be noted that, were developments adjoining the Borough to be permitted in South Oxfordshire (which the Council is not necessarily endorsing), these would be Reading-facing developments, relying on Reading services and facilities, and that they would in reality be addressing a need arising in the Reading area rather than South Oxfordshire.</p>
Reading Climate Change Partnership	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>Noted that the Sustainability Appraisal (page 14) shows that many of the sustainability objectives get negative scores, even with the lowest level of housing provision, and scores get worse with the higher levels of provision. Developments are likely to have a very major impact re increasing emissions - and the difference between 600 or 700 houses per year is small (9,000 - 10,500 houses over 15 years).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
West Berkshire	<b>Question 3</b>	<p>There are close linkages between Reading and West Berkshire as both</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has continued to work with</p>

<p>Council</p>		<p>are identified as being part of the Western Berkshire Housing Market Area. As work progresses on Reading and West Berkshire's Local Plan's, both authorities will need to continue to work together. It should be noted that West Berkshire are currently progressing a Housing Site Allocations DPD that will form part of the Local Plan alongside the Core Strategy when adopted later in 2016. Following the adoption of the Housing Site Allocations DPD, work will then commence on a new Local Plan.</p> <p>An application is currently pending consideration (app no: 160199) for a mixed use development on land at Madejski Stadium which includes proposals for c. 633 residential units in addition to up to 102 serviced apartments. If permitted, this proposal will increase flexibility in ensuring that the full OAN can be met.</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council throughout the plan preparation process under the duty to co-operate.</p>
<p>Willowside Homes</p>	<p><b>Question 3</b></p>	<p>Agree with Option 3.1. It would be inappropriate for Reading to continue to provide housing in accordance with historic levels as this would not reflect demographic and economic projections. There is no basis on which to divert from the OAHN and Reading should seek to meet it in full, in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that Reading Borough is a tightly constrained geographic area and it is likely that the 'policy off' figure of 16,077 dwellings pa cannot be achieved. Reading should therefore seek to meet its OAHN, but should that not be possible within its own boundaries, without harming the employment land supply or encroaching onto sensitive sites, then consideration should be given to allocations in neighbouring boroughs, particularly those which abut the urban area of Reading.</p> <p>The boundary of the Western Berkshire HMA is drawn very tightly to the north of Reading such that it excludes any part of South Oxfordshire. This approach appears at odds with the Travel To Work Area identified in the SHMA, which indicates a clear relationship between areas in South Oxfordshire, such as Henley on Thames and Sonning Common, and Reading.</p>	<p>The Council is currently working with neighbouring authorities to consider how the expected unmet need can be accommodated. However, the Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues.</p> <p>In terms of the boundary of the HMA in the SHMA, a 'best-fit' to local authority boundaries has been applied, in line with national guidance.</p>
<p>Dr Megan Aldrich</p>	<p><b>Question 4</b></p>	<p>My observations about obsolescence also apply to issues of 'affordable housing', which is not defined in the plan. What is 'affordable' -- is it</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework, and means housing</p>

		determined solely in terms of cost?	provided at below market price to meet the identified needs of an area.
The Butler Partnership	Question 4	Agree with continuation of the affordable housing policies on the proviso that the policies are updated in line with regular reviews of the viability evidence. In addition, the policies should be adopted on the basis of national guidance at the time, which may well change in light of the recent leave to appeal that was granted to the SofS in respect of the recent High Court challenge by Reading BC & West Berkshire DC.	Noted.
Mr Aaron Collett	Question 4	I fully support the policy for affordable homes, Reading is becoming an expensive place to live. Any incentive to help put first time buyers on the ladder I am onboard with.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 4	Agree with the continuation of the affordable housing policies and fully aware of the difficulties that Emmer Green's future generations will have in buying locally, so support RBC's attempts to enforce provision for affordable housing on smaller developments. We further support the closing up of loops that allow developers to avoid this obligation by periodically building less than 10 dwellings within the same area.	
James Lloyd	Question 4	Agree with the continuation of the affordable housing policies. It will be important to ensure that the plan can steer any new development, quality and size of unit to ensure decent mix of housing types are available. There is clearly a place for additional local guidance to ensure that the market delivers this.	
London and Quadrant	Question 4	The delivery of 30% affordable housing on larger sites should be retained in the new local plan in order to meet the pressing need for affordable housing in Reading. A prescriptive split as to the proposed tenure and type of the affordable housing units should be avoided where possible, to ensure the policy remains suitable for the lifetime of the plan (to protect itself against market/need changes etc).	
Oxford Properties	Question 4	OP does not object to the continuation of CS16, which requires that residential development delivers a proportion of affordable dwellings on site.	
Reading Football Club	Question 4	There is an acute affordable housing need in Reading and therefore the emerging Local Plan should continue to require the provision of 30% affordable housing on larger schemes coming forward subject to viability evidence. Given that there will undoubtedly be viability assessments undertaken to support the emerging Local Plan, there may	
University of Reading	Question 4		

		be a requirement to review the provision as and when this information emerges.	
Brian Jamieson	Question 4	Agree with continuation of the affordable housing policies.	
Elaine Murray			
Tarmac			
Scott Versace		Agree with continuation of the affordable housing policies. I would like to commend the council's stand against the Secretary of State on the issue of development sizes. With housing being such a vital issue for so many areas in the UK, limiting developments to more than 10 dwellings makes little sense to me. If suitable space exists for developing affordable housing, whether 2 or 20 dwellings, it should be considered	
Ropemaker Properties	Question 4	The affordable housing policy appears appropriate subject to the continued flexibility of viability assessments to ensure that sites are deliverable, particularly urban brownfield sites.	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 4	In general, SDRL agree with the principles of setting a target level of affordable housing on larger sites (30% is indicated), provided that this is subject to viability in accordance with the NPPF and there is recognition that provision may be on or off site depending upon the circumstances of specific sites.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 4	The affordable housing policies should be strengthened. Most housing developments are small. The lower limit is too low. I think developers should contribute more from the massive increase in value obtained when development occurs.	The Council agrees that more needs to be done to provide affordable housing. Affordable housing policies need to be set at a level that it is viable to provide, otherwise no development will occur and no homes will be provided. This is a difficult balance to strike, and viability information will continue to be updated to ensure that the maximum viable level of affordable housing is sought from new developments.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 4	Do not agree with continuation of the policies. They are not working and some changes are needed. We have people sleeping rough in Reading. Developers horse trade and ride roughshod over the rules and ignore them.	
Oxford Properties	Question 4	OP strongly objects to the continuation of CS13's requirement for new employment developments to contribute to the provision of affordable housing on the grounds that it is inconsistent with the NPPF (paragraph 21) and government guidance. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on planning obligations states that in all cases the local planning authority must ensure that the obligation meets the relevant tests for planning obligation. Requiring affordable housing contributions	
			It is not agreed that this requirements should be abandoned. The extent to which new employment development can put pressure on the housing market and exacerbate housing need is clear. Illustrative of this, the SHMA included an uplift in housing need as a result of economic growth. It is not sustainable for significant

		<p>from new employment developments represents a significant burden on commercial development. It represents an additional tax on commercial development which is not related to the use.</p> <p>In line with NPPF paragraph 50, affordable housing should be delivered on site where possible and the onus is, therefore, on the Council to positively seek and identify suitable sites for housing delivery, including affordable housing, rather than requiring financial contributions from commercial developers. In order for the Local Plan to produce a sound policy relating to this, it needs to clearly set out the housing needs arising from employment as the evidence base.</p>	<p>amounts of employment development to take place with no supporting mitigation of housing impacts.</p>
<p>Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd</p>	<p><b>Question 4</b></p>	<p>SDRL, consider that policy CS13 of the Core Strategy should not be carried forward into the new plan. This policy is flawed and unsound. There is no policy justification or evidence base which can be used to substantiate a policy of this kind.</p> <p>There is no mention of the acceptability of seeking affordable housing from other (non-residential) types of development in the NPPF and we consider that a policy of this kind fails to meet the tests in paragraph 204 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The relationship between an individual office development and housing is complex and indirect, and the provision of new jobs in the area should be seen as a direct benefit of the scheme and not an adverse impact to be mitigated. It is not possible even in principle to identify with any accuracy the impacts of a single office development in a highly accessible location, on a strategic housing market of 800,000, such as Reading's, where around one in ten households moves from one Berkshire district to another in any one year.</p> <p>More specifically, we do not consider that it is possible to show that additional office floorspace will result in 'additional' demand for affordable housing, particularly when a prime underlying cause of affordable housing demand is low incomes and high prices. It is noted that it could equally be assumed that providing jobs for local residents would reduce the need for affordable housing by increasing incomes, and for your housing policies to allow the market to respond to this</p>	

		change.	
Rentplus	<b>Question 4</b>	<p>Affordable housing policies may yet have to change following the policy changes emerging at a national level. These may impact on the deliverability of affordable housing.</p> <p>The Government’s current consultation on proposed changes to national policy explicitly indicates that the affordable housing definition may be amended to incorporate ‘innovative’ Rent to Buy housing. The Council are in the fortunate position of being able to respond quickly to these proposed changes through the current Local Plan production; the contents of the recent Government consultation will need to be thoroughly considered in relation to what constitutes affordable housing and how this in all its forms can be delivered. The Council would benefit from updating Policy CS16 as this is effectively superseded by the Government’s proposed changes; affordable housing is not always subsidised, nor is it always retained in perpetuity, as implied by the Council’s definition.</p> <p>The third paragraph of Policy CS16 indicates that an open-book approach will be taken to negotiations on viability. Brandon Lewis’s letter (dated 9 November 2015) was clear that the Minister “strongly encourages local authorities to seek the minimum amount of viability information necessary” when negotiating with developers on straightforward matters such as tenure mix. When presented with an option to vary tenure mix to include an element, or the balance as Rentplus rent to buy affordable homes, the Council should consider the Minister’s advice, and the expected changes to the NPPF and treat such matters favourably. It would be beneficial for the Local Plan to update the approach in Policy CS16 to reflect the Minister’s advice, and the need to take a pragmatic approach to boosting housing delivery, particularly where this would help deliver more affordable housing.</p> <p>Whichever option for sustainable growth is chosen to take forward the new Local Plan, affordable rent to buy housing has the potential to improve the overall viability of residential development across Reading. Due to the ready availability of private funding there is significant scope for early delivery of rent to buy homes on any sites that may be</p>	<p>Any changes to national policy will need to be considered as and when they are made. The Local Plan will not attempt to pre-empt such changes.</p> <p>The needs for affordable homes in Reading are significant and immediate. Whilst Rent to Buy potentially has a place in overall housing provision, it may not meet the needs of the significant number of households in need of genuinely affordable housing. Nor is a form of housing that would not be affordable in perpetuity a sustainable solution to the long-term affordable housing needs shown in the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment. As such, the policies continue to place the emphasis on forms of housing most likely to meet needs.</p> <p>In terms of viability assessments, given the scale of affordable housing need, it is critical that the Council is able to critically appraise these assessments to ensure that any arguments to reduce the provision of affordable housing on the basis of viability are fully justified. There are no plans to change this requirement.</p>

		considered for delivery, including on strategic sites.	
Viridis Real Estate	<b>Question 4</b>	Do not agree with continuation of the affordable housing policies.	It is not clear on the reasoning for not agreeing.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 4</b>	<p>Do not agree with continuation of the policies.</p> <p>More has to be done to make affordable housing available provided by the local authority or housing associations (or others), with reasonable security of tenure and rent.</p> <p>The affordable housing policy should be seen to be applied - for example the Lok n'Store development should have provided 40 (36%) affordable homes, this was allowed to be removed for 'viability'.</p> <p>Reading has a housing shortage. Is there really anything wrong with local authority provided prefabs for people on the housing waiting list if other housing stock is not available? Sites that currently have water, sewage, electricity and/or gas connections such as vacant commercial sites or the prison, might be suitable.</p>	<p>The Council agrees that more needs to be done to provide affordable housing. Affordable housing policies need to be set at a level that it is viable to provide, otherwise no development will occur and no homes will be provided. This is a difficult balance to strike, and viability information will continue to be updated to ensure that the maximum viable level of affordable housing is sought from new developments.</p> <p>There is a role for temporary housing, and permission was recently granted for such a scheme at Lowfield Road. However, the priority in most cases must be on permanent provision.</p>
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 4</b>	<p>Agree with continuation of the policies.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing up to 30% should to be tested against the viability of each scheme.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate for schemes of less than 10 units to provide affordable housing, given the disproportionate costs involved in developing smaller sites.</p>	Noted. The affordable housing requirements for smaller sites have been tested for their viability, and therefore take into account any disproportionate costs in developing small sites.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 5</b>	I would support the use of redundant industrial sites provided there are no health concerns.	Noted. The policy on Housing Mix sets out expectations in terms of larger developments of houses setting aside a portion for self-build.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 5</b>	We are not aware of any such sites within Emmer Green but support in principle a policy of encouraging self-building, as this is more likely to equate with a better quality of building than those supplied by developers and a greater pride in their homes, as well as more affordability. There are exciting larger scale projects leading the way in other parts of the country, such as Cherwell District Council's Graven Hill site, where nearly 2,000 homes are planned to be built on former MoD land. Reading could be another such pioneering area, taking the	<p>The opportunities within the Borough for projects on the scale suggested are, however, extremely limited, as these lend themselves to large-scale developments on land under a single ownership.</p> <p>The Lok n Store site has planning permission, and</p>

		continental models as inspiration.	
James Lloyd	Question 5	All sites are appropriate for self build and cooperative housing developments. The land next to the river Kennet on the site of the old lock and store. Especially if the self builders were encouraged to be designed in a more interesting style or using a Walter Segal approach like in Lewisham and Brighton.	therefore, if the development as permitted is built, there are no opportunities for Planning to insist on self-build.
Dr Megan Aldrich	Question 6	I would support the use of redundant industrial sites provided there are no health concerns -- students like to live in areas close to town centres.	<p>The emphasis on starter homes in national policy is likely to change with the Housing White Paper 2017. The Council will need to consider what role, if any, starter homes will play in future affordable housing provision, in view of the level of need for genuinely affordable housing.</p> <p>In terms of the sites specified, a number are identified for development, and the policy expects affordable housing provision. This includes Central Pool, the Makro site and land to the rear of the Butler.</p> <p>In terms of industrial and warehouse land, the Central Berkshire Economic Development Needs Assessment has demonstrated a very high level of need for industrial and warehouse space, and this limits the potential for employment land release.</p>
The Butler Partnership	Question 6	Land to the rear of The Butler, Reading. Part of the site already falls within the existing Oxford Road/Eaton Place/Chatham Street allocation, as detailed at Policy RC4a of the RCAAP.	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 6	Acre Road, Garrard St, in general older very energy inefficient industrial areas of which we have lots.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 6	Unaware of any such sites within our area but support this in principle.	
Mr Guest	Question 6	As summarised above the redevelopment of the Bridgewater Close site for residential uses would be entirely appropriate. In line with emerging legislation and national policy guidance it would be likely to present an opportunity for the provision of an element of starter homes on the site. The extent of this provision should be clearer as the legislation I policy guidance crystallises and more detailed design proposals of the potential of the site are undertaken.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 6	Tessa Road empty buildings.	
Elaine Murray	Question 6	Site where Central Swimming pool is. The pool could be closed, relocated and facilities upgraded to provide a 50metre pool elsewhere in line with leisure development. Funds from sale of land could be used to redevelop new pool facilities.	
Evelyn Williams	Question 6	The Makro site on Elgar Road is massive, ill-kept and the state of the frontage onto Elgar Road is a blot on the local landscape. It is not a perfect location as there are other commercial buildings around but there are houses opposite and it is a good as some others where development has taken place.	



Scott Versace	<b>Question 6</b>	Currently there is a premises that used to be a used car sales business on Tilehurst Road opposite Prospect Park that has been vacant for some time now. This land could easily be developed for at the very least 4 dwellings.	This site (330 Tilehurst Road) now has planning permission for residential development.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 7</b>	I would support the use of redundant industrial sites provided there are no health concerns.	In terms of industrial and warehouse land, the Central Berkshire Economic Development Needs Assessment has demonstrated a very high level of need for industrial and warehouse space, and this limits the potential for employment land release.
Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 7</b>	Central Club	Central Club and Reading Prison are proposed as residential-led allocations in the plan. However, the proposal is that new student housing provision should be focused on the existing campuses and accommodation sites.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 7</b>	Reading Prison would be suitable for student housing	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 7</b>	Phoenix College on Christchurch Road is a secondary special school currently delivering quality education to students despite being on a site that is not fit for purpose. If alternative premises were located for the school, its current site, containing a 3-storey mansion house and other temporary buildings, could be redeveloped for a considerable number of student housing.	There is no indication that Phoenix College will be moving elsewhere and that the site will be available.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 8</b>	I would support the use of redundant industrial sites provided there are no health concerns.	Noted. However, as shown in the Draft local Plan, it will be important to retain much of our existing employment.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 8</b>	The old Elvian school Site, instead of another Secondary school perhaps a care home in its place?	Elvian School now has planning permission for residential and a school.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 8</b>	We believe 'Highridge', Upper Warren Avenue, the property originally bought by RBC as an option for the Caversham Heights School, could be suitable.	Noted. This site was considered for identification, but was considered to be unlikely to meet the threshold for inclusion, i.e. the equivalent of ten dwellings.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 8</b>	RBC must prevent any future loss of bungalows in our area to overdevelopment. The consultation paper states the need for 52 more dwellings per year of specialist housing for older people and bungalows are in great demand for the elderly to be able to continue living independently, particularly on housing estates where there is a mixture of types of housing and therefore the ages and family make-up of the residents, who can look out for each other in a neighbourly way. The	There is a need to balance the provision of housing to meet needs with the efficient use of land. Bungalows provide a suitable type of space for elderly people to live independently, but are also often inefficient users of space. Whilst the plan does not actively seek their loss, this needs to be considered on a case by case basis, and this

		loss of bungalows is now recognised as a national problem and The Joseph Rowntree Foundation is currently championing this issue.	will be informed by judgements on local character.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 8</b>	Site A23, and prison site.	Noted. These sites are identified for residential, although an element of residential care could be provided.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 9</b>	I would support the use of redundant industrial sites provided there are no health concerns.	Noted. However, as shown in the Draft local Plan, it will be important to retain much of our existing employment.
Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 9</b>	Aware of sites, but is that a good idea?	Noted. Meeting needs for gypsies and travellers is an expectation of national planning policy.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 9</b>	Please be aware that this type of development falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category. Please note that highly vulnerable development within Flood Zones 3a and 3b should not be permitted and this would raise a policy objection at the planning application stage. So when looking at site allocations for gypsy and travellers sites the sequential test still applies in Flood Zone 2 but would not be appropriate in Flood Zones 3a or 3b as these are highly vulnerable developments. This also applies to change of use applications to land for a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home site or park home site.	Noted. These considerations will be taken into account when looking at potential sites.
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 9</b>	Not aware of any sites. Don't know enough about the area as whole. This sensitive issue cannot just be ignored.	Noted.
BBOWT	<b>Question 10</b>	Paragraph 21 of the NPPF is clear that a lack of housing should not create a barrier to investment. If the Berkshire SHMA's methodology is not considered to provide the full OAN, the figure may well increase. On this basis we suggest that option 10.1 is the most appropriate course of action in this instance (no limit on employment) in order to allow for the potential for a higher, economic-led OAN figure and resultant flexibility.	The approach in the Draft Local Plan is a combination of options 10.2 and 10.4. Employment needs should be considered over the wider Functional Economic Market Area (covering Wokingham, Bracknell Forest and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead), as shown in the Berkshire FEMA study. Where a balance between housing and employment is to be struck, it needs to be considered over the wider FEMA/HMA area rather than within the artificial Borough boundaries.
John Booth	<b>Question 10</b>	Agree with Option 10.4. There certainly need to be limits but limits should depend on complex criteria - demographics, types of future work, transportation systems, working from home (note projections are emerging that automation may drastically reduce the number of workers, or their hours )  Presumably want enough employment for local working population to minimise commuting, so a number of issues about how much out-	However, it is agreed with many respondents that overall limitations are a blunt tool and are not appropriate. What is preferable is that the Plan

		commuting (to London or Heathrow) to expect in the future. Will depend on levels of congestion and fuel prices and availability of work. But not so much employment that people will commute in from great distances.	plans for the objectively assessed need for both housing and employment as far as is possible, as these have been assessed using the same basis and are therefore in 'balance', but seeks to ensure that, where that need is exceeded, development provides mitigation that preserves that balance insofar as is possible.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 10</b>	Option 10.4 is most sensible. I think Reading is a very small geographical area and so it is foolish to confine decisions based only on the irrelevant borough boundary. The economic success in say the Wokingham Bracknell Reading Triangle does not recognise borough boundaries.	
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 10</b>	Agree with option 10.1	
Dr Antony Cowling			
Elaine Murray			
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 10</b>	Agree with option 10.2	
Scott Versace			
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 10</b>	Ideally Option 10.4, but this would be difficult to manage given the leads and lags between commercial and residential development. Also the fluctuations in the economic cycle would make it difficult to tie commercial and residential development too rigidly.	
John George Ltd	<b>Question 10</b>	Given overriding housing pressures and constrained nature of Reading, the Council should approach the issue by placing a limit on employment development, based on how much housing is to be provided in the wider housing market area (Option 10.4). Potential flexibility is welcomed and further policy must allow for redevelopment for alternative uses where benefits arise which would justify the loss.	
James Lloyd	<b>Question 10</b>	Agree with Option 10.2. It is essential that all new development effectively contributes to section 106 payments for public goods. These should be set out in the local plan and developers encouraged to develop.	
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 10</b>	Oxfordshire County Council encourages Reading BC to seek to achieve a balance between the numbers of jobs and workers so as not to lead to an increase in out-commuting from Oxfordshire to Reading, particularly	

		<p>by private car.</p> <p>However, should Reading BC decide not to limit employment growth, the County Council would encourage the borough council to look to locate new employment space so as to make the best use of (and benefit from) committed investment in the rail network and the improved connectivity this will bring.</p>	
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 10	<p>Need to consider available workforce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want enough employment for local working population to minimise commuting</li> <li>• But not so much employment that people will commute in from great distances</li> </ul>	
Reading Football Club	Question 10	<p>Employment and housing will be key strategic priorities for the emerging Local Plan given the focus of Reading being at the heart of the Thames Valley and an area for considerable investment through the Thames Valley LEP. The NPPF requires that through plan-making there should be commitment to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development' ensuring that there is sufficient land to take account of the needs of 'the residential and business communities' (paragraph 17): on this basis a lack of housing should not be a barrier to growth (paragraph 21). In this regard, Option 10.1 would provide scope for the Local Plan to pursue higher economic led OAN figure if this is considered appropriate moving forward and would be better aligned with national policy guidance.</p>	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 10	<p>Agree with Option 10.1. Not possible to control.</p>	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 10	<p>There should be no need to limit employment development. There is a complex relationship between employment and housing development which is based on sub-regional development patterns not just those in Reading Borough. Reading is the regional hub to the west of London and draws its employees from a wide area. Equally, its resident's works and commute to London and elsewhere and it is not possible to create a system in equilibrium where housing and employment development are linked.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to Question 4, we strongly</p>	

		disagree with suggestions that employment development should in some way mitigate housing impacts.	
Tarmac	Question 10	Agree with Option 10.2. Reading is a very successful employment location and its potential will be further increased by the completion of the Cross Rail project. The Local Plan should not seek to limit employment development.	
Willowside Homes	Question 10	Agree with option 10.1. Economic growth in Reading should not be restricted. The town is well placed to accommodate further growth and overspill from London. Crossrail will support additional economic growth and the Local Plan should seek to foster this by protecting existing employment sites and seeking to allocate further sites in accessible locations.	
Ian Campbell	Question 10	<p>Employment, housing and environmental protection in central Berkshire need to be balanced. Finding and preserving the right balance needs a strategic approach. 20 years is too short. National and local economic prosperity is helped by managing growth pressures over 40/60 year timescales. These periods match long term infrastructure delivery timescales.</p> <p>Reading's employment policies over the last two decades are a success. This success is a measure of finding the right balance between demand and supply. It reflects decisions to encourage new employment in two distinct but complimentary locations, Reading's town centre and Reading's new business parks. It is important that this dual policy is maintained and encouraged.</p> <p>Due to increasing house prices and improvements in business sentiment, it is likely that unless there is another recession within two or three years employers concerns about staff availability will again return to levels last seen in 1999/2000 and indeed ten years earlier than that. If this happens, and the Reading area once again wins a reputation for staff shortages, the perceived labour shortage will again become a cause for concern. Staff shortages quickly change perceptions of a location's appeal. Concerns about affordability can rapidly deter new employers from choosing an area like Reading, and deter existing local employers thinking about making long term investment decisions from new investments. As it is likely to happen, it is another reason for</p>	

		<p>increasing the supply of housing to buy and rent as quickly as practicable.</p> <p>For these reasons I support Option 10.1. There is no need for planners to do so. The market will do a good job.</p>	
Highways England	<b>Question 10</b>	In reference to the future work for revisiting the need for additional employment development and the associated infrastructure needed to deliver the employment land requirements, we welcome early engagement on providing a revised assessment for the transport infrastructure requirements.	Transport modelling of the proposals is currently underway, and the report will be shared with the Highways Agency when available.
Mr Ian Mackinder	<b>Question 10</b>	Given Central Reading's extraordinarily good position as a public transport hub, the sub-regional priority should be to locate office, retail and cultural/entertainment facilities in central Reading. This would necessarily be at the expense of housing. However, getting neighbouring authorities to agree to Reading BC having the employment and them having the housing, may not go down too well!	The Draft Local Plan continues to provide for a significant amount of new office floorspace in central Reading. This can be provided alongside additional housing.
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 10</b>	<p>OP does not support any of the options in Question 10.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 17 bullet point 3 states that plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land, which is suitable for development. The onus is, therefore, upon the Council to identify and allocate sufficient land to meet identified housing and employment needs. Restricting employment development, due to insufficient housing land being identified, is unsound and contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 158 of the NPPF confirms that 'Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated'. Further guidance is in the NPPG. The Local Plan evidence base must assess the economic led need of the wider HMA, and associated housing requirement. The Plan should include a jobs target and in line with the requirements of paragraph 158 of the NPPF, the economic and employment policies of the Local Plan need to be based upon up-to-date evidence, which is robust and credible. The options presented would not see the Plan positively prepared nor encourage economic growth.</p> <p>Limiting employment development contradicts NPPF paragraph 19. The</p>	The Plan seeks to provide for the objectively assessed needs for both housing (from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment) and employment (from the Economic Development Needs Assessment) insofar as is possible. These documents were based on the same baseline information, and therefore are compatible and comply with the NPPF. The plan does not seek to limit employment development due to not providing sufficient housing sites. However, there is a clear relationship between additional employment and need for new housing (as demonstrated by the uplift to the SHMA figures as a result of economic growth) and therefore employment growth beyond the identified need should address the issue.

		<p>Local Plan includes no headroom for additional sites to come forward which stifles the potential for inward investment and future economic growth within the Borough. This is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>OP is keen to ensure that any future Local Plan document meets the current and future employment needs of the Borough. Green Park is currently short of built employment space and Oxford Properties are progressing plans for new development. Refusing permission for employment expansion where there is an identified need is an unsound approach to policy.</p>	
Roxhill Developments Ltd	<b>Question 10</b>	<p>The development of A31 for employment uses represents an opportunity to assist in the management of the relationship between employment development and housing in south Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Berkshire SHMA highlights that, with the development of internet shopping, there has in recent years been a growing demand for B8 space for high spec warehousing;</li> <li>• The development of A31 would provide employment opportunities across a range of occupation types and skill levels; reflecting the way in which modern large scale commercial developments incorporate a range of usable spaces including for storage, drivers and office-based staff;</li> <li>• The development of A31 would contribute towards objectives that are set out in the Strategic Economic Plan, including addressing the pockets of economic activity and unemployment in Reading; recognising the importance of the connectivity of the area for the growth of the economy, particularly links to London including the M4; and acknowledging that the Reading/Wokingham/Bracknell urban area is a major centre of economic activity with significant potential for future growth;</li> <li>• A large area within Reading has a higher than average proportion of residents employed within the transport and storage sector. There are particular opportunities to make connections between A31 and existing areas within the southern part of Reading with concentrations of residents seeking employment in this sector.</li> </ul>	Noted. This area of Island Road is proposed for a major industrial and warehouse development site.
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 10</b>	West Berkshire Council agree with the comments at 3.24 in the consultation document which state that more jobs than workers in Reading will lead to high levels of in-commuting and greater pressure	Noted. This comes back to the need to plan for a balance of employment and housing across the wider area. The Berkshire SHMA and the Central

		on the housing market. There is already a flow of outward commuting from West Berkshire to Reading. Any increase will impact upon highways and transport and create pressure on housing needs in West Berkshire.	and West Berkshire EDNAs documents were based on the same baseline information, and therefore are compatible. Planning on the basis of the identified needs across the wider area will help to ensure that the overall balance is struck.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 10</b>	None of the options are preferred. Reading currently has many vacant offices etc. and many people who live in Reading work further afield including commuting to London. The options for managing the relationship between employment development and housing need to take these into account.	Noted. Since the permitted development right to convert offices to residential was introduced, much of Reading's vacant office stock has either been converted, or is due to be converted. These figures are accounted for in our calculations, but there is still a substantial need for new homes.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 11</b>	The evidence of the success in recent years of the area around Covent Garden in London, and the similar success of London's South Bank area as destination locations for social purposes, not retail amply shows the potential for creating this sort of leisure destination. Could the same be done in central Reading around the station and extending these uses to the river Thames? The current weakness is the poor pedestrian connectivity north and south of the railway station. The recently improved links are welcome but are insufficient to link the potential appeal of the river with the area's more established attractions south of the station. But London's successes show that to become a thriving destination location the requisite scale is needed, often on more than one level. Market evidence shows the potential exists for turning central Reading into a popular city centre, and an important national transport hub.	Noted. The Station/River major opportunity area takes this approach of vastly strengthening north-south links to the Thames and beyond to leisure uses around the Thames at the Riverside site and on the North of the Station site.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 11</b>	Whilst I believe there is no need for major expansion of retail space in the town centre, I feel a proper indoor/outdoor market would be a nice addition to the town. I feel Reading as a retail experience is very copy and paste, retaining Friars Walk or Bristol and West Arcade for the quirky independent retailers would be a very good idea.	The proposals for Hosier Street include provision for a replacement market site. The Bristol and West Arcade forms part of site CR14d. The potential for ground floor retail at this site is included within the policy, and the Small Shop Units policy includes general expectations for small shops.
John Booth	<b>Question 11</b>	Agree that there is no need for major retail expansion.	The Retail and Leisure Study, assessing the need for new retail and leisure facilities within Reading and the rest of the Western Berkshire HMA, has now been completed, and informs the approach
Mrs Jenny Cottee			
Dr Antony			



Cowling			<p>of the Local Plan. The levels of need for new retail is lower than was assessed in the previous study that informed the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Study recognises that there is considerable uncertainty in planning for retail in the second half of the plan period, which is where most of the need arises. The approach is therefore to plan for up to these levels, in recognition of this uncertainty.</p>
James Lloyd			
Elaine Murray			
Tarmac			
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 11</b>	Agree that there is no need for major retail expansion. The need is in regeneration of existing areas rather than any expansion. The British Retail Consortium has highlighted the threat of closure of thousands of shops and the trend towards online shopping.	
Hammerson plc	<b>Question 11</b>	<p>It is premature to conclude that there is unlikely to be a need for major retail expansion in Reading. It is acknowledged in the Consultation on Issues and Options that the Reading Retail Study dates back to 2005; it has a base Study year of 2004. The retail sector nationally and in Reading has changed substantially in the last 12 years. The quantitative need for additional floorspace should be objectively assessed before any decisions are made in respect of the direction of policy or future growth in Reading Town Centre.</p> <p>As owners of The Oracle Shopping Centre, Hammerson plc are a significant stakeholder in Reading Town Centre and would, therefore, wish to be consulted on the scope, conclusions of the Retail Study at the appropriate time and in advance of publication of the draft Local Plan.</p>	
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 11</b>	Incremental expansion seems inevitable, but there is no obvious need for a major expansion. This is largely a zero-sum game, so major expansion in one area would cause retrenchment in another.	
Eleanor Pitts	<b>Question 11</b>	No more retail space.	
Reading Football Club	<b>Question 11</b>	<p>The NPPF requires that Local Plans 'promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer' (paragraph 23) and is supportive of further studies being undertaken to support the preparation of the Local Plan to determine whether further retail provision is required.</p> <p>Elsewhere within the Borough there will be opportunities for smaller scale provision to support new development which contributes to the diversity of large scale developments that are not within the town</p>	

		centre location. The NPPF is supportive of such an approach especially to ensure that 'the needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centres uses are met in full' (paragraph 23). In this regard, the Local Plan must recognise where appropriate retail uses will support the vitality of larger scale developments especially given the role of retail in supporting economic activity over the plan period.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 11	Agree that there is no need for major retail expansion. The impact of internet shopping will control retail expansion.	
Scott Versace	Question 11	Agree that there is no need for major retail expansion. With the town centre, the Rose Kiln Lane area, the numerous ward precincts across Reading, I believe there are plenty of retail areas for the size of the town. In my opinion, any extra space should be considered for housing and greenfield/environmental use.	
Willowside Homes	Question 11	Do not agree that there is no need for major retail expansion. If Reading is to continue to fulfill its regional role, with increased housing and employment allocations, it needs to increase retail provision both in the town centre and in out of centre locations which are accessible by public transport.	
Foudry Properties Limited	Question 11	It is not yet possible to comment given that a further new evidence base is being progressed by the Council. However, given the progress now made at Kennet Island, it is considered that the shops and services that operate at the centre of this new community should be designated as a 'Local Centre' within Reading's retail hierarchy. On this basis appropriate policy protection, and therefore investment confidence, would be secured.	Given the very limited facilities on offer at the heart of Kennet Island, it is not considered that it can be designated a local centre. It is very close to the Whitley district centre, which is the main centre for the expansion of facilities in South Reading.
Oxfordshire County Council	Question 11	Work to identify whether there is a need for major additional retail and other town centres uses in Reading should take account of the redevelopment of the Westgate centre in Oxford. This scheme is currently underway and is due for completion October 2017. It will create significant additional retail floorspace and improve the commercial leisure offer in the city centre, attracting expenditure from the wider area.	Noted. The Retail and Leisure Study that reported in 2017 took account of development in nearby centres.
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 11	SDRL note the importance of being flexible, given the rapidly evolving nature of the retail market where shops must compete with on-line retailers and increasing shops have a presence on-line and on the high street, with the latter being increasingly used to showcase goods and	Noted. Allocations on key sites within the town centre are drafted to include a degree of flexibility. The allocation at the former Civic Offices site in Hosier Street includes retail.

		<p>be a collection point for goods purchased on line.</p> <p>If major retail expansion is a preferred option, the Council's former Civic Centre appears to be a good location for this to take place. This site is likely to be more attractive to High Street retailers than the more peripheral Station area. It also has much greater potential to enhance rather than compete with Reading's successful core shopping areas so it should generate positive interest from retailer developers and investors while meeting the principal retail need in Reading in a logical and deliverable location.</p>	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 11</b>	<p>Agree that there is no need for major retail expansion. More should be done to encourage independent shops or small chains in the town centre. Apart from Harris Arcade there are few locations. The Bristol &amp; West arcade (site A6) should be renovated and might be suitable. Effort should be expended in reviving local shopping centres and encouraging independent shops or small chains in these areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The potential for ground floor retail at this site is included within the policy, and the Small Shop Units policy includes general expectations for small shops.</p>
John Booth	<b>Question 12</b>	<p>Arts, sports and open space would seem to be obvious candidates.</p>	<p>The plan makes provision for sports and open space provision, as well as a re-provision of the Hexagon.</p>
John Booth	<b>Question 12</b>	<p>Renewable energy and low-carbon heating systems, public transport and cycling infrastructure.</p>	<p>The plan makes provision for transport improvements and decentralised energy.</p>
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 12</b>	<p>Hotel accommodation - as recognised in the existing Core Strategy, and the RCAAP. The land to the rear of The Butler, would be a suitable site for a new hotel, forming part of the wider redevelopment of the RC4a opportunity area.</p>	<p>There has been a substantial amount of hotel development in recent years, and it is not clear that there is a significant additional need that should be fulfilled. Nevertheless, policy CR4 includes general support for leisure and tourism uses in the centre.</p>
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 12</b>	<p>There is a serious under provision of existing leisure facilities in Reading. We would like to see policies included to provide additional leisure facilities both for current residents, and also to meet the needs of the projected increase in population. In particular we regret the paucity and the condition of swimming pools in the borough, and would hope that an aspirational policy to provide new and improved swimming facilities would be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Proposals for additional leisure provision, particularly for swimming, are included in the draft plan.</p>
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 12</b>	<p>The removal of the Hexagon, civic centre and police station would make a brilliant area for a multi-use bowling/ice skating/theatre one</p>	<p>The need for bowling and ice skating facilities is noted in the Retail and Leisure Study, and the</p>

		stop destination for entertainment.	plan includes sites that could accommodate a range of leisure facilities.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 12	Ten pin bowling alley or skating rink.	
Brian Cottee	Question 12	Why does the consultative document contain no plans for sites that might be needed for cultural and leisure facilities. For a town with city aspirations the lack of a theatre is a major embarrassment. Why are possible sites not identified?	The Local Plan includes provision for leisure facilities and supports re-provision of the Hexagon.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 12	Leisure- theatre, swimming pool, galleries etc- see core strategy bullet point	Noted. The Local Plan includes swimming provision and supports re-provision of the Hexagon. Gallery space, where proposed, is likely to be part of a wider mix of town centre uses.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 12	Community uses, cycle parking, light rail, hydro electricity. Covered roof over the whole of Broad Street	New community uses and cycle parking are covered in the Draft Local Plan, and the potential for hydropower at Caversham Lock is also highlighted. It is not considered that a roof over Broad Street is achievable or necessary.
James Lloyd	Question 12	A new town centre Swimming Pool, athletics track and astroturf pitch walking distance from the station would encourage youth sports and reduce local levels of obesity.	Noted. The Local Plan includes swimming provision. There are existing athletics and astroturf facilities reasonably close to the town centre.
James Lloyd	Question 12	There needs to be better interpretation to encourage people to walk from out of town to the surrounding area encouraging more leisure activity as part of daily life.	Noted, although this is a detailed matter not within the remit of the local plan.
Elaine Murray	Question 12	Improved cultural facilities, making more of the Town Hall and Abbey area.	Agreed. An Abbey Quarter policy includes more detail.
Reading Football Club	Question 12	Given the quantum of both of employment and residential likely to be required within the Borough over the forthcoming plan period, there will be a need for a range of facilities to support increased community needs. The Council should commit to undertaking further studies in this respect in order to support and inform the Local Plan.  The adopted Core Strategy (paragraph 8.4/8.8) refers to a number of aspirations by the Council with regard to specific facilities that were	The Retail and Leisure Study looked at the leisure facilities needed within Reading, and these are referenced in the retail and leisure section of the plan.

		sought to be delivered over the plan period, if sufficient land were to come forward in an appropriate location. It is considered that some of these requirements could be carried forward into the forthcoming Local Plan given the important contribution they will make to increasing leisure and cultural facilities within the Borough, and the fact that they remain a longstanding aspiration for the area. Specific facilities which ought to be referenced include the delivery of a new ice rink and music venue.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 12</b>	Arts complex to replace hexagon (in the prison if it is up for redevelopment), swimming pool redevelopment, walking routes around the town, running routes around the town (if we are having more central reading residents	The Local Plan includes provision for leisure facilities and supports reprovision of the Hexagon. The plan generally supports improvement to movement around Reading on foot.
Scott Versace	<b>Question 12</b>	As well as the uses included in the guidance document I believe specific consideration needs to be given for the planning of green spaces. Open spaces providing a link for residents with nature are important for mental and physical health, as well as providing locations for social gatherings and leisure activities.	Noted. The plan includes requirements for the provision of green spaces with new developments.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 12</b>	Should be planning for allotments and gardens.	The need to provide allotments and gardens is understood. However, there is no known need that would necessitate a significant allocation in the Local Plan.
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 12</b>	Health and education.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan covers the health and education infrastructure needs of new development.
John Booth	<b>Question 13</b>	Wildlife corridors, Arts, sports and open space would seem to be obvious candidates. Renewable energy and low-carbon heating systems ... public transport and cycling infrastructure ... waste management infrastructure ... incinerators linked to district heating	Most of these elements are covered within policies in the Local Plan. Waste management and incinerators will be a separate matter to be considered as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 13</b>	I hope the new Local Plan will retain flexibility to respond to new demand. One of the reasons for Reading's success compared to many other towns is the willingness of the Council since it became a unitary authority to respond to new commercial demand. The local business parks are an example of a welcome mind-set which is very important to new companies trying to decide where to set up for the first time.	Noted.

		House builders need to made to feel equally welcome too	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 13</b>	The list given included in bullets 1 and 2 should be planned for. Development must include matching infrastructure. Reading already has very high density development and poor facilities.	Policies seek to ensure that the needs for community provision are met. In terms of sports provision, the plan includes policies protecting leisure (including sport) and open space facilities, and also providing for new sports facilities, in particular for swimming.
Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 13</b>	Should assess the need for churches, ice skating, music and arts	The need for leisure facilities is included within the Retail and Leisure Study. Churches will fall within the general policy on community facilities.
James Lloyd	<b>Question 13</b>	More planning for access to open spaces held in commons ownership, arts areas and better wildlife corridors as part of a plan for Green and Blue infrastructure.	The need for provision of open space is covered in policy, although ownership of the space cannot be governed by the Local Plan. The policy on the green network includes a number of Green Links which should be consolidated and enhanced.
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 13</b>	We would suggest that the Central Swimming pool needs closing and a new 50metre pool and diving facilities built. We don't use Central because of the hygiene - we use private facilities. This is a loss of revenue for the Council.	The Council is progressing with plans for new swimming provision, which includes the closure of Central Pool and Arthur Hill and replacement at Rivermead and Palmer Park. The Local Plan reflects this by identifying the relevant sites.
Reading Climate Change Partnership	<b>Question 13</b>	There was a requirement for energy infrastructure associated with renewable energy and low-carbon heating systems to create local resilience.	The plan includes a policy seeking decentralised energy provision on major schemes, which contributes towards resilience.
Reading Gospel Hall Trust	<b>Question 13</b>	<p>The need of provision for sites for community use and social infrastructure should not be crowded out. I attach a recent publication Faith Groups and the Planning System: Policy Briefing, which covers the needs of all faith groups, and makes recommendations as to a wide range of policy changes needed in the changing social environment of Britain. We suggest that the principles put forward in this policy briefing should be reflected in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>So far as the needs of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church are concerned, although we cannot at this stage nominate any particular site, we do have a fast growing congregation. Our projection of the number of new Brethren households to be established in the RBC/WBC area over the next 10 years involves the need for at least one further</p>	The policy on community facilities seeks to ensure that where development results in needs for community space, those needs are met, and that facilities are only lost where there is no need for them or they are replaced.

		<p>hall, and probably three further halls over the 20 year plan period.</p> <p>In view of the scarcity of community use D1 buildings across the Borough, we trust the wording of relevant policies can be revised to strengthen the resistance to loss of such facilities, and to provide for favourable consideration to be given towards new facilities applied for, bearing in mind that enough suitable provision is not available.</p>	
Sport England	<b>Question 13</b>	<p>The NPPF is clear about the role that sport plays in delivering sustainable communities through promoting health and well-being. As such, Sport England wishes to see local planning policies that seek to protect, enhance and provide for sports facilities based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need in accordance with paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Sound policy can only be developed in the context of objectively assessed needs, in turn used to inform the development of a strategy for sport and recreation. Policies which protect, enhance and provide for sports facilities should reflect this work, and be the basis for consistent application through development management. Sport England is not prescriptive on the precise form and wording of policies, but advises that a stronger plan will result from attention to taking a clearly justified and positive approach to planning for sport. Without such attention there is a risk that a local plan or other policy document could be considered unsound.</p>	The plan includes policies protecting leisure (including sport) and open space facilities, and also providing for new sports facilities, in particular for swimming.
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 13</b>	<p>There are linkages between the eastern most communities of West Berkshire and Reading. Our Core Strategy DPD and emerging Housing Site Allocations DPD acknowledges that West Berkshire residents will use services and facilities in Reading and vice versa. This is particularly the case in relation to West Berkshire schools educating Reading pupils, especially children of secondary school age.</p> <p>In determining needs, Reading and West Berkshire will need to ensure there is a coordinated approach, particularly as West Berkshire Council will be commencing work on a new Local Plan towards the end of 2016. There is therefore the potential for any discussions/joint work to benefit both emerging Local Plans.</p>	Noted. The Council will continue to cooperate with West Berkshire Council in terms of infrastructure planning.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 13</b>	Today there is a gap in the market for housing for nurses and others	The need for affordable housing for a range of

		whose low pay, maybe during training, make living in decent accommodation in Reading impossible.	people, including key workers such as nurses, is significant, and the plan seeks to secure this through policy.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 13</b>	The need for long term mooring for people living on narrow boats.	The need for moorings for houseboats is being assessed as part of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 13</b>	Allotments. Allotments are not just green space or open space. It is the statutory duty of the council under the Allotments Act to provide sites for allotments that meet demand. Given the fluctuation that occurs in demand a reasonable provision of allotments should be aimed for, but this should be part of the planning requirement for new developments such as Royal Elm Park.	The need to provide allotments is understood. However, there is no known need that would necessitate a significant allocation in the Local Plan.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 13</b>	Need for hotels should be assessed.	There has been a substantial amount of hotel development in recent years, and it is not clear that there is a significant additional need that should be fulfilled. Nevertheless, policy CR4 includes general support for leisure and tourism uses in the centre.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 14</b>	Reading seems saturated with retail spaces; on the whole I agree with the spatial strategy.	See comments on retail above.
John Booth	<b>Question 14</b>	Need to debate whether/how to enhance suburban centres - 'distributed concentration' - to enhance community spirit and reduce demand for transportation. Hub office-space with hot-desking and fast broadband? Working from home?	The policies on district and local centres seek a diverse range of facilities, including both residential and employment. However, specifying the exact form of that, e.g. home working, is too detailed.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>If Reading is to successfully manage the long term growth pressures in the Thames Valley, there must be a fundamental change in the strategy. The current draft Local Plan approach is parochial; short term; shoe-horned into historic unhelpful boundaries; ignores the rest of the SHMA area; ignores the problems faced by London; ignores the probable east/ central Berkshire pressures, and ignores the lessons of 40 years of local policy failure.</p> <p>High local land values show there is big pool of potential new prosperity. Tapping into this wealth is in the control of the local authorities. Outside London and the south east this opportunity does</p>	<p>The draft objectives for the Plan were stated in section 2, so it is unclear what is being referred to when it mentions "not revealing objectives".</p> <p>The many issues raised in this comment are clearly important, but in producing a Local Plan there is a very clear process that must be followed. Lobbying the Government for boundary changes, for instance, is clearly not a matter that the Local Plan can deal with. It is incumbent on London and/or Eastern Berkshire to calculate</p>



		<p>not exist. It ought to be exploited as part of a long term, strategic house building policy by the Berkshire local authorities.</p> <p>In Reading greenfield sites are a limited and valuable resource. Beyond the boundaries of Reading this is not the case. The Council is already having conversations with its neighbours within the Housing Market Area about how this issue might be addressed. This is welcome. No clues about the objectives of the Council in these conversations are given in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The decision by the Council not to state their objectives at this stage is revealing. Its absence suggests the radical, innovative strategic solutions needed in place of tried, tested and unsuccessful policies of the last four decades may not emerge. For example there is no evidence in the document that the Council will take a case to the government for an extra-territorial, long term, self-funding building solution on the legitimate grounds that there is an impasse locally which it is the responsibility of government to resolve.</p>	<p>whether there is a need for other authorities to accommodate their unmet needs, and no such approach has been made.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document was developed against a background of a considerable amount of joint work with neighbouring authorities, which has resulted in the production of the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework, and this work continues. The work was not at a stage where it could be fully set out in the Issues and Options document. However, even in this context, the Council needs to follow statutory procedures and national policy in progressing with its Local Plan, and can still only work with the land that is within its control.</p>
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 14</b>	The spatial strategy for land within the borough boundary should remain.	Noted.
De Merke Estates Ltd	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>We would suggest that whilst elements of the spatial strategy may still be relevant given the on-going development occurring across the Borough, a key consideration will be the most up-to-date OAN requirement within the SHMA and how any adopted additional housing requirements will be delivered and accommodated over the Plan period.</p> <p>The administrative boundary of Reading is tightly constrained. It is therefore entirely possible that the full OAN may not be able to be accommodated within the Borough boundaries. As a result, the Council will be required to cooperate with neighbouring authorities through the DtC in order to deliver its housing requirement. There will inevitably be a requirement to consider the release of new green field sites outside of the central and south Reading area. Depending on suitability and availability, there may well be a need for variations to the existing strategy in order to facilitate sustainable development and meet OAN requirements. In our view this should logically include consideration of</p>	<p>The Local Plan has identified that the shortfall against objectively assessed need will be in the region of 1,000 homes.</p> <p>However, the Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues. As a result, the Council has approached Wokingham and West Berkshire Councils to consider meeting a proportion of these needs.</p>

		<p>suitable sites to the north of the Borough including those which tie within the administrative boundaries of South Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Early activity on the Duty to Co-operate (paras 4.15 and 4.16) is of course welcome. That said, we would urge the Council to include South Oxfordshire District Council in ongoing discussions - though it is not in the Western Berkshire HMA, in spatial terms the southern part of the South Oxfordshire district offers obvious potential to provide sustainable options to help address Reading's housing requirements. Further consideration of the potential in this area is considered entirely logical - and potentially critical.</p> <p>Locations such as Emmer Green present opportunities to deliver new housing and address a proportion of Reading's housing need in a wholly sustainable and readily accessible location. The southern part of the South Oxfordshire district (including Henley on Thames) is included within the Reading Local Housing Market Area, and is subsequently very well placed to accommodate an appropriate proportion of the Borough's housing needs. It is also relevant to note that the Oxfordshire SHMA of 2014 established that there are links in housing and economic terms between parts of Oxfordshire and the surrounding areas 'including major employment centres close to the county's boundaries, including Reading (the influence of which extends into South Oxfordshire including Henley on Thames)'.</p> <p>We would actively encourage Reading Borough Council and South Oxfordshire District Council to look closely at the cross boundary opportunities that exist in the area to the north of Reading, and should a review of the spatial strategy be necessary we advocate targeting a proportion of development in this broad direction as a logical and sustainable choice for future growth.</p>	
Foudry Properties Limited	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>We agree that South Reading should continue to be a key focus for the Council's Borough-wide land use spatial strategy going forward. This area is highly accessible, in parts underdeveloped and could deliver significant and much needed regenerative benefits for the local communities. In this context, the Southside site (A29) represents a significant development opportunity in terms of scale, accessibility and</p>	<p>Noted. The Southside site is identified for development in the Draft Local Plan.</p>

		visibility.	
Highways England	Question 14	Paragraph 4.7 states that you do not think it is necessary to present a wide range of options for the overall strategy of where development will be located, because significantly different alternative options are not likely to be realistic and questions relating to specific types of sites are deemed more meaningful. Therefore, we would welcome a meeting as the number of site options and associated transport evidence base develops in order to ensure that the impacts on the SRN are considered on a cumulative basis and can be suitably mitigated.	Transport modelling of the proposals is currently underway, and the report will be shared with the Highways Agency when available.
James Lloyd	Question 14	Mixed development with retail space should be encouraged. Brownfield needs to be a priority with sustainable drainage, there should be no building on the flood plain and adaptation and resilience planning needs to be built into all new development. Priority should be given to land that is close to the train stations and existing transport infrastructure.	Noted. These elements are generally reflected within the overall strategy of re-use of urban sites at efficient densities, linking intensity of development to accessibility, mixed uses and measures for adaptation to climate change,
London and Quadrant	Question 14	We agree that the existing spatial strategy of concentrating new development within the Central Reading area and the South Reading area remains appropriate and that there should be no fundamental change to this approach. Reading is a small borough, most of which is already relatively densely populated. It is therefore imperative that in order to deliver sufficient housing, all sites allocated within the local plan within these areas must be redeveloped and optimised to make the most efficient use of the land available.	Noted. The Centre and South continue to form the main elements of the spatial strategy.
Oxford Properties	Question 14	OP supports the Core Strategy Fig 4.1 where Central and South Reading are the focuses of future growth to still be relevant.	Noted. The Centre and South continue to form the main elements of the spatial strategy.
Reading Football Club	Question 14	<p>Whilst elements of the spatial strategy may still be relevant given the on-going development occurring across the Borough, a key consideration will be the most up-to-date OAN requirement within the Berkshire SHMA and how any adopted additional housing requirements will be deliver over the plan period.</p> <p>Given the recognised constraints to the ability of delivering new residential development, there will be a requirement for consideration of the release of new greenfield sites outside of the central and south Reading area. As such, depending on the suitability and availability of sites, there may be a need for variations to the existing strategy in such</p>	<p>The full range of possible sites for new development have been considered. In terms of greenfield sites for an expansion within the Borough, the options are very limited, in particular by flood risk, with most of these areas falling within the functional floodplain.</p> <p>It is considered that the full OAN requirement cannot be met within the Borough, and the Council is therefore working with its neighbours under the duty to cooperate to seek to meet</p>

		<p>a way that will ensure sustainable development.</p> <p>In addition, as it is generally acknowledged that the administrative boundary of Reading is tightly constrained, it is entirely possible that the full OAN may not be able to be accommodated within the Borough boundaries. Therefore, the Council will be required to cooperate with neighbouring authorities through the Duty to Co-operate. This will be imperative in understanding the scope for potential adjustments to the existing strategy.</p>	these needs.
<p>The Butler Partnership</p> <p>Emmer Green Residents' Association</p> <p>Reading Urban Wildlife Group</p>	<b>Question 14</b>	The existing spatial strategy is still generally right.	Noted.
Ropemaker Properties	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>Within the centre of Reading, there are a number of sites including at Weldale Street (Allocation RC2b in the CAAP) which are still to be developed. Development within the city centre is seen as highly sustainable with employment and leisure opportunities within walking distance.</p> <p>In addition to this Reading railway station has been the subject of significant upgrades in recent years and with Crossrail due to open in 2019 will enhance Reading as a transport hub significantly enhancing accessibility. The general thrust of Government policy from the recent NPPF consultation is a presumption in favour of developing on Brownfield sites and increasing densities around transport hubs. As a result, Policy RC13 of the CAAP and the Tall Buildings Strategy are considered to be outdated and should be updated increasing residential densities in such locations and promoting the delivery of further Tall Building Development in appropriate locations. Between Weldale Street and Chatham Street is considered to be an appropriate location located adjacent to and existing tall building 'cluster'; as defined on the Proposals Map and the recently completed Chatham Street development which incorporates only a single tall building, whereas the</p>	The Draft Local Plan has sought to increase densities to help meet needs wherever that is appropriate. The Weldale Street site is identified for high density development. However, high density does not always necessitate tall buildings, and the Council's view is that the tall building clusters identified in the existing RCAAP remain relevant.

		<p>Tall Buildings Strategy suggests three tall buildings could be provided in the western cluster.</p> <p>The regeneration and redevelopment of the city centre is considered to be in line with the direction of national policy and with a number of sites allocated in the CAAP still to be developed, the emphasis on the development within the City Centre is considered to accord with sections 1, 2 and 4 of the NPPF</p>	
Tarmac	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>The existing Spatial Strategy still has relevance. However, it does not take full account of Reading's ongoing development needs. The opportunities for the further expansion of the town are limited. In effect, the only major potential expansion areas (within the administrative area of Reading) lie in the south western sector of the town - west of the A33. Large parts of this area are currently shown as "Strategic Green Space". Some limited parts of this land may have development potential - either for built development or as enabling infrastructure to serve adjacent development areas.</p>	<p>The full range of possible sites for new development have been considered. In terms of greenfield sites for an expansion within the Borough, the options are very limited, in particular by flood risk, with most of these areas falling within the functional floodplain.</p>
University of Reading	<b>Question 14</b>	<p>The assessment of housing need requirements is a fundamental component of plan making as is the way in which they are met. As a consequence, changes to the spatial strategy are considered likely to be necessary given the identified level of OAN and the need to plan for a significant new quantum of housing with the Reading Borough. Given the recognised constraints to the availability of development sites within the Borough consideration will necessarily need to be given the release of sites - including greenfield sites - outside of Central and South Reading, both which are the current focus for growth.</p> <p>In addition, there is a recognition that Reading is a very tightly constrained Borough and consequently there is a likelihood that it will not be able to meet its own development needs in its entirety. In the event that provision for Reading's housing needs is required to be met outside of the Borough, significant cooperation with the neighbouring authorities will be required. Reading's municipal boundaries do not include all of the surrounding suburbs, some of which belong to West Berkshire and Wokingham: this creates a significant challenge for Reading in terms of the delivery of new housing on account of the diminishing quantum of land physically available and suitable for</p>	<p>The full range of possible sites for new development have been considered. In terms of greenfield sites for an expansion within the Borough, the options are very limited, in particular by flood risk, with most of these areas falling within the functional floodplain.</p> <p>It is considered that the full OAN requirement cannot be met within the Borough, and the Council is therefore working with its neighbours under the duty to cooperate to seek to meet these needs.</p>

		development within the Borough boundary.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 14</b>	Whilst the current spatial strategy is broadly relevant, I would urge the council to protect open spaces, specifically those adjacent to land marked for development.	The Draft Local Plan protects key open spaces
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 14</b>	Reading Borough Council will need to be mindful of the sites that West Berkshire has selected for allocation within its proposed submission Housing Site Allocations DPD (and due for submission to the Secretary of State in the spring of 2016) and the potential cumulative impact of development upon highways and transport and infrastructure. The cumulative impact may be heightened if densities are increased.	Noted. Site allocations within West Berkshire and close to Reading have been considered within the transport modelling work.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 14</b>	The South West Reading Area is a very large one. Nothing has been suggested in relation to the more mature residential areas dating from the 1890s onwards. Some of these streets show up with high housing deprivation scores, because of the age of the housing and possibly they do not have central heating etc. There is also insufficient parking provision. Is Reading Borough Council actually considering the compulsory purchase and redevelopment of such private housing? Reading Borough Council should look again at the renewal of suburban areas. If these have to be on a small scale, then that is good as the success in one area can be re-used and failures would not be as disastrous.	There is general support in the Plan for renewal of suburban areas. However, the priorities are likely to lie in areas other than Victorian terraces. Using CPO powers for areas of existing homes largely in private ownership would require very significant resources and would be a long and complex process. Given the densities of Victorian residential areas, it is also unlikely that it would lead to substantial numbers of additional homes.
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 14</b>	The existing spatial strategy has served Reading well and has brought significant regeneration benefits to the town in the form of new housing and employment opportunities. However, that strategy has led to limited choice in terms of housing and employment in other parts of the town. Therefore in seeking to meet the OAHN, Reading should have regard to sites north, east and west of the town, including those in neighbouring boroughs such as South Oxfordshire and Wokingham.	The Local Plan has identified that the shortfall against objectively assessed need will be in the region of 1,000 homes.  However, the Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues. As a result, the Council has approached Wokingham and West Berkshire Councils to consider meeting a proportion of these needs.
Wokingham Borough	<b>Question 14</b>	Wokingham Borough Council requests that Reading Borough Council continues to engage Wokingham Borough Council over the development	Noted. The Council has continued to engage with Wokingham Borough Council under the duty to co-

Council		of these sites and any others to the south and west of Reading Borough, as part of the Duty to Cooperate process.	operate, including on potential development sites.
BBOWT	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>1= - Town centre development  1= - Conversion of offices to residential  1= - Conversion of houses to flats  8= - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development  8= - Residential gardens  9 - Development on greenfield sites</p> <p>All allocations of land for development should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prefer land of lesser environmental value (NPPF para 17),</li> <li>• seek to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species (NPPF para 114, 117 and 118), while;</li> <li>• development proposals should actively seek to achieve a net gain for nature (NPPF para 9), in particular within Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.</li> </ul> <p>Development plan policies should therefore favour town centre development and seek to avoid greenfield development at all times. Brownfield sites can also provide strategically important locations for protected habitats and species. Redevelopment of brownfield sites should therefore only be pursued following appropriately detailed ecological assessment of existing habitats and species and the importance of the site in terms of landscape connectivity (including habitat and species surveys). Other development that potentially impacts on existing habitats, species and landscape connectivity such as infill development and development on residential gardens should also be subject to appropriate ecological scrutiny before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>My comments above should be applied to the decision making process for all suggested site allocations (Appendix 3) and existing allocations (Appendix 4) of this Issues and Options paper.</p>	Noted. These matters have been taken into account in considering site allocations, and, where mitigation is possible, been incorporated into the policy wording. The need to ensure assessment and, where necessary, mitigation of ecological impacts on all sites is incorporated within the biodiversity and green network policy.
Brian Cottee	<b>Question 15</b>	Since 1980 the policies pursued by Reading BC have been extremely successful in achieving economic development and regeneration. Success has brought with it housing problems. The consultative	The Issues and Options document followed national policy in looking first within the Borough boundaries. It is considered that the full housing

		document seems to contain with it the assumption that this can and should be solved within Reading's boundaries. This is patently absurd. Is Reading exploring the possibility of either satellite towns or suburban developments outside the borough such as Lower Earley or Ford's Farm-Beansheaf Farm which did so much to rein in house prices in the period 1980-2000?	need requirement cannot be met within the Borough, and the Council is therefore working with its neighbours under the duty to cooperate to seek to meet these needs.
The Englefield Estate Trustees of the Phillimore Successors Settlement	<b>Question 15</b>	In calculating the 'to find' figure in paragraph 4.13, the Council has included dwellings expected to be delivered from pre-application sites. However only limited weight can be placed on these sites as it is unlikely that every site that is the subject of a pre-application enquiry will ultimately come forward for development. Furthermore, a heavy reliance has been placed by the Council on allocated sites carried forward from the SDPD (2012). However the fact that a number of the allocated sites have not come forward since 2012 suggests that there is a higher rate of non-implementation than has been assumed in the Council's calculations. On this basis, and given that the Councils should be seeking to deliver a housing target significantly above 699 dwellings per annum, the Council will need to identify sites for more than 4,500 dwellings.	It is agreed that any figure for sites undergoing pre-application discussions needs to be treated with caution, although progress has been made on a number of these sites since Issues and Options.  It should be noted that the existing allocations included in these calculations already have a lapse rate applied of 10 or 20% (depending on the site), so there is already an allowance for non-implementation. Since consultation on this Issues and Options took place only three and a half years after the SDPD adoption, a document with a 15 year timeframe, it is hardly surprising that some of the allocations have not yet been implemented (many were not expected to be until later in the time period in any case), and is not a reason to add in an additional buffer.
Ropemaker Properties	<b>Question 15</b>	The NPPF emphasises that policies should promote competitive town centre environments and allocate a range of sites to meet retail, leisure, office, cultural, community and residential uses (Paragraph 23). Development within the city centre close to the train station and bus routes is considered to be highly sustainable and therefore development should continue to be focussed in close proximity to the city centre.  The Governments recent consultation on changes to the NPPF identified the need to increase residential density around commuter hubs. The Weldale Street site is located approximately 650 metres from Reading Train Station, and given the arrival of Crossrail, the station is and will become a more important key transport hub. It is a site which has been	The Draft Local Plan has sought to increase densities to help meet needs wherever that is appropriate. The Weldale Street site is identified for high density development. However, high density does not always necessitate tall buildings, and the Council's view is that the tall building clusters identified in the existing RCAAP remain relevant.



		<p>identified within the CAAP for redevelopment and therefore a high density development would be an effective use of the land.</p> <p>Increasing densities on sites particularly within the City Centre would be likely to result in an increase in building heights, however in the case of Weldale Street there are already tall buildings to the south (as part of the Chatham Place development) and it borders the area defined in the Tall Buildings Strategy as the western grouping. It is therefore considered that increasing densities and building heights on suitable sites would be an effective way of helping to meet Reading's Objectively Assessed Need.</p>	
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                  2 - Town centre development                  3 - Conversion of offices to residential                  4 - Redevelopment of employment land                  5 - Renewal of suburban areas                  The others are unacceptable.</p> <p>Increasing density: This is deeply damaging to social cohesion and the character of an area, and can undermine years of work cultivating and promoting sensitive areas in terms of historical or other value.</p> <p>Building on gardens: as above. The character of an area, and its monetary value, can be undone in remarkably short time.</p> <p>Houses into flats: as I know from first-hand experience, it is something of a new trend for the younger generations to live with the older. In order for each generation to have its own space, larger homes are essential. Not everyone wants to move into a tiny flat in their old age and not every young person wants to dive into the responsibilities of home ownership.</p>	<p>The scale of the housing need has necessitated looking at all types of site within the Borough. The strategy is inevitably therefore something of a mix of the various sources, but with a focus on some of the elements, largely relating to where sites arise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre development - this will be the largest single source, making up around half of proposed homes;</li> <li>• Increasing densities - there has been some increase of densities over historic levels built into the figures, particularly in the more urban and town centre sites.</li> <li>• Vacant brownfield sites and infill development - wherever there are opportunities, these sites have been included, but the number of these sites is limited.</li> <li>• Conversion of houses to flats - some allowance has been made for this, but too much of this will have a counterproductive effect given the need for family-sized accommodation.</li> <li>• Conversion of offices to residential - given permitted development rules, the Council is not fully in control of this. There are a number of identified sites, but many suitable offices have already been converted.</li> </ul>
John Booth	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>1 - Increasing densities                  9 - Development on greenfield sites</p>	
Tilehurst Poor's Land Charity	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>We consider that RBC should fully consider the potential for development on "vacant brownfield sites and infill development", and the "renewal of suburban areas". Opportunities for development on these sites should be maximised efficiently. As a result of this process</p>	

		we would anticipate that these options should be identified high up the series of options (which we note in any event are not all mutually exclusive).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewal of suburban areas - there may be scope for this to contribute towards housing supply in the long-term, and a policy to support this has been included. However, given the timescales of such development, it is difficult to rely on significant numbers in the short-term.</li> <li>• Redevelopment of employment land - since publication of Issues and Options, the Economic Development Needs Assessment has reported, and found a very high level of need for employment space. This severely limits the ability to lose existing space without significant economic effects. Nevertheless, the Plan finds capacity for around 1,600 homes on existing employment or commercial land, which can be balanced against new provision.</li> <li>• Residential gardens - in examining sites, only limited opportunities for development in gardens were identified. Where appropriate, these are identified in the policies, but the potential is limited.</li> <li>• Greenfield land - although consistently scoring poorly in consultation, these options were examined. However, greenfield land within the Borough is generally either within the functional floodplain, or is already serving an important open space function. Some limited greenfield sites have however been identified.</li> </ul>
The Butler Partnership	Question 15	<p>1= - Town centre development                      1= - Increasing densities                      1= - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                      1= - Redevelopment of employment land</p> <p>The site of The Butler is in the central area of Reading. It is a brownfield site (being in employment use), which lends itself to a high density residential redevelopment scheme.</p>	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 15	<p>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                      2 - Town centre development                      3 - Conversion of offices to residential                      4 - Redevelopment of employment land                      5 - Residential gardens                      6 - Conversion of houses to flats                      7 - Renewal of suburban areas                      8 - Increasing densities                      9 - Development on greenfield sites</p>	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 15	<p>1 - Conversion of offices to residential                      2 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                      3 - Town centre development                      4 - Redevelopment of employment land                      5 - Renewal of suburban areas                      6 - Development on greenfield sites                      7 - Increasing densities                      8 - Conversion of houses to flats                      9 - Residential gardens</p>	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 15	<p>1 - Town centre development                      2 - Conversion of offices to residential                      3 - Redevelopment of employment land                      4 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                      5 - Renewal of suburban areas                      6 - Residential gardens                      7 - Increasing densities                      8 - Conversion of houses to flats</p>	

		9 - Development on greenfield sites	
Brian Jamieson	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>2 - Town centre development</li> <li>3 - Increasing densities</li> <li>4 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>5 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>6 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>7 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>8 - Development on greenfield sites</li> <li>9 - Residential gardens</li> </ul>	
James Lloyd	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Town centre development</li> <li>2 - Increasing densities</li> <li>3 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>4 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>5 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>6 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>7 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>8 - Residential gardens</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
London and Quadrant	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Town centre development</li> <li>2 - Increasing densities;</li> <li>3 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development;</li> <li>4 - Conversion of houses to flats;</li> <li>5 - Conversion of offices to residential;</li> <li>6 - Renewal of suburban areas;</li> <li>7 - Redevelopment of employment land;</li> <li>8 - Residential gardens;</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites.</li> </ul> <p>We consider points 1 and 2 to be equally important and should not be considered in isolation. Increasing densities in sustainable locations is critical if Reading Borough Council wish to realise its ambition to deliver appropriate levels and types of housing for its current and future occupants. This is the most sustainable approach to development, with the effective use of previously developed land being one of the core objectives of the NPPF. This would also help to protect more sensitive sites (such as green belt, employment land etc).</p>	

		<p>Increasing densities on those sites already identified for development within sustainable locations could significantly increase the number of dwellings which could be built during the plan period. Optimising these already identified sites will be essential if Reading is to meet its identified housing need.</p> <p>We advocate the retention and conversion of those sites already identified for redevelopment of employment land for housing, and support the inclusion of further employment sites where it can be demonstrated that the loss of such land would not seriously adversely affect the local economy by pushing existing businesses out of Reading and reducing space for new and growing businesses to occupy.</p>	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                  2 - Conversion of offices to residential                  3 - Renewal of suburban areas                  4 - Redevelopment of employment land                  5 - Town centre development                  6 - Conversion of houses to flats                  7 - Increasing densities                  8 - Residential gardens                  9 - Development on greenfield sites</p>	
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>In order to ensure that sufficient land is available to ensure that Reading can continue developing as the hub for the Thames Valley, Reading BC should pursue increased densities, in line with Paragraph 47, bullet point 5, of the NPPF.</p> <p>Increasing the height of new developments represents a pragmatic approach to the issues at hand. Allowing high quality and sustainable taller buildings, both for residential and commercial developments, is likely to be the most suitable way of increasing density, representing an appropriate strategy to meet the development needs of the area, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is also a sustainable approach if those areas of higher density are supported by good public transport and provide a mix of uses to support communities.</p> <p>OP urges caution in Reading BC's approach to redevelop employment</p>	

		land for housing. Whilst there are certainly some defunct employment sites that are suitable for redevelopment, reducing available employment land to provide homes will have a negative impact on Reading's economy; losing significant areas of employment land that are unlikely to be returned to an employment use in the future. Introducing residential uses on land adjacent to established industrial uses could prejudice the continued operation of existing uses due to impacts on amenity.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>2 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>3 - Town centre development</li> <li>4 - Increasing densities</li> <li>5 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>6 - Renewal of suburban areas (don't know what this means)</li> <li>7 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>8 - Residential gardens</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Town centre development</li> <li>2 - Increasing densities</li> <li>3 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>4 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>5 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>6 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>7 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>8 - Residential gardens</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites</li> </ul> <p>The above order is broadly sensible and accords with the thrust of national planning policy. However, it is important that the Council put into place policies which positively encourage development in the right locations. This could be done by positively encouraging development in locations where there few constraints. In Reading Town Centre clear guidance on the location where tall buildings would acceptable would provide clarity for all parties and would be informed by consideration of constraints (e.g. heritage assets) and opportunities (vacant sites).</p>	
Tarmac	Question 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Development on greenfield sites</li> <li>2 - Town centre development</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 - Increasing densities</li> <li>4 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>5 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>6 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>7 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>8 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>9 - Residential gardens</li> </ul>	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>2 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>3 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>4 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>5 - Increasing densities</li> <li>6 - Town centre development</li> <li>7 - Residential gardens</li> <li>8 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
Viridis Real Estate	<b>Question 15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Town centre development</li> <li>2 - Increasing densities</li> <li>3 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>4 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> </ul>	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>2 - Renewal of suburban areas</li> <li>3 - Conversion of offices to residential</li> <li>4 - Redevelopment of employment land</li> <li>5 - Town centre development</li> <li>6 - Increasing densities</li> <li>7 - Conversion of houses to flats</li> <li>8 - Residential gardens</li> <li>9 - Development on greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>The development strategy should focus on accessible sites within or adjacent to the existing urban area, including consideration of greenfield sites in such locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development</li> <li>2 - Town centre development - this is considered appropriate having</li> </ul>	

		<p>regard to the accessibility of public transport, employment, shops and services. However, it is important that new residential development does not displace existing uses. Therefore, vacant brownfield sites, in accessible locations, should be prioritised.</p> <p>3 - Development on greenfield sites - this provides an opportunity of developing much needed family housing. It is accepted that many greenfield sites are restricted, and there is a limited availability of greenfield sites within Reading. The development strategy should therefore consider greenfield sites outside the Borough boundary which are adjacent to the urban area of Reading.</p> <p>4 - Conversion of houses to flats - this makes a contribution towards meeting housing need, particularly having regard to Reading's stock of Victorian properties.</p> <p>5 - Residential gardens - this is eroding the character of a number of residential areas. The redevelopment of residential backland sites should be carefully controlled to ensure it does not impact on the character of an area or undermine residential amenity.</p> <p>6 - Conversion of offices to residential</p> <p>7 - Redevelopment of employment land - this should be resisted as it will undermine the employment opportunities within Reading. There is a need to retain employment sites across Reading in order to respond to market demand in other locations.</p> <p>8 - Renewal of suburban areas</p> <p>9 - Increasing densities - this should be resisted as, in most cases, this would impact on residential amenity.</p>	
<p>Gregory and Andrea Grashoff</p>	<p><b>Question 15</b></p>	<p>Provision of additional housing for Reading should be focused on brownfield sites within Reading or on areas of land where all the necessary services can be provided within the planned development. The use of existing amenity and greenfield sites should not be considered.</p>	<p>Noted. The vast majority of land identified is brownfield, although the scale of the housing need does necessitate use of appropriate greenfield sites where available.</p>

Mr Guest	<b>Question 15</b>	We consider that RBC should fully consider the potential for option 7 "redevelopment of employment land." As a result of this process we would anticipate that this option should be identified higher up the series of options (which we note in any event are not all mutually exclusive).	The needs for new employment floorspace have been identified through the Central Berks Economic Development Needs Assessment, and the message is that there is substantial need for new floorspace. Loss of existing floorspace will exacerbate this issue. Whilst there are some opportunities to make such a change without a significant impact on employment space, these are limited.
Historic England	<b>Question 15</b>	We note the recognition in paragraph 4.12 that increasing the density of development in some areas may adversely affect historic buildings or areas, and this would obviously be a concern for us. However, there may be areas where an increase in density would be perfectly acceptable in terms of the historic environment, so we do not wholly oppose the general principle.	Noted.
John George Ltd	<b>Question 15</b>	Given the constrained nature of Reading, there is a particular need to identify appropriate sites for potential redevelopment, including sites currently within alternative uses (option 7). This will give Reading the best opportunity to begin to address its unmet housing need.	Noted. A number of sites with alternative uses have been identified for development to meet housing needs.
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 15</b>	<p>1 - Town centre development                  2 - Increasing densities                  3 - Vacant brownfield sites and infill development                  4 - Conversion of offices to residential                  5 - Redevelopment of employment land                  6 - Conversion of houses to flats                  7 - Renewal of suburban areas                  8 - Residential gardens                  9 - Development on greenfield sites</p> <p>Kier's firm view is that 'town centre development' is the number one priority source of development sites. In order for the region to grow in a sustainable manner, Reading town centre should be intensified as a top-class location for housing, business, retail, leisure, culture and learning. It should continue to be the focus high quality mixed-use development, building on its regional status. It has excellent transport connections and is nationally significant interchange between European, UK, regional and local services.</p>	Noted. The town centre is expected to accommodate around half of the Borough's housing provision. This includes the Hosier Street site.



		The land at Hosier Street is in a central, prestigious location within the town centre and represents an excellent opportunity for high-density sustainable development, which can help realise the potential capacity of the town.	
Universities Superannuation Scheme	<b>Question 15</b>	USS recognises that there is a lack of suitable land for housing in the Borough, but urges caution when proposing the release of existing employment sites for residential uses. Too much loss of employment land would push businesses out of Reading and reduce space for new and growing businesses to occupy, which could affect the local economy and the availability of employment. Releasing employment sites could also prejudice the continued operation of existing neighbouring employment uses, due to impacts on amenity. The onus should be on the developers of any new residential uses to ensure that it does not negatively impact neighbouring employment operations.	Noted. The needs for new employment floorspace have been identified through the Central Berks Economic Development Needs Assessment, and the message is that there is substantial need for new floorspace. Loss of existing floorspace will exacerbate this issue. Whilst there are some opportunities to make such a change without a significant impact on employment space, these are limited.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 15</b>	Many of the sites that are allocated or suggested for residential allocation are in areas prone to flooding or are actually on the banks of The Thames or Kennet. These areas are attractive to live in, but the problems of flooding need to be overcome by some radical measures that do not just allow developers to hide behind the 'Once in a 100 years' phrase; flooding today it is likely to be more often than that. Some revolutionary building techniques should be tried out e.g. building on stilts, building floating homes, building homes resistant to or that recover easily after flooding.	The consideration of flood risk has been a key aspect of determining whether sites are suitable for development. Relevant site allocation policies highlight the need to build flood risk into development proposals.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 15</b>	Car parking in residential areas of Reading is a problem. A strategy is needed that will provide more car park spaces, for example secure multi-storey and underground car parks in residential areas.	In terms of car parking, the Local Plan can mainly only deal with new developments. Car parking would be required in line with standards in the Parking Standards and Design SPD, which may be subject to review during the plan period.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 15</b>	Wheelie bins are a major nuisance and headache in terraced properties and HMOs, larger communal bins should be trialled.	This is not a matter that the Local Plan can address, although the issue of accumulation of bins associated with HMOs should be part of the consideration under the residential conversions policy.
Emmer Green Residents'	<b>Question 16</b>	We feel strongly that any development in South Oxon next to Emmer Green, an area that is currently well defined to the boundary, would	Noted. The Council is not currently proposing that its housing needs should be met adjoining

Association		result in sprawl that would engulf the South Oxon villages alongside, and in overstressing Reading's supporting infrastructure. It may not do anything to count towards RBC's housing quota.	Reading in South Oxfordshire. This will ultimately be a matter for South Oxfordshire District Council to determine.
The Englefield Estate	<b>Question 16</b>	The hierarchy of sites set out in question 15 will not deliver housing sites for Reading that achieve an appropriate balance between delivering sustainable development and minimising potential adverse effects. Nor is it a hierarchy that is compliant with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.	The list of sites in question 15 is not presented as a hierarchy. The purpose is to ask for consultees to use those sources to create their own ranking.
Trustees of the Phillimore Successors Settlement		<p>Priority ought to be given to the first three sources of land listed in the hierarchy as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Town Centre development;</li> <li>2. increasing densities; and</li> <li>3. re-use of vacant brownfield sites.</li> </ol> <p>However, we considers that an alternative source of land ought to be introduced at number 4 of the hierarchy, as underlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. sustainably located greenfield sites on the edge of Reading but outside of the Borough Council's administrative boundary.</li> <li>5. sub division of houses into flats;</li> <li>6. conversion of offices into residential;</li> <li>7. renewal of suburban areas;</li> <li>8. redevelopment of employment land;</li> <li>9. development on residential gardens;</li> <li>10. development of greenfield sites within the Reading urban area.</li> </ol> <p>Sustainably located sites that are on the edge of Reading, but lie outside of the Borough Council's administrative boundary, would allow development to be delivered at a scale that could provide necessary infrastructure and facilities to support the new development. Moreover, the potential impacts of development delivered via urban extensions to Reading are less significant than those associated with sources 5 to 10 as listed above. Sources 5 to 10 would result in piecemeal development that would have a range of harmful environmental impacts and are unlikely to be able to deliver infrastructure and services necessary to support new housing development.</p>	<p>National policy is quite clear that a local authority must look within its own boundaries before it requests that adjoining authorities accommodate its need. Neighbouring local authorities will quite reasonably want to be convinced that the Council does not have enough suitable, available and achievable sites before they can agree to accommodate any of Reading's unmet need.</p> <p>It is considered that the full OAN requirement cannot be met within the Borough, and the Council is therefore working with its neighbours under the duty to cooperate to seek to meet these needs.</p>

The Englefield Estate	<b>Question 16</b>	Land to accommodate an urban extension to Reading is available and deliverable on the Estate's land in the vicinity of Grazeley. Importantly, this land is not constrained by Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Heritage designations.	Noted. The potential for development at Grazeley is referred to throughout the Plan, albeit recognising that this will be for adjoining authorities to decide within their own plans.
Trustees of the Phillimore Successors Settlement	<b>Question 16</b>	Land to accommodate an urban extension to Reading is available and deliverable on the Estate's land in the vicinity of Playhatch and Emmer Green. Importantly, this land is not constrained by Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Heritage designations.	The Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues.
The Englefield Estate Trustees of the Phillimore Successors Settlement	<b>Question 16</b>	<p>It is very likely that Reading Borough Council will need to deliver more than 699 dwellings per annum over the Local Plan period. Accordingly it is also likely to be the case that the Council will need to identify land for more than 4,500 homes over the Plan period. There is also a very high likelihood that Reading will need to accommodate some housing from other parts of the Berkshire HMA.</p> <p>For these reasons the new Local Plan must make provision for sustainable urban extensions to Reading to come forward through the Local Plan process. If this Option is not included in the new Local Plan, then the Plan will be unsound on the basis that it will not be Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy. On this basis the Estate requests that paragraphs 4.14 to 4.16 of the Issues and Options consultation document be comprehensively re-written to allow for sustainable urban extensions to Reading to come forward during the Plan period and to facilitate necessary cross boundary working.</p>	It is not agreed that Reading's objectively assessed need is higher than 699 per annum, and it is not clear what that would be based on. An urban extension to Reading would not be within the Borough's boundaries, as there is no land where that could happen, and would therefore not involve Reading accommodating need from elsewhere.
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 16</b>	<p>Having regard to the increased housing need identified in the SHMA and the difficulty of accommodating it within the Borough, there is a need for Reading's housing strategy to actively consider the role of sites outside the Borough boundaries. This is considered an appropriate way forward, particularly given the tightly constrained nature of Reading's geographic area and the proximity of sites within neighbouring boroughs, many of which are contiguous with the existing urban area of Reading.</p> <p>In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate and NPPF, Reading should</p>	<p>It is considered that the full OAN requirement cannot be met within the Borough, and the Council is therefore working with its neighbours under the duty to cooperate to seek to meet these needs.</p> <p>However, the Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial</p>

		work closely with South Oxfordshire District Council to review and allocate sites which would assist in meeting the need for market and affordable housing in the town.	new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Anything around the Thames should be considered extremely sensitive.	Noted. The sensitivity of waterside development is taken into account in the relevant allocations.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	In my opinion specific sites are not appropriate for inclusion at this stage. The focus needs to be on strategic considerations. If omission of sites at this stage means a delay in order to focus attention on the priority issues, deciding and delivering the right medium and long term policy for the existing and future residents of Reading and the Thames Valley, by taking a longer term strategic view, this is the better route to sustainable development.	In a location such as Reading, which is highly constrained, consideration of the overall strategy and the sites cannot be divorced. Arriving at a strategy is not possible without at least a basic appreciation of the where sites are likely to arise.
Brian Cottee	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Appendix 3 lists proposals from landowners and others for developing particular sites. What mechanism is available for correcting inaccuracies in these proposals?	Appendix 3 is now part of a historic document, so cannot be corrected. If the inaccuracies are relevant to the Draft Plan, we encourage a representation through the consultation process.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Where a site is potentially contaminated, site allocations should be justified by an adequate assessment of the risk, and supported by policy that makes clear the requirement for land to be remediated so that it is suitable for the intended use, and at least not able to be determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environment Protection Act 1990.	The policy on Pollution and Water Resources makes it clear that contaminated land will need to be remediated to be suitable.
Historic England	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	<p>Whatever the potential sources of land for development, Historic England will expect the selection of sites to be allocated for housing (or any development) to be based on, inter alia, full and proper consideration of the potential impacts of development on the historic environment; in particular on heritage assets and their setting, and the need to conserve and enhance those assets. This will require the use of a comprehensive historic environment evidence base including specific studies to understand the significance of assets that may be affected.</p> <p>We will expect the Council to demonstrate how the historic environment has influenced its choice of sites (including those for gypsies and travellers), and to set out detailed overriding justification if it proposes the allocation of any sites that would have an adverse impact on a heritage asset or assets.</p>	It is agreed that any allocations will need to be considered in the light of the significance of any heritage assets. However, evidence to support allocations needs to be proportionate, and in many cases impacts on the historic environment will be dependent on detailed design.

Historic England	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	A number of the sites include or are adjacent to or nearby designated heritage assets. We are satisfied that the Council has identified these in its site assessments in the Appendix and will expect further assessment to be undertaken of the potential impacts on the significance of those assets (positive or negative) before these sites are taken forward.	
Historic England	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Each site should be considered against the Berkshire Historic Environment Record for non-scheduled archaeological remains and the East Berkshire Historic Landscape Characterisation, due for completion in July this year.	Noted. Sites have been considered in the light of the HER and the Historic Landscape Characterisation work.
Harvey Smith	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Although for each site you have a box headed 'Issues and constraints' this box does not address key local infrastructure concerns such as roads, schools or medical facilities. Where these are inadequate or only just adequate for the current local population - in other words, where the development would require much more than just building the dwellings - this should really have been addressed before the sites were included in the consultation document.	The Draft Local Plan has a section setting out the infrastructure required to support growth.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Site specific comments from desktop assessments on sewerage/wastewater infrastructure are provided, but more detailed modelling may be required to refine the requirements.  These sites have been assessed on an individual base. Therefore, the impact of multiple sites in the same area coming forward will have a greater impact. The scale, location and time to deliver any required upgrades will be determined after receiving a clearer picture of the location, type and scale of development together with its phasing.	Noted. The Draft Local Plan provides more details on the scale and nature of development which can feed into more detailed assessment. The Council is currently considering what evidence will need to be assembled for Submission on water and wastewater issues.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	Cumulative impact on Blakes Lock SPS required for following sites: A1, A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, A13, A20, A21, A22, A25, A26	Noted. The Council is considering how best to assemble evidence related to the water effects of development.
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 17/18</b> General	The majority of sites listed in Appendix 3 are currently in use for retail, employment or leisure activities. Unless it can be demonstrated that these sites are redundant and/or the use can be satisfactorily accommodated elsewhere within Reading, it is not considered appropriate to allocate these sites for housing.	Consideration of sites has also taken account of whether there are existing uses that need to be retained or reprovided, and this has affected whether sites are allocated, and what for.
Historic England	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A1	The possible proposal for 300 houses suggests a tall building which would have an impact on nearby listed buildings.	The site is within the Station Cluster where there is potential for tall buildings, based on the Tall

			<p>Buildings Strategy, so a tall building may be appropriate, although this will of course need to be assessed in terms of impact on heritage assets. The draft allocation as proposed does not necessitate a tall building.</p>
<p>Legal &amp; General Property</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18 Site A1</b></p>	<p>We support the suggested alternative option A1b of Question 18, and the inclusion of Apex Plaza as a site allocation within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The site provides significant potential to deliver a range of uses within a redevelopment scheme of significant scale during the Plan period. The following policy principles for redevelopment of the site already apply:</p> <p>In land use terms, this is a highly accessible location, a focus for major office development, with other town centre uses also acceptable, including housing and retail; and there is already support for introduction of mixed use within the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of scale, the site lies within an area defined as being capable of delivering a 'tall building' as part of a new cluster of tall buildings, a tall building in this location should "signify the status of the station area as a major mixed-use destination and the main gateway to and most accessible part of Reading".</p> <p>The Apex Plaza site is capable of making a significant contribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capable of providing a mix of uses, including commercial, residential, and retail uses</li> <li>• Provide a significant contribution to the Borough's housing targets</li> <li>• Compatibility with nearby commercial and residential uses, the wider Town Centre, and the adjacent Opportunity Areas</li> <li>• Contribute to wider regeneration and Development Plan objectives</li> <li>• A 'gateway' site in a highly sustainable location, will promote better sustainable travel choices</li> <li>• Potential to optimise the use of the site to provide higher densities and a taller building</li> <li>• An entirely appropriate location for such a building</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Apex Plaza and Brunel Arcade sites are proposed to be allocated in the draft plan.</p> <p>It is considered to be good practice to link the two sites within the policy, given their close relationship and the fact that many issues will apply equally to both sites. This is the case for many sites within Major Opportunity Areas, and, unless the policy states otherwise, does not mean that sites must be developed at the same time.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable use of previously developed land in a highly accessible location; and</li> <li>• It is capable of being delivered over the course of the Plan period.</li> </ul> <p>An allocation that promotes a positive, flexible approach will ensure the Borough's Plan is deliverable, can meet local needs, and can deliver wider development plan objectives, including a vibrant town centre with a mix of uses, and contributing towards the Borough meeting its 5 year housing supply. The site should be allocated in its own right, as opposed to being part of the adjacent 'Brunel Arcade, Station Approach' site. There needs to be sufficient flexibility in the allocations document for these sites to come forward for redevelopment independently, if required.</p>	
Network Rail	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A1	<p>Network Rail support the allocation of this site for a mixed use re-development along the lines set out in A1a, although work undertaken by architects appointed by Network Rail in 2013 showed this site alone has potential to accommodate a mixed use scheme with up to 200 residential units. At the time this work was undertaken the re-development of the site, even with 200 residential units, was not viable when prevailing property values and the cost of construction was taken into account. For any redevelopment to proceed it would have to be financially viable and it is felt that the potential to provide up to 200 units would greatly improve the scheme's overall viability.</p> <p>Network Rail support the inclusion of Apex Plaza in this allocation although this is clearly a matter for the site owner. Whether or not the owners of Apex Plaza are willing to re-develop their site, it is considered that Brunel Arcade could be developed independently and there is no reason why the two schemes should be linked.</p>	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A1	<p>This is the only part of Reading Station that has retained its historical charm during the redevelopment. Do not allocate anything that changes the skyline here or the frontage. Fine to redevelop inside.</p>	<p>It is recognised that the setting of the old station building, now the Three Guineas, is important to the heritage of Reading. However, it is not agreed that this means that a building on the adjacent Brunel Arcade site cannot be developed at a greater height. This is one of the most accessible sites in the region, and it is considered that a high density development can be achieved</p>

			without a detrimental effect on the listed buildings.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A1	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the water and wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A1	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Sites A2, A3, A4, A6	These are comments for a2.a3.a4.a6. Option d residential with retail at base for all.	Agreed. This is the proposed allocation.
Sonic Star Properties Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Sites A2, A3, A4, A6	We request that A2, A3, A4 and A6 are dealt with under one site allocation in order to ensure that a comprehensive scheme for redevelopment is brought forward.  The previous owner halted redevelopment of the site due to viability reasons. We consider that the suggested use should instead be	These sites are included in the Draft Local Plan as a single allocation for residential with ground floor town centre uses.  The work that has been done so far does not identify scope to accommodate up to 90



		<p>"Residential development with flexible ground &amp; LG floor A1/A2/A3/A4/A5 uses."</p> <p>This assists in meeting Reading's annual housing target and retains the flexible 'A' use classes at ground floor level which will ensure that the site features active frontages at ground level. This will be a vast improvement on the existing situation, where the ground floor across the site has become vacant over past years and currently has a neglected feel. It will assist in attracting investment and revitalising the area.</p> <p>The document states that the 2006 permission "has not been implemented". We would request that the site allocation does not state that the permission has not been implemented as this position is still to be determined.</p> <p>The planning history shows that physical alterations, including partial demolition of the listed buildings, were previously allowed. Whilst we agree that full redevelopment of the listed properties may not be appropriate, we would request that the allocation is amended to state that any development "respects the historic significance of the Grade II listed buildings", as this allows for the possibility of partial redevelopment along the lines of what has historically been approved.</p> <p>We note that, added together, the current allocations document suggests that the site can accommodate up to 37 new dwellings. However, this estimate was based on the previously consented scheme which included proposals for hotel and leisure facilities. As noted above, the land use preference for the site (above ground floor level) is now 100% residential, as such the maximum target for housing should therefore be increased to reflect this. Our initial studies have shown that the proposed redevelopment of the site could accommodate up to 90 residential units. We would propose this is a maximum potential and would request that the allocation is amended to reflect this maximum figure.</p>	<p>dwellings on the site. Through the HELAA process, scope for around 36-54 dwellings has been identified. However, the figures in the plan are indicative, and more detailed work may be able to justify a different figure at planning application stage.</p>
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Sites A2, A3,	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to	Noted.

	A4, A6	this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Sites A2, A3, A4, A6	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. However, the total development identified in the vicinity of Market Place area may cause concern relating to foul water sewerage if all developments were to go ahead. We would welcome early consultation concerning any proposed development.	Noted.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A2	The sites in Market Place are an opportunity for a creative strategy for heritage. The buildings are deteriorating and may be difficult to let because of their listed status. However it is a convenient central location in a conservation area and the upper floors could be residential. The ground floor is an opportunity for a small business, not necessarily retail.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A3	The sites in Market Place are an opportunity for a creative strategy for heritage. The buildings are deteriorating and may be difficult to let because of their listed status. However it is a convenient central location in a conservation area and the upper floors could be residential. The ground floor is an opportunity for a small business, not necessarily retail. This appears to be the biggest of the three sites on Market Place with plenty of opportunity for a creative residential conversion. Option A3d but not necessarily retail on the ground floor.	Agreed. This is the proposed allocation. Whilst ground floor uses may not be retail, they will still be required to be a related town centre use to ensure that important retail frontages are not disrupted.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A4	The sites in Market Place are an opportunity for a creative strategy for heritage. The buildings are deteriorating and may be difficult to let because of their listed status. However it is a convenient central location in a conservation area and the upper floors could be residential. The ground floor is an opportunity for a small business, not necessarily retail.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A5	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A5	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	Noted. The potential for ground floor retail at this site is included within the policy, and the Small Shop Units policy includes general
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A6	A6c encouraging small independent retailers on the ground floor (such as in Harris Arcade).	

			expectations for small shops.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A7	A7c keep the buildings	Noted. This site is now subject to planning permission and is not included within the Draft Local Plan.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A7	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A7	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	This site is compromised by proximity to the railway facilities and the major disturbance from diesel engines being experienced around Cardiff Road. We therefore believe that it should not be considered for housing development until the railway has been electrified. If housing was eventually considered appropriate, we would expect that there should be provision within any scheme for on-site parking.	Noted. This proposal is not carried forward into the Draft Plan, due to the significant needs for additional industrial and warehouse uses, which will be exacerbated by wholesale losses of employment space.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	A8d, put good planting amongst residential. Ensure wildlife corridor n-s leading to riverside area. Assume this will be the start of more residential development. Go for lower end of density	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	Water: We are concerned about this developments proximity to Fobney Water Treatment works and the ground water boreholes which serve the works. Fobney takes its supply from both a river intake and groundwater boreholes. A study will be required to ensure that there is no impact on water quality as a result of this development. The Study should have regard to the river floodplain and possible	

		contamination from historic land use in the area. The study should identify and protect drinking water supply mains that may run through the site and should build in a water resource protection zone.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	225mm nearest foul sewer so capacity concern. Due to the size of the potential development, further consultation would be required once the proposals have been confirmed.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	Erect Reading's Skytower, that will be taller than the Blade. Potential to relocate BBC Radio Berkshire here.	
Thames Properties Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	It should be noted that the site plan for site A8 is not entirely accurate as it excludes a portion of land to the east of Tessa Road which is also within Thames Properties ownership. We request that the red line boundary is amended to this effect.	Noted. The whole employment area has been considered within the HELAA and site selection process.
Thames Properties Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A8	Campbell Gordon have prepared a report that deals specifically with the former Cox and Wyman building. The Campbell Gordon report advises that the building 'is highly unusual and was built and expanded on a bespoke basis by Cox and Wyman as a book printing works ... The building is outdated and unsuitable for most modern industrial/warehouse operations due to its layout, specification and design ... The building is in very poor condition ... The offices are extremely dated and extensively worn, and damaged from day to day usual wear and tear.'	It is agreed that the Cox and Wyman building has little future as a wholly employment site, and it has therefore been proposed for allocation as a residential-led scheme.

		<p>In terms of letting prospects, the report confirms that 'The property's age, location, layout, size, specification and condition are not suitable for the demands of the current market, and it is therefore highly unlikely to attract a tenant on a normal commercial basis .. it is unsuited to modern industrial processes ... the age of the building means it is in a very poor state of repair.' The building has been actively marketed by Sharps Commercial since Cox and Wyman vacated in April 2015 and has now been let at an almost nil rent basis (10 pence/sq.ft) in order to mitigate business rates and security costs, and the Campbell Gordon report is clear that 'There has been no significant interest to take the unit on for a long term on normal market terms. '</p> <p>The Cox and Wyman Building should be removed from the CEA designation entirely and reallocated for residential purposes. The site could be put into a far more sustainable use on what is plainly a highly accessible brownfield site in close proximity to both Reading Town Centre and Caversham. Furthermore, given the site's location adjoining existing residential the redevelopment of the site for compatible uses is entirely appropriate and presents an opportunity, through careful masterplanning and visioning to facilitate a clearer demarcation between employment and residential uses. As the consultation document notes, some houses on Cardiff Road are almost entirely surrounded by employment uses, with other houses backing closely on to employment uses. Redevelopment of the Cox and Wyman site presents an obvious opportunity to resolve these issues and deliver an improved living and working environment, whilst making a valuable contribution to the Borough's housing stock (including affordable) on a previously developed site.</p>	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	If used for housing careful attention would need to be given to the density of development and issues on access and parking. Trees should be protected.	Noted. These elements are built into the proposed policy.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of

		development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	Water: We are concerned about this developments proximity to Fobney Water Treatment works and the ground water boreholes which serve the works. Fobney takes its supply from both a river intake and groundwater boreholes. A study will be required to ensure that there is no impact on water quality as a result of this development. The Study should have regard to the river floodplain and possible contamination from historic land use in the area. The study should identify and protect drinking water supply mains that may run through the site and should build in a water resource protection zone.	Noted. The need to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on water quality is set out in the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	I would support A9a in the allocation for redevelopment for residential use with the provisos that tree preservation orders are upheld and steps are taken to improve the air quality of the area by means of greater tree planting.	Noted. The draft policy highlights the importance of retaining trees.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A9	Erect a large number of prefabs.	The residential allocation does not specify the construction methods.
Historic England	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	We are concerned at this proposal because of its likely substantial harm to the grade II Tilehurst Road Bridge. The NPPF states that "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss". In our view, the provision of housing on this site would not be an overriding public benefit and this site should not be taken forward. We therefore object to this potential allocation of this latter site.	Noted. This proposal is not carried forward into the Draft Plan.
Network Rail	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	Whilst Network Rail are open to fully utilising their land assets, it is considered this particular proposal is not viable on account of the following:	

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst building on top of a track in the manner suggested is technically possible, the cost of the necessary engineering work is extremely high and experience has shown that this form of development is only viable where a high value/high density scheme is possible. It is felt that in this case such a development is not feasible as the density required to make the scheme viable would be out of character with the low density nature of the surrounding residential area. A lower density scheme more in keeping with the area would not have sufficient value to justify the high construction costs.</li> <li>2. Construction over an operational railway as proposed would create serious operating difficulties for Network Rail as the line would need to be kept open throughout construction work.</li> <li>3. The proposal would have a considerable impact on Tilehurst Bridge which is a grade II listed building.</li> </ol>	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	Disagree with the suggestion for major development on both sides of the station and redevelopment of the bridge. This is a green corridor and should be protected. Possible potential to develop on one side of the rail cutting only. Do not destroy current bridge	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning	

		Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	225mm nearest foul sewer so capacity concern. Due to the size of the potential development, further consultation would be required once the proposals have been confirmed.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A10	A10b - no allocation for development due to proximity to the railway line.	
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	Caversham Weir should not be further developed as the area around the Thames is highly sensitive.	The potential for hydropower at Caversham Weir is now recognised with the site allocation for Caversham Lock and Weir. It should be undertaken in a way that does not have a negative impact on flood risk, biodiversity or any other sensitivities of the Thames.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	The Hydropower plan is a very forward thinking idea, would show commitment to greener energy similar to the turbine on Green Park.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	Hydropower generation on this weir with feed-in to the national grid would be of great benefit, both locally and nationally, and local council policy should encourage its go-ahead.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	From a flood risk perspective we have no objection in principle to a hydropower scheme at this location and have already been involved in pre-application discussions with the applicant.	
Environment	<b>Question 17/18</b>	From a biodiversity perspective any hydropower scheme would need to	



Agency	Site A11	address all potential impacts of the scheme on the river and incorporate appropriate and sufficient mitigation measures.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A11	Fine with this providing Environment Agency is happy	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A12	This is pretty, quiet and relaxing island with a natural, open space with grassy paths and seating near to the weir at Caversham Lock. It contains a wildlife pond and several wooden, chainsaw-carved sculptures, an education area and a canoe pontoon. It is managed as a nature reserve by local volunteer groups and is part of very popular circular walk. We believe there should be no allocation for development and we wish to see its present valuable use protected.	Noted. This proposal is not carried forward into the Draft Plan.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A12	<p>Caversham GLOBE is strongly opposed to View Island being allocated for development.</p> <p>Since being opened up to the public in the 1990s by Reading Borough Council, the island has been managed as a nature reserve by volunteer groups. View Island is designated for protection as open space and as a major landscape feature next to the Thames. The entire island is within the Flood Zone 3 and has been completely under-water during several recent floods.</p> <p>Caversham GLOBE strongly refutes the suggestion by the nominator that View Island "is under used and has become a focus for anti-social behaviour". The island is in fact well used by local residents as a quiet, tranquil place to visit and is on a popular circular riverside walk. Any building on the island would inevitably result in the loss of valuable wildlife habitat and protected open space.</p> <p>A large building with meeting rooms and catering facilities as well as onsite accommodation would be totally inappropriate; such a building would be far more suited to the neighbouring Lock Island.</p> <p>View Island would also fail to meet the exception test since the nearby Caversham Lock Island is already designated for development and would be a more suitable location. The Lock Island is more easily accessible from King's Meadow, and is raised above the flood plain; it would also not involve the loss of woodland or other wildlife habitat on</p>	

		View Island.	
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A12	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A12	This site lies within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b). We would not want any ground level raising on this site and are opposed to the suggestion of a sustainability centre building on this site as it is contrary to the NPPF.	
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A12	As an island, the site is surrounded by water and there is a pond on site. Whilst not convinced of the need for a building on site, there is potential for greater involvement of the local community with ecological management and education.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 17/18 Site A12	Option b, no development. This is a good wildlife area and prone to flooding. If sustainability centre should be required or cafe, then put these on lock island or adjacent to swimming pool area.	
Scott Versace	Question 17/18 Site A12	I would back suggestion A12a, to include conservation and an ecology exemplar area.	
Steve Waite	Question 17/18 Site A12	View Island is a nature reserve, designated for protection as open space and as a major landscape feature next to the Thames. As such this should not be considered for development.	
Mr Chris Webster	Question 17/18 Site A12	My conclusion: Do Not Allocate. Twice in recent years the entire View Island has been under several feet of water. Therefore, what sort of building is contemplated? A "small scale" one, but elevated on pillars at least a metre above ground? We hear locally that it is to be occupied day and night - how are Emergency Services to reach it during floods?	
Caversham and District Residents'	Question 17/18 Site A13	We believe this site to be unsuitable for housing because of its location in a Zone 3 flood area and the difficulty of providing satisfactory road access.	Flood risk was taken into account in considering whether to allocate the site. The southernmost part of the site is within Flood Zone 3, but the

Association			northern half is in Flood Zone 2, and is likely to pass the sequential test for flooding. For this reason, the policy limits development to the northern half, which will also ensure that any impact on the landscape feature is minimised.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	Do not allocate. Caversham GLOBE is strongly opposed to this site being developed. It is within Flood Zone 3. It effectively forms part of the active flood meadow and is adjacent to the public open space and designated major landscape feature of Christchurch Meadows. Safe road access would also be difficult.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	The site lies partly within the functional floodplain and almost entirely within the current 1 in 100 year plus an allowance for climate change level. It should be noted that there is not much room on site to provide for floodplain compensation. You should consider whether you would accept other forms of mitigation against the loss of floodplain before deciding if this site should go forward as a site allocation. For example if voids are used, floor levels are raised and bearing in mind the new climate change figures, this could have an implication on the roof heights of buildings.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	A13a preferred, providing on northern end of the site	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
University of Reading	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A13	The University is entirely supportive of the suggested use of the site for housing. A13a reflects the submission to the Call for Sites consultation in October 2015 wherein it was indicated that the site is capable of delivery 15 units based on a typical density of 30 dwellings per hectare.	Noted. The site is included as an allocation in the draft plan, albeit that the developable area is reduced for flood risk reasons.

		<p>Should a higher density development on this site be considered appropriate, the University would endorse alternative option A13b. Given the central location of the site, its clear sustainability credentials and the character and nature of the surrounding area, a higher density development is considered feasible subject to more detailed masterplanning work moving forwards. A higher density development is considered favourable given the pressing need to deliver new housing within the Borough and to make the most efficient use of available development sites within central Reading.</p> <p>The site is capable of making a valuable contribution to the Borough's housing stock in the short term (1-5 years). It should be noted that a small proportion of the site, namely the rectangular piece of land adjacent to 28/29 The Willows is not within the UoR's ownership. This does not affect overall deliverability.</p>	
Len Abery Mrs P Ager Tina Allen Anonymous L Asbury Clive Bedford John Berry Deborah Dadd David Evans Louise Fenner Joanne Hales Gordon Johnson Carol Mclellan K Phillips Ruth Shaffrey L West	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	<p>The proposal is to identify two parts of the land on Kentwood Hill and Armour Hill for development and to protect the remainder including Victoria Recreation Ground as Local Green Space. The land to be used for housing has not been in use as allotments for some time, and there is no likelihood of allotments being reprovided on this land regardless of whether it is allocated. Given the very significant needs for new housing, it is therefore considered that this is an appropriate balance between provision of much needed housing, with protection of those areas that are of significance for recreation, wildlife and as allotments. It is considered that this approach provides the comprehensive solution that the SDPD Inspector required. An overall comprehensive approach at applications stage is also a requirement of the allocation.</p> <p>In terms of local infrastructure, this clearly needs to be considered as a whole for the area, and the</p>

Gillian Andrews	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	My preferred option is A14c (do not allocate for housing). My second option if absolutely necessary is A14d (only develop land currently used as a builder's yard), though it would add further pressure on general parking and local infrastructure.  This area is identified as open space, with both the Victoria Recreation Ground, and allotments being of significant value, and indeed very popular. It is therefore of great importance to hold this entire area as 'green space'.	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan seeks to pick up on the needs identified. Advice from the transport section has highlighted the need for development to address the main affected junctions. In terms of Polsted Road, no access from this road is proposed.</p> <p>The expectations are that this site will need to provide at least 50% 3+ bedroom homes, in line with the policy on housing mix. Affordable housing provision will also be part of any development in line with policies, and this will ensure that development helps to meet local needs.</p>
Peter Andrews	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. When will this building madness stop? Enough is enough! Local infrastructure (roads, trains, doctors, schools, hospitals etc) is already stretched to the limit.	
Anonymous	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	
Sally Archer	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. The builders yard seems bigger and noiser than it was. Will any expansion become brown fill?	
Bob Asbury	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. It should stay as a local amenity.	
M Asbury			
David Bailey	<b>Question 17/18</b>	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green	

	Site A14	Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. The fact that there is a waiting list for the local allotments indicates a true need. In a Rat-Race age, people need recreation, in various forms, to relax. Adding more housing, in an already crowded area, needs more infrastructure, which rarely, if ever, happens.	
Joseph Baker	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 should not be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotments, on the land previously used as allotments, on the builders yard, on the Withies/Copse area. The land previously used as allotments should not be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Housing is more important than hobbies. I am a plot-holder but this is crucial.	
Mary Bartlett	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. It is vital that land is kept for growing for future generations to benefit.	
Lynda Chater	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the builders yard. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Tilehurst has a rich history of horticulture, with a large number of nurseries and allotments having been centred around Tilehurst village until the area was engulfed in housing development from the sixties onwards. This site is one of the few remaining areas in Tilehurst that reflect this heritage.	
Jane Chesterfield	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole	

		area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Development of housing over such a large area would have a considerable impact on local traffic congestion and would require significant investment in local infrastructure (schools, doctors' surgeries, etc), as there is no space capacity in the area at present.	
Mrs Sarah Chilton	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the Withies/copse area. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	
Lis Clayton	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Tons of wildlife in allotments, badgers, owls, deer, bats, birds (red kites) etc that should not be disturbed. It is extremely peaceful working there on allotments, a great relaxation and therapeutic. More houses would destroy the area and devalue properties already here.	
Julia Cooper	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. As more houses are built in gardens and new ones have virtually none, it is even more important to keep green space and the opportunity for healthy exercise and mental recreation.	
Peter Andrews Karen Clyne	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the builders yard. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should	

		continue to be used as a playing field.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	Option 14b. Do not accept any of this land for housing or employment development until a plan for the whole site has been produced. Piecemeal development and erosion of the significant landscape and environmental value must be prevented.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.  Until and unless there is an accurate plan for the whole site all the land should be protected. The current proposal is vague. It seems to disregard the judgement of the previous planning inspector about preventing piecemeal development. I wish to prevent loss of green space. If an accurate plan were available for comment, and reliable future safeguards were in place I might agree to a small amount of building on the lowest part of the site -possibly in compensation for the existence of the builders yard so long unfettered by planning regulation, and freeing the builders yard from 'brownfield' status.
Ian Duddle	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	Governments have always wanted land to be used for recreational and growing/fitness use. Keep the allotment land for allotments.
Roger Ebbett	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. As usual every piece of green land is considered as potential building land without a thought to how it will affect the existing residents. I suppose the landowner will receive large sums of money and the rest of us can go to hell as we are supposed to just accept it, but why should we? We are important too and pay large amounts of money in council tax and get less and less for it, I'm sick of the council and the way they just ignore everyone except money grabbing landowners.
Colin Edwards	<b>Question 17/18</b>	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green



	Site A14	Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	
Mr R W Embling	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	<p>A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. I can remember as a lad going to fetes and playing football at Victoria Recreation Ground which gave me much enjoyment and pleasure, I find it hard to believe that this playing field can be allocated for building and just the thought of housing appearing on this area makes me feel sick. This area should be kept as a Recreation Ground for many years to come for our future children, grandchildren to enjoy all the benefits as I had when I was younger.</p> <p>With regards to the Allotments, all younger and older people all need to have somewhere to go and enjoy their hobbies, especially for people who have not got room for growing vegetables in their gardens. We all need open spaces, therefore these Allotments should remain for generations to come. It is my belief that the charity that owns all the surrounding land has become too greedy, what with extortionate prices for Allotment plots, and now the idea of selling parts of this land off.</p>	
Liz Ellis	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. We need more space for allotments. And this site includes Victoria Recreation Ground which is a much used play area. All the site should be protected as local green space.	
Mark Eveleigh	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the builders yard. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should	

		continue to be used as a playing field. These are vital amenities and should be retained. Allotment space is at a premium - with the Chapel Hills site under threat.	
J Fidler	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. No houses on any of this site, i.e. allotments or playing field.	
Jane Field	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Victoria recreation ground is used by local sports group. It is a very popular area and the only one this part of Tilehurst. The allotment site was left to the people of tilehurst by the person who previously owned the site.	
Mrs Gould	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. It is most important that the Recreation Ground is used as a playing field. This area is used for football, which helps bring the community together. It is used by dog walkers (especially the elderly). Tilehurst Village is already a very built up area	
David Griffiths	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. This land was set aside for the people of Tilehurst by the enclosures act. It is outrageous that it should be hijacked by a small private charity.	
Miss L V Jones	<b>Question 17/18</b>	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green	

	Site A14	Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Victoria Recreation Ground has become part of the Tilehurst community, being well used by children, dog walkers, sports and annual fetes; there would be nothing to replace it & the community would be deprived of a valuable recreation area. To consider building on any of the 'allotment' area would be inconceivable. Even discounting the health & recreation benefits it brings, the road systems around the area are too narrow to cope with increased usage and facilities practically non-existent.	
J Kirton	Question 17/18 Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. I was moved from my allotment site about 20 years ago. This land has stayed empty. Only the builders yard has been used and has got bigger. It has been bad management by the trustees.	
Greg Lewis	Question 17/18 Site A14	I appreciate the need for new housing, however I strongly object to certain sites. These should not be included in any plan. In particular, site A14 the only option here must be A14c (do not allocate for housing). I have been a resident in Tilehurst all my life and have seen a huge amount of development. So much so, few spaces remain un-covered with concrete. This cannot be allowed to continue.	
Melinda Lewis	Question 17/18 Site A14	There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotment land. The land previously used as allotments should not be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	
Mr William Macphee	Question 17/18 Site A14	The whole site (with the regrettable exception of the builder's yard) should be kept as open space.  At the moment the allotment area is more or less fully let and utilized. Until the owner threw tenants off the rest of the site was allotments,	

		<p>which I believe were well used. The fact that that half of the site is derelict wasteland is a function of the owner's actions, and not necessarily an indication of a lack of would be tenants.</p> <p>One cannot tell how the demand for allotments (or other open recreational areas) will develop over the coming decades. There are predictions that population will rise and work will reduce (due to computerization and automation), so in the future there may be more under-occupied people who might like allotments. Once built upon it will be difficult and probably uneconomic to return land to open space.</p> <p>The land, as it is, provides open views northwards over Oxfordshire - these should be preserved, and not blocked by building.</p> <p>The Recreation ground is well used for sport, dog walking, shows and general enjoyment of open space and greenery, and so once again should be preserved.</p>	
Orla McBride	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the builders yard. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. More homes means more people, and as housing is getting denser the requirement for allotments will increase. Please preserve this space for this use. Also, I use the recreation ground most days, and there are always other people using it. I'm not sure why the football has stopped - I've heard a rumour about rats, but this can easily be sorted by pest control if this is the case.	
Gill McDonald	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Leave all valuable green spaces alone.	
Date Newnham	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. This should not include housing development. The land	

		previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. This land should be left as allotments and green space. There isn't the infrastructure in place to sustain further large development and the local people do not want it.	
Jennie Newnham	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Precious allotment land and we don't want to lose it to yet more houses.	
J Pritchard	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 should not be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotments, on Victoria Recreation Ground, on the builders yard, on the Withies/Copse area. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Need to know where access points will be and if Polsted road will be a no through road for traffic and pedestrians	
Natalie Pryor	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. To develop this open space for housing will certainly cause issues especially on the Amour Hill side - this is a dangerous road at the best of times - being used as a rat run and also during extreme weather - ice / snow - sometimes not negotiable because of the steepness. Parking is also an issue, especially when there are events at the Scout Hut.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14e, do not build on allotments, copse or recreation land. Include wildlife corridor alongside new development to give n-s route	
Tanja Rebel	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as	

		allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. If anything, there should be more space for allotments.	
Miss Karen Reeves	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	My view is that the best option is A14c, or A14d as the only possible second best option for this site.	
Andrew Scott	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the builders yard. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. The Victoria Recreation Ground is a hub of community activity where the young can run around and partake of the sport and exercise we are told so often that they need. Not everyone can afford a gym membership. The allotments are another focal point of community life. We already have enough housing on postage stamp sized pieces of land, these can be made bearable for some people with an allotment. Also we want a comprehensive plan of what housing is proposed so that we know we are getting the housing the area needs not more detached expensive properties to fill the builders pockets!	
Katherine Slater	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 should not be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the land previously used as allotments. The land previously used as allotments should not be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. The Victoria Recreation Ground is well-used for all sorts of purposes: dog-walking, football, fetes among them. Arthur Newbury Park is too hilly to satisfy all these needs. If there is more housing in the area then there will be a greater need for this 'green lung'.	
Anita Soulsby	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotments, on the land previously used as allotments, on Victoria Recreation Ground, on the Withies/Copse area. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field.	

<p>Tilehurst Allotments Society</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14</p>	<p>Tilehurst Allotments Society agrees with option 14c, that none of the land should be allocated for housing.</p> <p>All the land is designated as open space apart from the de-facto builders yard. The planning inspector in 2012 rejected the proposal to build on part of the site. He recommended that a plan showing use of all the land on this site should be drawn up and proposals for development of any portion should be considered in context so avoiding piecemeal development. Tilehurst Allotments Society would welcome an opportunity to consider the future of allotment gardening locally in the context of such a plan.</p> <p>Apart from temporary delays in lettings (3%) there are no vacancies on the land currently let as allotments off Armour Hill/Polsted Rd. Even with no advertising the waiting list is currently about 10, which is replicated over Reading. Significant waiting lists are the norm despite the move to small plots (half the traditional size). Smaller gardens, greater housing density and increase in awareness of health/food/exercise issues all tend to mean there is continuing need for allotments.</p> <p>Even in this housing crisis allotments are needed by those who enjoy the healthy hobby, and as mitigation against ever increasing housing densities and urbanisation. We believe that even if left as it is for the life of the revised Local Plan it would be better for the 'reserved lands' to remain as it is than to be built on without any overview of the use of all the site and start a period of piecemeal development.</p>	
<p>Tilehurst Poor's Land Charity</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14</p>	<p>Our assessment of "the site" relates to all of the land at Kentwood Hill owned by Tilehurst Poor's Land Charity recognising that it is unlikely that the entire site will be appropriate for residential development.</p> <p>Given the site's location and proximity to services, we consider it a highly sustainable location which could provide much needed additional housing in Reading.</p> <p>We support the principle of allocating the land at Kentwood Hill for development. Given the need for Reading to deliver 699 new homes a</p>	

	<p>year, and issues RBC faces in identifying suitable sites then appropriate sites such as the land at Kentwood Hill are essential in assisting in meeting the Borough's Objectively Assessed Need. For these reasons we consider that the Option "Do not allocate" is not appropriate, and should be discounted.</p> <p>On the basis that it is entirely appropriate, and necessary, that the site should be allocated, the next consideration is what extent of the site should be allocated. Having regard to the Inspector's comments on the SDPD, we consider that in order for the emerging Local Plan to be found sound, the entirety of the Kentwood Hill site should be allocated as a mixed use development, comprising residential, formal and informal open space. Such an approach would avoid the earlier Inspectors concern about both avoiding "piecemeal development that is not well related to the surroundings" and delivering the "comprehensive approach" sought by the earlier Inspector.</p> <p>A mixed use allocation could comprise the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 4.7ha of land for residential development of around 141 dwellings at 30 dph. This consists of the builders yard and immediate surrounds, the land to the east of the yard fronting Kentwood Hill and the allotment area;</li> <li>• Retention of Victoria Recreation Ground as formal public open space;</li> <li>• Retention of the Local Wildlife Site and Major Landscape Feature;</li> </ul> <p>This proposal would involve the loss of the allotments, however, these are non-statutory allotments which are not afforded any protection and whose use could terminate at any point. We consider the pressing need for new homes in sustainable locations and the requirement for the Council to meet its OAN outweighs the need for the retention of non-statutory allotments.</p> <p>As a further consideration, an allocation of this scale could deliver improvements to the formal open space at Victoria Recreation Ground. Development could fund improvements such as improved changing facilities and improvements to the play area.</p> <p>For these reasons our client supports option (v). The proposed</p>	
--	---	--



		<p>allocation at Kentwood Hill should therefore read:</p> <p>"Allocation of site for a mixed use development comprising up to 141 dwellings and including the retention of Victoria Recreation Ground, the Local Wildlife Site and Major Landscape Feature. Development will include opportunities to improve leisure facilities at the Victoria Recreation Ground and maintain or improve the existing Green Network and will maintain or enhance the Major Landscape Feature."</p>	
Lucie Twivey	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotments, on the land previously used as allotments, on Victoria Recreation Ground, on the builders yard, on the Withies/Copse area. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Please don't let's lose this space. If it has to be sold by the present owners perhaps it should be bought for the community.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	The allotments and adjoining recreational fields are integral parts of the surrounding community, not to mention the value they hold to the ecosystems in place in the area. If any development is to occur in this area I would back suggestion 1 (A14a) or the alternative (A14d).	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	The allotments really should stay as allotments as there is the demand for them.	
Frances	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. This should not include housing development. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue to be used as a playing field. Please do not put housing there especially allotments and Victoria Park, they have fetes, football playing do walking, great place to be, it would ruin it.	
Matt	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	A14 (apart from the builder's yard) should be identified as Local Green Space. There should be a plan showing proposed land use for the whole area outlined in red. There should be housing development on the allotments. The land previously used as allotments should be protected for use as allotment land. Victoria Recreation Ground should continue	

		to be used as a playing field.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	Site A14 includes an area of land designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (deciduous woodland), Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any development at this location that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, including loss of its connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act.	Noted. The area designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance will be retained, and the policy seeks to ensure its connectivity with the rest of the Green Network.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the water and wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A14	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect	Noted. These issues are referred to in the supporting text to the policy.

		the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A15	A15b do not allocate. No reason to destroy area of woodland.	Noted. The proposal is not carried forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A15	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A15	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A15	A15b due to the tree preservation orders in place and previously refused development applications.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A16	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Noted. The proposal is not carried forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A16	This site has the Holy Brook to the rear. Any redevelopment should reinstate an ecological buffer zone between the development and the top of the river bank in excess of 10m width. Ecological enhancements to the river bank and the buffer zone should be incorporated into any designs at an early stage.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A16	All options OK. Need wildlife corridor area alongside the Holy Brook in all plans	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A16	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	

Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A16	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A17	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A17	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A17	Within larger Dee park regeneration site. Cow Lane SPS has been upgraded to deal with additional flow from Dee Park, Thames Water would require consultation if changes are made to the proposed development.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A17	Suggestion 1 - Remove any contamination and consider underground parking. Possibly consider for prefabs / starter homes.	Noted. The policy ensures that any contamination is dealt with. The construction methods of new homes are not dealt with in the policy.
Mount Properties Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A18	<p>We support Option A18a for the residential development of the site for 57 dwellings. The site is ideal for residential development, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• located within the settlement of Reading;</li> <li>• in a highly sustainable location close to Reading Town Centre and Cemetery Junction District Centre;</li> <li>• surrounded by and well related to existing residential development;</li> <li>• well connected to public transport, being on a major bus corridor with regular bus services;</li> <li>• well served by cycle routes and within walking distance of key services and facilities; and</li> <li>• located in a built up area outside any local landscape designations, ecological protections or flood zones.</li> </ul> <p>The site should be developed as efficiently as possible. The siting of the development between two existing larger apartment buildings also creates the existing environment within which to provide a higher density development that respects the surrounding context. Through</p>	This site is proposed to be allocated for development within the Local Plan. It is considered that, at this stage, the plan is not able to justify an allocation for the number of homes specified here. The allocation specifies 26-38 homes. However, this is an indicative capacity, and if a planning application is able to demonstrate that a different figure is appropriate, the policy recognises that this may be acceptable. A revised draft will need to take account of any changes in circumstances as a result of any planning applications.

		<p>pre-application discussions with the Council it has been demonstrated how 57 units on the site can be achieved whilst providing a high standard of design that will enhance the wider street scene.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site will also deliver a mixture of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties, provide 30% affordable housing and create a high quality development that will enhance the street scene. Air quality and noise will not constrain development and can be mitigated, where found to be necessary, through the design of the development. The site is deliverable and developable and is in a suitable location for development. Furthermore, there is a realistic prospect of housing being delivered on the site within five years.</p> <p>Options A18b and A18c are not viable options. There is limited demand for offices in this location, and through pre-application discussions Officers have advised that on the basis of the information presented the principle of residential development on the site is acceptable. Option A18d should also be discounted due to the need for housing and the sustainable nature of the site.</p>	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A18	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A18	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	We understand that this site could only be made available if land could be acquired outside the Borough boundary. Our views on the development of the site would depend on the details of any specific development proposals.	The site is included within the Draft Local Plan as an allocation for residential development. The following comments are made in terms of the specific issues raised  In terms of loss of undeveloped land, the need for new housing means that undeveloped land may be required as part of the strategy. This site is not covered by other designations such as flood risk or biodiversity, and does not have the landscape significance of other nearby open
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	Do not allocate. The golf course is a well used leisure space and forms part of the open space on the edge of the borough adjacent to South Oxfordshire Countryside. As such it forms part of the green belt on the edge of the built up area and should be retained as open space.	
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	The golf course is not a major loss to the local area, there are at least 2 within 5/10 miles of this. 100 new houses in theory sounds good, but the implications on traffic need to be considered as this area	

		bottlenecks quite quickly.	
Mrs Sadie Cooke	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	My main worries are about the services i.e., water, sewage etc. and then there are Schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals all of which are working at capacity. There will be many more cars on Kidmore End Road which is already over full with traffic. And apart from all this the environment here will be badly affected as there is an amount of wildlife in that particular area all of which makes Emmer Green one of the nicest residential areas in Reading.	<p>areas. It is not open to the public, and would not result in the loss of a leisure facility as the allocation would result in the retention of the golf course overall.</p> <p>The site has been assessed for its wildlife significance and was not found to be particularly significant in its own right. It performs a role as part of the Green Network, and policy ensures that a link across the site is retained.</p>
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	We have concerns that large scale development on Reading Golf Course would result in additional pressures on other facilities such as schools and doctor's surgeries, and road infrastructure: The recent overriding local issue of where to site the Caversham Heights School has only just been resolved after a long battle and there is a danger that this issue would flare up again with a further influx of pupils, even before the new school is built. Development would add significantly to the congestion in the south-eastern part of Kidmore End Road (alongside the recreation ground), which only allows for a single lane of traffic, one direction at a time.	<p>In terms of transport, it is recognised that there may be upgrades necessary to nearby roads and junctions. The policy takes account of this.</p> <p>The education infrastructure necessary to support development north of the Thames will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Specific options are under consideration.</p>
Gregory and Andrea Grashoff	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	<p>The inclusion of this possible site is counter to the second Core Objective.</p> <p>This is a designated Green Space and environmentally important for wildlife, plants and trees, is also an important local amenity and a key leisure, sport and recreation facility.</p> <p>There is already huge pressure on the oversubscribed school and "education" infrastructure in North Reading. Efforts to provide additional schooling in North Reading have proved to be extremely difficult.</p> <p>The pressure on doctor and "healthcare services" in North Reading is extreme with places at existing practices also oversubscribed.</p> <p>Other essential services are also under severe pressure. Thames Water are already experiencing problems with water pressure due to the additional housing development that has already taken place in Emmer Green.</p>	<p>The primary healthcare constraints in the area are noted, and this site has scope to provide a site for new facilities. The policy reflects this.</p> <p>The potential for archaeological finds are noted in the policy.</p>

		<p>Traffic on Kidmore End Road is already excessive particularly at rush hour and school start/finish times. Any increase in traffic would also adversely affect traffic flow into Reading. Currently queuing traffic occupies Buckingham Drive and Peppard Road for lengthy periods attempting to enter Reading by either Reading or Caversham Bridge.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the plan removes A19.</p>	
<p>Sheila Harris</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19</p>	<p>Given that recent developments in this area show that each dwelling has an average of 2 vehicles this would result in a potential increase of 200 vehicles using the road. In addition, if the Golf Club extends to incorporate a health club and swimming pool, even more traffic will be generated. Kidmore End Road is virtually a single lane road from its junction with Peppard Road almost to the entrance to Benets Way. This is due to residents of the terraced houses having no alternative parking. As this is also a bus route traffic is frequently held up. The new housing development would presumably require its own entrance separate from that for the Golf Club. That would mean having exits from Benets Way, Lyefield Court, Chalgrove Way, the new Golf Club, the recent development of houses opposite the Golf Course and Twin Oaks within a comparatively short distance.</p> <p>I understand from local residents that pressure on local schools is intense. Is there any plan to provide for the extra influx of children? I presume that most of these dwellings will be family homes.</p> <p>Local doctors surgeries are also under pressure and the ones at Emmer Green, on the Peppard Road and Hemdean Road have to room to expand. Are there plans for provision for extra demand?</p> <p>Are the utilities able to cope with an additional 100 dwellings? Since mid January there have been 2 sudden electricity power failures and a curtailment of supply of about 5 hours while a major fault was repaired.</p>	
<p>Sheilah Higginson</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19</p>	<p>Education: Extra classrooms were provided at Grove Road Primary and I expect they are fully occupied. You also have to consider the early years and childcare facilities locally. Pressure to provide extra school places.</p>	

		<p>Environment: the loss of a leisure facility and open space. The effect on wild life living on the golf course</p> <p>Health: air pollution would increase from extra traffic</p> <p>Highways: this is a very worrying aspect of the proposed development. Kidmore End Road is very heavily used. 100 houses would probably mean 150+ extra cars, add service vehicles. A new access road to the dwellings would be needed, plus an entrance to Reading Golf Club making a total of 2 access roads. Driving north up Kidmore End Road you pass in quick succession a large number of entrances. Poor parking on this road can block buses. To give you some idea of traffic on our development we have visits by doctors, nurses, carers, chemist, milkman, dustbins, cleaners, hairdressers, chiropodists, cleaners, supermarkets and many more, before the residents and their visitors.</p> <p>Housing: I realise all Councils are under pressure to provide extra homes but looking at the area could you really fit 100 dwellings, although I see 3.75 ha comes in the range 85-134 homes. Would these be starter homes? Would you have to include any social housing?</p>	
Bethan Howard	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	I wish to object to the idea that A19 is suitable for housing. Access on Kidmore End Road is narrow with frequent parked car movements adding to the hazards, plus the entrance to the club house car park is crossed daily by school children and is already a great risk to them.	
Ian Howard	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	I wish to object to the proposed housing at Reading Golf Club at Kidmore End Road. Access is too limited down Kidmore End Road past the terraced houses and Emmer Green Primary School is already over subscribed.	
Gillian and Dennis King	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	We are very disappointed to see that Reading Golf Course is being suggested for consideration for possible housing development. We understand this golf course has been in existence for over 100 years and to take away this amenity would be a great loss to the local community. This area has already suffered from a major development recently, commonly referred to as Bugs Bottom which has already made local schools and doctors full to capacity. The road structure from the north of Reading to the town centre has not had any major	



		<p>improvements unlike the roads from the southerly direction and any future development will clearly only worsen traffic flow. Added to the above Thames Water authority has already advised us that the water pressure is so low in this area due to the excess housing development which have been recently built.</p>	
<p>Margaret and Michael Pocock</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19</p>	<p>Schools are already full and overflowing with temporary classrooms occupying playground space. Doctors are becoming desperate. We would refer you to the failure of providing a surgery to cover the "Bugs Bottom" development and of course a school.</p> <p>If the residential development proposed were to come to fruition the numbers of cars exiting on Kidmore End Road (150 plus) would be a major impact on the area. At the moment when there is an event at the golf club parking on the K.E. Road is of considerable inconvenience. At any time parking from a good section of the road is impossible and Chalgrove Way takes the brunt. Our prediction is that this would intensify. The road is also subject to speeding and this will increase and endanger the children walking to the schools.</p> <p>This development cannot take place unless South Oxfordshire agree to the Golf Club proposals to build a clubhouse in Tanners Lane. Even if this was agreed the approach road which is very narrow would need to be considerably upgraded and they would be unlikely to bear the cost. At this time the extra traffic generated by golf club members travelling to the car park in Tanners Lane is mostly only necessary at weekends but the proposal will necessitate all members and event attendees always using this totally inadequate access,</p> <p>We would suggest that the only proposal that is remotely sensible is a new clubhouse as put forward in Option(s) A 19c or (if arms are twisted) A19d</p>	
<p>Reading Urban Wildlife Group</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19</p>	<p>Against development for residential. Wildlife corridor east west to open country, and link to open areas to north east. Only potential area is at the south of the site next to club house.</p>	
<p>Harvey Smith</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19</p>	<p>Kidmore End Road between the Golf Course and Peppard Road, which is a bus route (24), allows for traffic in one (alternating) direction only and is already congested at times and is blocked when refuse is being</p>	

		collected or when there are emergency vehicles or work vehicles trying to access the houses opposite the recreation ground. A solution to the road access situation would need to be found before such a large number of new dwellings should even be considered by RBC. The one surgery in Emmer Green (next to St Barnabas church) seems to be struggling to cope, given how difficult it is to get an appointment there. Schooling may also be an issue. There is also the issue of the character of Kidmore End Road in the area of the Golf Club. The Council should exclude Suggestion A19a from the Local Plan and adopt Alternative Option A19b or A19c.	
Peter and Linda Smith	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	<p>This plan is in conflict with the Core Objective concerning quality of life. Among the specific concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to and traffic on Kidmore End Road: the impact of more traffic turning on to this road will be major and significantly adverse. This road is already subject to heavy through traffic. Residents without garages/parking places have to park on roadside, reducing it essentially to an alternating one way circulation for much of the day.</li> <li>• Access to Caversham and Town: the increase in population would increase further rush hour traffic from Peppard Road and the already inevitable “rat runs” along Hemdean Road, currently heavily congested and add to the heavy traffic over both congested bridges.</li> <li>• Pressure on School places: Already heavily subscribed (viz refer to the recent discussions for extra school on Mapledurham playing fields)</li> <li>• Pressure on Doctor Services: Already heavily subscribed and led to suspension of new patients at a practise for a recent period.</li> <li>• Impact on archaeological sites: Responses to previous planning applications revealed the risk of disturbing remains of adjacent ancient sites and possibly the Golf Course and surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p>We therefore request that the plan leaves the utilisation of the Reading Golf Club site unchanged.</p>	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the water and wastewater constraints.

		to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A19	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A20	In our own area, our preferred option is A20.	Noted. This site is a proposed allocation in the Draft Local Plan. The draft policy notes the importance of a north-south green link.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A20	This is reducing wildlife corridor from the Thames up through the crematorium area. Important for design of layout to leave a north south corridor across this development	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A20	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A20	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A21	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.

Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A21	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
University of Reading	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A22	The University is entirely supportive of the suggested use of the site for housing in the region of 20 dwellings. A22b is not considered an appropriate strategy given the need to find suitable, deliverable and sustainable sites in the short term in order to boost and maintain the supply of housing in Reading, and of course to assist in the delivery of full OAN. Sites such as A22, which lie in close proximity to central Reading, the University and array of services as well as key public transport routes should be viewed positively with a view to enabling delivery in the short term (1 - 5 years). It should be noted that property no. 18 does not fall within the UoR's ownership, however this does not impede overall deliverability.	Noted. The site is included as a proposed allocation within the Draft Local Plan, although the sensitivities of the site, in particular in terms of trees within a conservation area, mean that fewer dwellings are likely to be appropriate.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A22	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A22	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A23	Prefer A23 b or c. This is an important corridor along the long gardens east west linking the university grounds to Kendrick Road north south route. Lower density development could be appropriate, but only if there is a barrier to extending the road into the site. Otherwise, this development proposal will come with a new road and intention to continue back garden development along the length of these long gardens	The proposed allocation is generally in line with the existing plan. It will require a new road accessing the site, but this does not create any presumption that land further west of the site will be appropriate for development.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A23	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A23	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A24	This proposed site entirely comprises land designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (floodplain grazing marsh), by Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any	Noted. This area is not proposed for development within the Draft Local Plan, particularly due to its flood risk and wildlife

		development at this location that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, including loss of connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act. Development of this site would therefore be contrary to the statutory obligations of the NERC Act and the policy obligations of the NPPF. This site should remain undeveloped.	<p>significance.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan includes recognition that an area largely outside Reading Borough may be considered for development (as recognised in the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework). Use of parts of this land for associated open space or flood alleviation would need to be considered as part of an overall whole, and cannot be pre-empted in this plan.</p>
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A24	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A24	This site is functional floodplain and residential development ('more vulnerable' development) should not be an option for this site. This would not be NPPF compliant. The NPPF states that only water compatible and essential infrastructure (with exception test) is compatible on this site as long as it remains safe to users in times of flood, results in no loss of floodplain storage, does not impede flows and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.	
Environment Agency	Question 17/18 Site A24	This land should not be included for development due to the impact on the various watercourses and their associated corridors.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 17/18 Site A24	Not suitable for development due to flooding	
Tarmac	Question 17/18 Site A24	The development potential of Searles Farm is intertwined with what might happen in the wider area. Therefore, at this stage it is not appropriate to define particular development land uses or alternative options. There should be a clear recognition that Searles Farm has an essential role to play in the development of the wider area and that its future use will be determined as proposals emerge for some version of the earlier Kennet Valley Park proposal. Specific land uses designations are inappropriate and so a designation as a Major Opportunity Area with a menu of potential land uses is the most robust way forward.	
Thames Water	Question 17/18	Water: We are concerned about this developments proximity to Fobney	

	Site A24	Water Treatment works and the ground water boreholes which serve the works. Fobney takes its supply from both a river intake and groundwater boreholes. A study will be required to ensure that there is no impact on water quality as a result of this development. The Study should have regard to the river floodplain and possible contamination from historic land use in the area. The study should identify and protect drinking water supply mains that may run through the site and should build in a water resource protection zone.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A24	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A24	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A24	A24g due to the flood zoning and the town's need for new leisure developments.	
Caversham and District Residents'	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A25	CADRA has submitted comprehensive comments on the current planning application on this site. Whilst supporting the proposal in principle we have comments about a number of details of the proposed layout. We	Noted. This site now has planning permission and is therefore not allocated within the plan.

Association		have especially significant concerns about the proposed 4th storey of the building, which would not only be out of character in the immediate vicinity, but perhaps more importantly, would be clearly visible in views towards Caversham from many vantage points in Reading, thereby destroying a beautiful green skyline which is a valuable part of Reading's heritage.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A25	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A25	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A26	This is a highly sensitive area either in or contiguous to a conservation area.	The site is not particularly close to a Conservation Area. However, it is recognised that there are particular sensitivities in terms of trees and wildlife that limits the amount of homes that could be provided.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A26	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A26	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A27	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	Noted. This site now has planning permission and is therefore not allocated within the plan.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A27	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be	

		required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A27	60 houses draining to a 150mm sewer. Possible need for an impact study	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A28	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A28	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	Noted. This site is not proposed for housing in the Draft Local Plan.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A28	Wastewater: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A28	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment	The proposed allocation is for continued employment use rather than residential, so it is unlikely that the specific assessments referred to will be required. However, the policy refers to the need for liaison with Thames Water where



		would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	development is proposed.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Foudry Properties Limited	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	<p>Foudry Properties Limited has a long term interest in this site. RBC owns the freehold of the entire Site. The site benefits from an historic outline planning permission, which for this land includes a substantial amount of office floorspace with ancillary retail and car parking. The Council accepts that these proposals are no longer viable, and therefore a new solution is required to bring forward this large, contaminated and visible site adjacent to the A33.</p> <p>The development plan should recognise that RBC are freehold owners of the land (Foudry Properties has a leasehold interest expiring on 24th December 2030 incorporating a purchase option); and that the site is effectively allocated for development in the existing Core Strategy (known as 'Southside'). This site should be taken forward as an existing development allocation unlike other sites suggested by third parties in the earlier 'Call for Sites' part of the plan process.</p> <p>The extent of decontamination required to bring forward redevelopment of this Site is a significant up front cost affecting viability. Overly restrictive policies that either limit the range of value generating future land uses that are acceptable, or burden the land with additional costs, would mean that the Site is unlikely to come forward within the forthcoming plan period. This would not be an acceptable position for either land owners or the local community.</p> <p>At this time, Foudry is further investing, to build up a better</p>	<p>Noted. The identification of this site recognises that a range of commercial uses may be appropriate, although gives particular weight to industrial and warehouse uses given the scale of the identified need.</p> <p>The policy does not seek to place unnecessary burdens on development, but there are some clear issues that need to be addressed if development is to be appropriate.</p>

		understanding of the range of options available to address the necessary on-site decontamination in a more commercial and financially acceptable manner. Until this is concluded, a wide range of commercial and residential uses should not yet be discounted for this Site at this time. It is hoped that as the plan develops then further certainty can be provided by Foudry.	
Tarmac	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	Development of this site for mixed commercial uses is supported. This represents the most efficient use of land.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	Water: We are concerned about this developments proximity to Fobney Water Treatment works and the ground water boreholes which serve the works. Fobney takes its supply from both a river intake and groundwater boreholes. A study will be required to ensure that there is no impact on water quality as a result of this development. The Study should have regard to the river floodplain and possible contamination from historic land use in the area. The study should identify and protect drinking water supply mains that may run through the site and should build in a water resource protection zone.	Noted. The need to avoid detrimental impacts on water quality is referred to in the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A29	Require further development details once available. Where development is being proposed within 800m of a sewage treatment works, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. The odour impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in closer proximity to a sewage treatment works.	The proposed allocation is for commercial use rather than residential, so it is unlikely that the specific assessments referred to will be required. However, the policy refers to the need for liaison with Thames Water where development is proposed.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.

		to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	Any development here would need an undeveloped buffer zone a minimum of 10m wide measured from the top of the river bank. Ecological enhancements to the watercourse should be included in any proposals.	Agreed. The proposed allocation highlights the need for a buffer to the watercourse.
Tarmac	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	Development of this land for employment uses is supported. This represents the most efficient use of land.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan includes more detail on the scale of development proposed.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A30	Where development is being proposed within 800m of a sewage treatment works, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour impact assessment is required.	The proposed allocation is for commercial use rather than residential, so it is unlikely that the specific assessments referred to will be required. However, the policy refers to the need for liaison with Thames Water where development is proposed.
BBOWT	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	This site includes an area of land designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (deciduous woodland), Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any development at this location that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, including loss of its connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act.	The need for development to avoid detrimental impacts on features of wildlife significance is built into the policy.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be

		how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	assembled as the plan develops.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	On this site the sand and gravel (Secondary A Aquifer) has been removed and backfilled with waste (leachate is a source of contamination). The landfill material will continue to settle for some years and therefore piling will be required for any development on this site. The engineered landfill sits directly over the Lambeth Group (Secondary A Aquifer) and piling used will penetrate through the landfill and into the top the Lambeth Group and could form pathways for contaminated leachate or groundwater to migrate vertically during the piling operation. The choice of an unsuitable piling solution could leave open pathways for continued vertical migration of contamination. The basal beds of the Lambeth Group have sandy lenses that can act as pathways for pollution to migrate to the top of the Chalk that underlies the site. The Chalk as the receptor is a Principal Aquifer. Please be aware of this when considering what development type will be used for this site.	These issues are noted in the proposed policy, and the contamination issues have informed what the proposed use of the site could be.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	Contained municipal landfill. Any development has to consider landfill gas issues. Not suitable for residential, could use for commercial with concrete raft construction.	
Roxhill Developments Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	<p>Redevelopment for employment uses under Option A will be the most appropriate outcome for A31. RBC has already acknowledged the potential of Site A31 to accommodate employment development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Core Strategy Key Diagram shows A31 as 'Undeveloped Land'. It is the only specific area shown, and as within 'South West Reading';</li> <li>• Policy CS10 states that major employment uses, including industrial and storage and distribution, will be located in the A33 corridor within which the Site sits. Supporting text to the policy acknowledges that the A33 corridor is currently a relatively successful industrial and warehousing area and is likely to continue to be needed in employment use;</li> <li>• A31 was previously promoted for a distribution centre and concrete batching plant through the submission of representations on the SDPD. Whilst the site was not formally allocated within that policy</li> </ul>	Noted. The site is included as an employment allocation in the Draft Local Plan.

		<p>document, RBC did conclude that there is sufficient guidance in the local planning policies to judge an employment development on its merits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RBC agreed that the Site should be removed from the Major Landscape Feature. RBC's Main Modifications document explained that this change "may give more scope for employment development that could contribute to the local economy".</li> </ul> <p>The alternative options are not favoured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option B (do not allocate): it is considered that there is already sufficient guidance in the existing local planning policies to judge an employment development of Site A31 on its merits, irrespective of an allocation. Nevertheless, an allocation would help to further acknowledge the development potential of the site and enable it to be considered in the context of the overall plan-making process;</li> <li>• Options C and D (residential and leisure uses): A31 comprises a former landfill location and the approach along Island Road is already characterised by established commercial uses including the RE3 Recycling Centre and the Thames Water treatment works.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that pre-application discussions have now commenced in connection with a planning application for the development of Site A31 for employment development.</p>	
Roxhill Developments Ltd	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	The boundary of Site A31 should be revised in order to 'square off' the north east corner adjacent to the RE3 Recycling Centre. The change would enable any allocation to be as comprehensive as possible. It would also reflect the development potential of the north east corner, which it is understood that Cemex UK is considering as a potential location for a concrete batching facility.	Agreed. This land has been incorporated within the proposed allocation.
Tarmac	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	Development of this land for employment uses is supported. This represents the most efficient use of land.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan includes more detail on the scale of development proposed.

Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A31	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	The proposed allocation is for commercial use rather than residential, so it is unlikely that the specific assessments referred to will be required. However, the policy refers to the need for liaison with Thames Water where development is proposed.
Reading Football Club	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	<p>We fully support the allocation of site A32a for Land at Madejski Stadium. It provides an opportunity to make effective use of previously developed land in a prime location within the Borough: an approach fully supported by the NPPF (paragraph 17). The forthcoming infrastructure improvements, including the planned opening of Green Park Station in 2019 emphasises the evolving accessibility and prominence of this area of the Borough</p> <p>The quality of the environment surrounding the Stadium is of low quality with little in the form of supporting uses, such as retail or residential, to create a vibrant destination that can contribute to Reading's economy. The Local Plan process will provide an opportunity to facilitate a sustainable development that can deliver economic, social and environmental benefits to the area.</p> <p>It represents an opportunity to further contribute to the regeneration of South Reading. Through the emerging Local Plan it is unlikely this part of the strategy will be altered given the considerable opportunities within this area in terms of previously developed land as well as the opportunity to bring forward social improvements to this area.</p> <p>The regeneration of the site will allow new development to come forward that can meet the needs of both the 'residential and business communities' as noted through paragraph 17 of the NPPF. There will be an opportunity to provide a considerable number of jobs both through</p>	Consideration of the allocation of this site has been undertaken at the same time as consideration of a planning application for the same broad development. At the time of drafting the Local Plan, the Council had not received sufficient data to demonstrate that the site, located on existing landfill, could be developed safely, particularly for residential use. This means that we cannot currently identify the sites for development. At the time of drafting, these discussions were ongoing, together with the exchange of relevant information. If there are any changes in circumstances, a revised Local Plan will need to take this into account.

		<p>construction and on completion of the development, thus meeting a strategic priority for Reading.</p> <p>This development will contribute significantly to achieving the objectively assessed need and boosting the supply of housing in line with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. This site provides an opportunity to create a new neighbourhood which is supported by a high quality mixed use environment incorporating a public square and open space. The delivery of a significant quantum of residential development will contribute towards creating a 'sustainable, inclusive and mixed community' supported by a variety of other uses which can support different groups of the community.</p> <p>A planning application has been submitted (ref 160199). This incorporates a significant quantum of residential development alongside a range of sought after community, leisure and facilities which have been long-term aspirations for the Borough. The application is supported by a raft of detailed technical material to demonstrate that the scheme is wholly deliverable.</p> <p>The proposed Convention Centre will further reinforce Reading as the heart of the Thames Valley in economic terms, and will build upon RBC's overarching strategy to ensure that Reading grows in regional importance. It will reinforce its evolving role within the wider Thames Valley by being the focus for inward investments and the headquarter location for national and international companies. It will meet the development needs of 21st century business through provide a series of spaces to host large conferences/ exhibitions/ meetings. The dual use for the Convention Centre given its ability to play host to live music events and exhibitions will reinforce Reading as a tourist destination and enhance Reading's cultural offer.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p><b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32</p>	<p>This is a landbuild site with waste deposited over alluvium and sand and gravel (both Secondary A Aquifers). Leachate within the waste is a source of contamination. The landfill material will continue to settle for some years and therefore piling will be required for any development on this site. The northern part of the site is underlain by Lambeth Group (Secondary A Aquifer) and the southern part with</p>	

		<p>London Clay (Unproductive stratum) and any piling used will penetrate the landfill, the alluvium; sand and gravel (and on part of the site the London Clay) and into the top the Lambeth Group.</p> <p>Piling could form pathways for contaminated leachate or groundwater to migrate vertically during the piling operation. Choice of an unsuitable piling solution could leave open pathways for continued vertical migration of contamination. The basal beds of the Lambeth Group have sandy lenses that can act as pathways for pollution to migrate to the top of the Chalk that underlies the site. The Chalk as the receptor is a Principal Aquifer.</p>	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	This site is not proposed to be allocated within the Draft Local Plan.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	Any development here would need to have an undeveloped buffer zone along all watercourses, a minimum of 10m in width, measured from the top of the river bank. Lighting will need careful consideration.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	Waste water: The wastewater network infrastructure is operating very close to capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study in order to determine the magnitude	



		of spare capacity in the network and a suitable connection point. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	A32c also allowing enough provision for adequate green space.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 17/18</b> Site A32	The residential aspects of this development are problematic. Where are the schools, shops, doctors etc to service the residents? Will it be a nice place to live or too noisy when events are on; too quiet and ghostly when they are not?	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> General	Cumulative impact on Blakes Lock SPS required for following sites: B1, B2, B4, B5, B6, B8, B9, B12, B16, B17, B18, B19, B20, B21, B22, B23, B24, B25, B26, B27, B28, B29, B30, B31, B32, B33, B34, B25, B41, B42, B51	Noted. The Council is considering how best to assemble evidence related to the water effects of development.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B1	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B1	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B1	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted. These issues are referred to in the supporting text to the policy.
Aviva Investors	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	Aviva welcomes the continued promotion of this allocation but would like to see the wording of the allocation be more supportive of residential led development to ensure that the overall allocation provides a balance of uses in this central location and to also reflect the site's appropriateness for a residential led mixed use redevelopment.	This allocation is carried forward into the Draft Local Plan, and it anticipates a more significant gain of residential than offices.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	B2c preferred. Want to emphasise the options for north south movement to the station	

Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	It is important that the Council carry over the existing allocation B2 as it relates to the Station Hill scheme. Consent has been recently granted for the proposals and works are underway to clear the site.	Noted. The existing allocation is carried forward, with the boundaries changed to reflect most recent development proposals.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B2	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted. These issues are referred to in the supporting text to the policy.
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B3	It is important that the Council carry over the existing allocation B3 as it relates to the Station Hill scheme. Consent has been recently granted for the proposals and works are underway to clear the site.	Noted. The existing allocation is carried forward, with the boundaries changed to reflect most recent development proposals.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B3	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	This development already has planning permission.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B3	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an	

		appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B3	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	
Aviva Life and Pensions UK Ltd	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B4	Aviva would like to see that the allocation is amended to provide additional supporting text to ensure that there is not only a flexible approach to delivery, in terms of land use, development footprints, quantum but also phasing. Phasing is an important issue with allocations involving various landowners and land uses and that the policy wording should reflect this, in that development allocations should be equitable to reflect the varying timescales required for bringing forward development. The policy wording should seek to ensure that development parcels within the allocation should be designed in such a way that they do not have a detrimental impact upon the flexibility and deliverability of the wider allocation.	Noted. The potential for the site to come forward in different stages is understood, and the policy does not insist on a comprehensive scheme for the whole site. Nevertheless, a comprehensive approach is clearly preferable, and it may be counterproductive for the policy to specifically support a phased approach.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B4	<p>Considerable care should taken in assessing the potential impact of any tall buildings on significant views. Any tall development in centre of Reading could inevitably impact on views to and from the River Thames and from Caversham. CADRA has helped to develop terms of reference for a study of views from Reading's waterways. This is an important area for Reading and should influence the decisions here.</p> <p>We have considerable concern about this area, on the Caversham side of the railway. The existing buildings surrounding this area are not of great height. We would argue that any development should be stepped down in height toward the Caversham Road and Vastern Road edges of the area, and stepped up in height towards the rear of the site and</p>	The tall buildings strategy was developed taking into account a wide range of views, including from Caversham. The Station Area Framework, which will remain relevant, includes more detail on building heights, and seeks to reduce height away from the station towards Caversham Road and Vastern Road.

		abutting the railway. This would lessen the visual impact on the surrounding development.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B4	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B4	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B4	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B5	<p>Considerable care should taken in assessing the potential impact of any tall buildings on significant views. Any tall development in centre of Reading could inevitably impact on views to and from the River Thames and from Caversham. CADRA has helped to develop terms of reference for a study of views from Reading's waterways. This is an important area for Reading and should influence the decisions here.</p> <p>When this site does become available, it will be the last remaining riverside town site, south of the Thames. We support the provision of new pedestrian access across the site, allowing removal of the additional section of the pedestrian bridge, parallel to the riverbank. Development will therefore need to be small scale around the footway to avoid wind tunnels and an oppressive feel. It will also be very important to views from the river and of the river.</p>	This site is not considered to be suitable for tall buildings. Agreed that development needs to reduce in height from the station towards the river, and this has informed the indicative capacity of the site.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B5	GLOBE would support the rerouting of the new pedestrian & cycle bridge access this site. Any development should allow for substantial	Noted. The link with the bridge and the potential for an area of open space is set out in the policy.

		open space and tree planting on the river frontage to improve and enhance the river frontage, as well as landscaping on the Vastern Road frontage. Any buildings need to be low-rise in order not to over-dominate the river frontage. Buildings need to be sensitive to views from the river, the meadows and from Caversham.	Agreed that development needs to reduce in height from the station towards the river, and this has informed the indicative capacity of the site.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B5	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B5	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B5	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B6	Considerable care should taken in assessing the potential impact of any tall buildings on significant views. Any tall development in centre of Reading could inevitably impact on views to and from the River Thames and from Caversham. CADRA has helped to develop terms of reference for a study of views from Reading's waterways. This is an important area for Reading and should influence the decisions here.  This site is on the edge of the proposed cluster and development should be highly sensitive to views from the river, the meadows and from Caversham.	The tall buildings strategy was developed taking into account a wide range of views, including from Caversham. The Station Area Framework, which will remain relevant, includes more detail on building heights, and seeks to reduce height away from the station towards Caversham Road and Vastern Road.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B6	Development of this site should be sensitive to views from the river, from King's Meadow and from Caversham and should include ample soft landscaping and tree planting along the Napier Road and Vastern Road	

		frontages.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B6	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B6	Water: Thames Water would like to view any flooding impact study work done to ensure protection of strategic business assets.	SFRA Level 2 work will need to be undertaken on sites at risk of flooding, which will be available at Submission stage.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	Considerable care should taken in assessing the potential impact of any tall buildings on significant views. Any tall development in centre of Reading could inevitably impact on views to and from the River Thames and from Caversham. CADRA has helped to develop terms of reference for a study of views from Reading's waterways. This is an important area for Reading and should influence the decisions here.  This site runs along the edge of Kings Meadow. It is important that it should not dominate the meadow.	This site is not considered to be suitable for tall buildings. The need to avoid impacts on the landscape significance of the meadow is set out in the proposed allocation.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	This site runs along the edge of Kings Meadow. It is important that it should not dominate the meadow and should also be sensitive to views from Caversham (particularly View Island, Heron Island and Mill Green on the opposite bank of the river). Any development should include ample soft landscaping and tree planting along the Napier Road frontage.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.

		the new climate change allowances.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	Water: Thames Water would like to view any flooding impact study work done to ensure protection of strategic business assets.	SFRA Level 2 work will need to be undertaken on sites at risk of flooding, which will be available at Submission stage.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B7	225mm nearest foul sewer so capacity concern. Due to the size of the potential development, further consultation would be required once the proposals have been confirmed.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B8	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B8	B8c preferred. Too far out of town centre for retail	The site is edge-of-centre, which is considered suitable for bulky goods retail.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B8	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.

		more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B8	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B8	B8a to continue current allocation.	Agreed. This forms the basis for the allocation.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B9	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Ropemaker Properties	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B9	This allocation is still considered to be relevant moving forward and has the ability to deliver a significant number of residential units to help meet Readings OAN. Given the recently completed development at Chatham Place a mixed used residential led development is considered most suitable in this location. However the site lies outside of the current western grouping within the Tall Building Strategy and policy RG13 of the CAAP, and with the recent consultation on the proposed changes to the NPPF including higher density development in residential areas close to transport hubs, it should be considered for higher density development given its sustainable location which in turn is likely to result in a tall building on the site, subject to appropriate assessment. At this stage, it is considered that such an approach is consistent with the objectives for tall building development as part of the Western Cluster and adjacent to the IDR. The delivery of a tall building and optimising the efficient use of the site will assist in delivering policy objectives.	The proposals have largely been carried forward into the proposed allocation. In terms of tall buildings, this was not one of the areas considered as suitable for tall buildings in the strategy, in part due to the proximity of low-rise residential. Achieving high density in order to contribute to meeting housing needs does not necessitate a tall building.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B9	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.



Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B9	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B11	Broad St Mall is surviving the passage of time very well. An opportunity for a creative heritage use as, soon the car park will be appreciated for its brutalist concrete facade. It would be a shame to lose this. The conversion of the Yell building to residential may make re-use of part of this site as residential an option.	Noted. However, even if the existing façade is to be retained, there is clearly a need to improve its interaction with the street, which is referenced in the policy.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	We request that all due respect is given to our CA across the IDR Bridge in terms of massing and height, design and all planning issues in terms of traffic flow, etc. Our area has already lost valued free sky space in terms of the Chatham Mews site development - and "green" views to the Caversham hills have been lost also. The bright lights from the IDR shine into bedroom windows at night two or more streets into our neighbourhood already. We ask that planners be mindful of the negative impacts that any major build may have on our historical neighbourhood where young families and young professionals call home.	The principles for this development area include a need to take account of low-rise residential areas as well as conservation areas to the west of the IDR.
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	<p>B12a - Object - the Civic Offices has now been moved to Bridge Street, meaning that there is no requirement for a new Civic Offices building within the site. For this reason higher priority land uses should be sought.</p> <p>B12b - Object - this would not be a proactive approach to community-led place-making and would not be conducive towards meeting the Borough's objectively assessed need.</p> <p>B12c - Support - a residential led development is the most commercially viable solution on the site and would enable the provision of a range of civic and communal facilities to the benefit of the town.</p> <p>B12d - Object - sufficient retail provision exists within alternative town centre sites.</p>	Option B12c forms the basis of the allocation, i.e. a residential-led scheme with retail and community uses on the ground floor.
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	<p>Land use: The proposal for the Hosier Street is to incorporate the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 600 residential dwellings</li> <li>• Office (for use by the Police</li> </ul>	

		<p>Station);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for small retail units and convenience stores;</li> <li>• Cultural/civic/commercial uses;</li> <li>• Car parking;</li> <li>• A market square; and</li> <li>• Public open space including; residential areas, a civic square and a cultural square.</li> </ul> <p>The case for an alternative option B12c is enhanced if specific reference is made to the priority land uses that Kier is seeking to deliver on the site, with particular reference to the residential capacity of the site.</p>	
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	<p>Residential tenure: The proposed residential development would be predominantly market-led, but subject to viability would seek to accommodate a range of tenures. Along with conventional affordable rent and intermediate units, the site could be an appropriate location for starter homes. The provision of dwellings within a Private Rental Sector may also be appropriate for the location.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation does not seek to specify tenures on the site, although the site will be subject to the general housing policies.</p>
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	<p>Tall buildings: Building heights in the policy are defined in relation to the station area. The building heights around the station are approximately 20 storeys in height, therefore it is suggested that some policy wording which defines a suitable building height limit would be a sensible inclusion within the policy wording. Tall buildings will enable the site to contribute as much as possible to according with Options 3.1 or 3.4 and meet or exceed the objectively assessed need housing target.</p>	<p>The Council has previously sought to include height limits in locations in the town centre, but these were removed by the Inspector after objections from English Heritage, due to concerns they would be seen as a target. Therefore, the policy seeks to define heights in relation to the highest buildings at the station.</p>
Kier Property Developments Limited	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	<p>Comprehensive redevelopment: In order to realise the optimal potential of the town centre Kier acknowledges that the redevelopment of the civic centre should be comprehensive. However, as the allocation text explains, the Hexagon building is outside of Kier's control at present. Whilst negotiations are on going to agree a joint venture for this part of the site, Kier would seek to bring forward redevelopment of majority of the Hosier Street development in such a way that it would not compromise future development of the Hexagon. The allocation wording should be written so that it allows flexibility and the possibility of a phased approach in order to expedite redevelopment of the site.</p>	<p>Noted. The potential for the site to come forward in different stages is understood, and the policy does not insist on a comprehensive scheme for the whole site. Nevertheless, a comprehensive approach is clearly preferable, and it may be counterproductive for the policy to specifically support a phased approach.</p>

		Beyond the Hosier Street allocation, Kier has undertaken testing to demonstrate that its preferred option will also be complementary to the possible future development of the Broad Street Malls site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted. These issues are referred to in the supporting text to the policy.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B12	If the police station and magistrates' courts are no longer required, they could be converted to residential (like the Yell building). The south side of Castle Street is partially residential. Provision for gardens would be nice to retain the Cartwheeling Boys statue, Clock and small garden around that. The existing underground parking would be a boon to the residents in this area.	As it stands, there is still a need for the magistrate's court. Conversion of the police station to residential may be acceptable within the proposed allocation.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	We hope that the Council will be in a position to ensure that the Prison site is protected for a Heritage use befitting its iconic status as part of Reading's history.	The use of the prison is not yet determined, but retention of the whole site for some form of heritage use is unlikely to be achievable. The Reading Prison Framework will continue to be applicable.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	It is important that archaeological work on this site proceeds as soon as possible and subject to that a use is found for the listed building and grounds. It could enhance the Abbey Quarter project as an open space and heritage location.  Given past use as a prison, the attractiveness of the building for residential purposes is questionable. However the site might be useful	

		for prefab or other uses that do not detract from the heritage location. It is adjacent to moorings on the Kennet and historically Abbey Wharf so more facilities for narrowboats could be made available here to capitalise on the riverside location.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	Noted. The need to liaise with Thames Water due to the proximity of a pumping station is referred to in the policy.
Scott Versace	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B13	B13a to continue current allocation	The proposed allocation is largely in line with the existing allocation.
Aviva Life and Pensions UK Ltd	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	Aviva welcomes the allocation for a mix of uses being carried forward in the new Local Plan. Aviva would like the allocation wording amended	Noted. The potential for the site to come forward in different stages is understood, and the

		<p>to include additional supporting text to ensure that there is not only a flexible approach to delivery, in terms of land use, development footprints, quantum but also phasing. Phasing is an important issue with allocations involving various landowners and land uses and that the policy wording should reflect this, in that development allocations should be equitable to reflect the varying timescales required for bringing forward development. The policy wording should seek to ensure that development parcels within the allocation should be designed in such a way that they do not have a detrimental impact upon the flexibility and deliverability of the wider allocation.</p>	<p>policy does not insist on a comprehensive scheme for the whole site. The policy recognises that some parts of the site may be implemented in the long term. Nevertheless, a comprehensive approach is clearly preferable, and it may be counterproductive for the policy to specifically support a phased approach.</p>
<p>Standard Life Investments Ltd</p>	<p><b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14</p>	<p>The allocation should maintain flexibility for the existing retail and leisure uses at the site in the short and medium term. In light of existing long term lease provisions in favour of existing tenants, residential led redevelopment of our client’s site could only be considered as a potential opportunity towards the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Although there is not an 'in principle' objection to the residential allocation, to reflect the established commercial use of the site, the Policy should not prejudice our client’s ability to meet the operational requirements of existing or new operators at the site. These requirements may include: the reconfiguration of and / or extension to existing floorspace; changes of use to other commercial classes or variations of conditions relating to opening hours or servicing.</p> <p>We request the following addition: “Residential led redevelopment proposals are likely to emerge at different stages over the plan period. Due to the presence of commercial users within the site, the Forbury Retail Park Phase 2 is unlikely to be considered for residential uses in the short or medium term. The allocation will therefore be applied flexibly to ensure that retail and leisure uses are not prejudiced.”</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p><b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14</p>	<p>The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take</p>	<p>Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that</p>

		forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	Any development should reinstate a buffer zone along the canal and carry out ecological enhancements to the river bank and the buffer.	This is incorporated into the policy in the Draft Local Plan.
London and Quadrant	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	<p>The retention of this key site for development will facilitate the delivery of a significant number of dwellings in the short term. We also broadly advocate continuing with the site's allocation description set within policy RC3c.</p> <p>We are currently formulating a design proposal in accordance with the existing allocation RC3c. The proposal is for a high density, high quality development that is sympathetic to the nearby heritage assets. The proposals include the incorporation of a high quality landmark building to signify the entrance to the new Kenavon Drive area, designed to improve legibility and connectivity to the river Kennet. The proposal will also incorporate a significant element of new public open space on the riverside, designed to benefit not just the future residents of the new Kenavon Drive community, but for the use of the wider Reading community.</p> <p>It is important to note that the redevelopment of those sites currently allocated within the current Local Plan (particularly those within the Reading Central Area) have largely not been forthcoming since their allocation in 2009. This could be attributed to a number of reasons (i.e the recession, financial viability of these sites etc). It is considered that the pending redevelopment of the Toys R Us and Homebase site will act as the catalyst for redevelopment of the wider Kenavon Drive area (including the Prison redevelopment).</p>	Noted. Many elements of the existing allocation are carried forward into the new proposed allocation. However, the site does not fall within a location where tall buildings are judged to be appropriate.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	Fine with allocation B14 good planting at present, need to replace (or retain) require corridors through the development from Kennet to railway and corridor for pedestrians and wildlife along the Kennet	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.

Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	<p>Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B14	<p>There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.</p> <p>Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.</p>	<p>Noted. The public sewers issue is referred to in the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>The need to liaise with Thames Water due to the proximity of a pumping station is referred to in the policy.</p>
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	<p>The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on</p>	<p>Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be</p>

		how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	assembled as the plan develops.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	Buffer zone along the river will be required, plus ecological enhancements to the river banks. This could include enhancements for the local sand martin population.	The boundary of the site no longer reaches the riverbank.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	Fine with allocation B15 good planting at present, need to replace (or retain) require corridors through the development from Kennet to railway and corridor for pedestrians and wildlife along the Kennet	Noted. These elements are included within the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B15	Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers	Noted. The need to liaise with Thames Water due to the proximity of a pumping station is referred to in the policy.



		would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	
Viridis Real Estate	Question 19/20 Site B15	The part of the site to the north of Kenavon Drive is under the ownership of Viridis Real Estate who have plans to bring it forward for residential development. The commercial units on the site are largely in poor condition and in light of the pressing need for housing in the Borough, as established by the Berkshire SHMA, residential redevelopment represents a more beneficial use of the site than continued commercial use. Making efficient use of the site will be key to maximizing the potential of its highly sustainable location. This may require relaxation of current guidelines provided in the Council's Kenavon Drive Urban Design Statement particularly with regard to building heights.	The proposed allocation seeks to make the most efficient use of land appropriate in the location. The key principles of the KDUDCS are expected to continue to be relevant.
Environment Agency	Question 19/20 Site B16	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Environment Agency	Question 19/20 Site B16	Any development will require an undeveloped buffer to the river to be reinstated along with ecological enhancements to the river banks. This could include enhancements for sand martins.	The need to preserve a wildlife corridor along the river is recognised within the policy.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 19/20 Site B16	Fine with allocation. need to preserve wildlife corridor against railway and Kennet	
Thames Water	Question 19/20 Site B16	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	Question 19/20 Site B16	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
The Butler	Question 19/20	Our Clients support the continued allocation of this site, but request	The proposed allocation has been extended to

Partnership	Site B17	<p>that the opportunity area be extended to include the full extent of land within their ownership, including an existing employment site and land/buildings associated with The Butler.</p> <p>The central and rear parts of the site lend themselves to appropriate redevelopment, either in the form of a new hotel, or additional housing development. This can be achieved in a sympathetic manner, which would respect the setting of the listed public house, whilst allowing the Council to focus new sustainable development to the central area of Reading on previously developed land.</p>	incorporate land to the rear of The Butler.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B17	<p>Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.</p>	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the water and wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B17	<p>Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B18	<p>Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to</p>	Noted.

		this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B18	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B19	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B19	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B20	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted. This site is no longer included within the proposed plan as it has been refurbished for offices.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B20	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B21	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted. This site is no longer included within the proposed plan as conversion for residential has taken place.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B21	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. However, the total development identified in the vicinity of Market Place area may cause concern relating to foul water sewerage if all developments were to go ahead. We would welcome early consultation concerning any proposed development.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B22	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B22	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. However, the total development identified in the vicinity of Market Place area may cause concern relating to foul water sewerage if all developments were to go ahead. We would welcome early consultation concerning any proposed development.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b>	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage	Noted. This site is no longer included within the

	Site B23	infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	proposed plan as conversion for residential has taken place.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B23	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. However, the total development identified in the vicinity of Market Place area may cause concern relating to foul water sewerage if all developments were to go ahead. We would welcome early consultation concerning any proposed development.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B24	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B24	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted. This site is no longer included within the proposed plan as the proposal to replace the library within a new civic centre have been superseded.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B24	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. However, the total development identified in the vicinity of Market Place area may cause concern relating to foul water sewerage if all developments were to go ahead. We would welcome early consultation concerning any proposed development.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B25	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	This site is no longer included within the Draft Plan as there is not considered to be a prospect of delivery.
Environment	<b>Question 19/20</b>	This will require a buffer zone to be reinstated, along with ecological	

Agency	Site B25	enhancements.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B25	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B25	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B25	Agree with B25b	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B26	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B26	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B26	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B27	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Noted. This site is no longer included within the proposed plan as it has been refurbished for offices.

Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B27	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B27	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B28	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B28	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B29	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B29	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B29	Water 12" Main adjacent to site. The site also has several Fire Hydrants in the main Rd. These need to be retained and access protected.	Noted. The need to take account of water mains and fire hydrants is referred to in the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B30	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted. This site is no longer included within the proposed plan.

Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B30	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B31	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	This site is not included within the Draft Plan, as a policy regarding general community and education sites adequately covers the issues.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B31	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B32	Kings Meadow should not be further developed as the area around the Thames is highly sensitive. There is also the matter of flood plains, and building on these is a fool's game.	This site is not included within the draft plan as it now has planning permission and development is underway.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B32	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	

Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B32	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B32	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	Caversham Lock should not be further developed as the area around the Thames is highly sensitive.	The existing allocation is carried forward, and it is for low-intensity uses that should not have a significant impact on the Thames. The Plan refers to the Caversham Local Area Development Principles as continuing to be relevant.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	We wish to see the Caversham Lock Area Development Principles, which provide a good framework for protecting this important asset, incorporated as part of the Local Plan. Sympathetic, low scale improvements on the island, particularly the western end nearest Reading Bridge could enhance the area. The Lock Island may be a more appropriate location for the development proposed on A12, View Island.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	Any development here should include ecological enhancement to the riverside/banks.	The wildlife value of the Thames is recognised in the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B33	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater	



		infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B34	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B34	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B35	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	This site is not included within the draft plan as it now has planning permission and development is either complete or underway.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B35	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B36	Site B36 includes areas of land designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (deciduous woodland), Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any development at this location that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, including loss of its connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act.	Noted. The draft policy highlights the importance of areas of wildlife importance on site.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B36	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide	Noted. The existing policy is not a formal development allocation, and provides general support for further higher education use. The

		more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	water implications of new development will need to be considered on a case by case basis.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B36	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B36	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted. These issues are referred to in the supporting text to the policy.
University of Reading	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B36	The suggested approach to site B36 is to continue the current allocation which recognises the University's need to adapt and expand over the Plan period, to include such development as additional student, staff, teaching and research accommodation, infrastructure and services, and sports and leisure facilities among other uses. The University supports the continuation of the current allocation within the emerging Plan.	Noted. The existing policy forms the basis for the new allocation.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B37	I would favour another residential development, Especially if they were affordable starter homes.	This site is not included within the draft plan as it now has planning permission.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B37	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B37	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning	

		<p>Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	
<p>The Sharma Family Partnership</p>	<p><b>Question 19/20</b> Site B37</p>	<p>The Owners consider the existing allocation for the former Little Chef site to be inappropriate use of the land and would ask the consideration be given to re-designating the site from a residential use to a commercial use. The council have recently granted a number of Planning Consents for Sui-Generis use, such the owner’s business, Berkshire Van Hire, can relocate for a limited time period. The owner has no plans to redevelop for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The site relates to the Basingstoke Road along with the adjacent Petrol Filling Station, through which the site is accessed. The site when developed in-accordance with the Planning Consents as detailed above will afford a degree of protection to adjacent residential developments to the East and South from road noise and light/traffic pollution which is likely to increase with the possible future redevelopment of Worton Grange.</p> <p>Planning proposals for development of the site (for hotel or residential) were rejected by the council.</p> <p>The proposed future redevelopment of the adjacent Worton Grange site locates a major new roundabout immediately outside the site which is likely to result in a significant increase in noise and pollution very close to the site, such that it would be inappropriate for residential use.</p> <p>The Worton Grange development proposal for the area closest to the subject site is for factory/warehouse developments again the proximity to residential is likely to cause nuisance to future residents.</p>	<p>It is accepted that there is not currently a realistic prospect of this part of the site being delivered for residential, and as such it has been excluded from the Draft Plan.</p>

		<p>Site investigation of subsoil conditions has reveals soft river bed alluvium traversing the site requiring piled foundation design to any building proposals in addition the history of the site being and adjacent to a petrol filling station has a high probability of contamination requiring the site to be decontaminated prior to any residential use.</p> <p>The council's policies on Affordable Housing Provision/contributions and CIL result in the site not being viable for residential development.</p>	
Environment Agency	Question 19/20 Site B38	<p>The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.</p>	<p>Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.</p>
Thames Water	Question 19/20 Site B38	<p>Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the water and wastewater constraints.</p>
Thames Water	Question 19/20 Site B38	<p>Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an</p>	

		appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B38	Due to the size of the potential development, further consultation would be required once the proposals have been confirmed.	Noted.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B39	Another massive residential development similar to Kennet Island would be favourable, although the impact on traffic in that local area would need to be addressed.	Noted. This forms the basis for the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B39	Water: We are concerned about this developments proximity to Fobney Water Treatment works and the ground water boreholes which serve the works. Fobney takes its supply from both a river intake and groundwater boreholes. A study will be required to ensure that there is no impact on water quality as a result of this development. The Study should have regard to the river floodplain and possible contamination from historic land use in the area. The study should identify and protect drinking water supply mains that may run through the site and should build in a water resource protection zone.	Noted. The need to ensure no detrimental impacts on water quality is included within the policy.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B39	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b>	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over	Noted. These issues are referred to in the

	Site B39	or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	supporting text to the policy.
BBOWT	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B40	<p>Site B40 is adjacent to both River Kennet Local Wildlife Site and Fobney and Kennet Valley Meadows LWS. Land within Fobney and Kennet Valley LWS is also designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (floodplain grazing marsh), by Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any development at this location that would result in deterioration of this habitat, including loss of connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act.</p> <p>A brownfield site of this type and in this location is expected to host a wide range of habitats and species, potentially including legally protected habitats and species. It is therefore imperative that any proposal to develop this site is accompanied by appropriately detailed ecological habitat and species surveys. The Council should implement the policy requirements of the NPPF in choosing land of lesser environmental value for development and applying the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>I would encourage the Council to leave this site undeveloped, or else revert to floodplain meadows.</p>	This site no longer forms part of a formal allocation, and is now part of a site-specific policy to promote recreation use of the Kennetside area. This may include some limited development, or may include reversion to meadows on part of the site. Any impacts on flood risk and biodiversity should be picked up as part of the policy.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B40	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B40	This site lies within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b); therefore the only options that should be considered are B40b and B40c to be	

		NPPF compliant.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B40	Enhancements to the ecological value of the site should be sought. Could you consider a reversion to meadows?	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B41	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B41	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B42	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B42	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B43	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	This site is not included within the draft plan as it not considered likely to be available for development.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B43	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B44	Site B44 includes areas of land designated as a Habitat of Principal Importance (deciduous woodland), Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Any development at this location that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, including loss of its connectivity within the landscape, would be contrary to the duties on Reading Borough Council set out in Section 40 of the NERC Act.	This site is not included within the draft plan as it now has planning permission.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B44	As earlier suggested use as a residential care home. It is a massive site and would help with the aging population.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B44	Water: The supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand in the Water Resource area. Currently the mains that feed the Water Resource area are running close to or at capacity. Consequently it is likely that the developer will be required to fund an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the	

		brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this. As set out in the Planning Policy Guidance, early contact with statutory undertakers (such as Thames Water) is recommended.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B44	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B44	225mm nearest foul sewer so capacity concern. Due to the size of the potential development, further consultation would be required once the proposals have been confirmed.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B45	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B45	Waste water: The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the	Noted. The draft allocation makes reference to the wastewater constraints.



		recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Option B46b -do not allocate. There is no compensatory provision possible for Downing Rd Playing Field, so there is no possibility of the plan being acceptable. It is therefore misleading and foolish to persist with this scheme. The loss of visual amenity at the very least would be unacceptable. The historic plan was not viable and remains so. The current situation should be recognised since it taints the credibility of the rest of the Local Plan.	<p>The Draft Local Plan retains the existing allocation for a new school with residential development at the Downing Road and Park Lane sites.</p> <p>There is a strong case for the school to be moved onto a single site, given the issues caused by its current split location.</p> <p>Downing Road is not publicly accessible open space. It has been considered in terms of Local Green Space, but it is not considered that it meets the criteria. It is considered that the loss of the playing field would not result in adverse effects on the overall offer as long as compensatory sports provision could be made in either quantitative or qualitative terms, as referred to in the policy.</p>
Louise Bancroft	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. The original plans for the redevelopment of this site reduced the amount of green space for Tilehurst which was not a good thing. The Park Lane School building in my option is lovely and an important building to retain for Tilehurst. Given that there is a threat to services like the library at present the cost redeveloping this whole site and maintaining services doesn't look feasible. It is better to maintain the services and make the best use of the buildings available at the present time.	
Andrew Scott	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. I have no objection to the redevelopments on the Laurels but Tilehurst simply cannot afford to lose any more green spaces! There are plenty of brown site redevelopment in the area that should be done before building over even more green space.	
Orla McBride	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. There is opportunity to redevelop in this area, but a new school should be built first on the existing Laurels site. The Park Lane juniors school could then be turned in to housing.	
Ian Lloyd	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. We cannot keep filling open spaces in urban areas. Brownfield sites are the obvious (probably more expensive) answer otherwise future generations will	

		have such a poor quality of life. People need some space to take part in leisure activities.	
Peter Andrews	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. However many new houses are built, it will never be enough. Every year there will be a demand for more! Once green spaces are gone, they cannot be replaced. Quality of life can only diminish with such stupid urban planning applications. Stop now! Enough is enough!	
Anonymous	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned.	
Mrs P Ager			
Tina Allen			
Mrs Sarah Chilton			
Trevor Haynes			
K Jones			
Bob Asbury	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. Keep it as a local amenity.	
L Asbury			
M Asbury			
Lynda Chater	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should not be abandoned. The Laurels site should be developed in a way that improves the frontage to School Road as part of the 'main street' linking the two shopping areas. It should be an attractive route for pedestrians with seating and other facilities focused around the library, police station and surgery. Park Lane Primary School is an important building in terms of townscape character, and any development as housing should preserve the School Road/Park Lane frontage.	
Karen Clyne	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. We need to protect our green spaces.	
Julia Cooper	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. More playing fields are needed not less - children and adults need more exercise.	
David Evans	<b>Question 19/20</b>	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space.	

	Site B46	The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. Once you lose it, you lose it forever.
Wendy Levey	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. It was a silly idea taking a school when more are needed.
Joan Macphee	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. Tilehurst is now a crowded community and we need as many more green spaces as we can.
Carol McLellan	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. Downing Road playing field is a valuable local green space, providing safe recreation/play area for children from the nearby school(s) - being sufficiently distant from the nearest busy traffic routes (eg Hildens Drive and Park Lane).
Liz Ellis	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. The plan to move Park Lane school was never realistic or practical. The reasons given at the time for the amalgamation of the two schools on to the Laurels site were never in the best interests of the community or even of the schools themselves. And it would have involved taking part of Blagrove Recreation ground and selling off Downing Road playing field - both of which are precious to the people of Tilehurst. Now we discover that we need more school places not fewer, so this whole scheme need to be scrapped and not considered for the new local plan.
Lisa Digweed	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should not be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should not be abandoned. It makes sense to have the nursery school and children's centre all on one site. The playing field is only used for PE and is not used by public.
Tanja Rebel	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should not be abandoned. If anything there should be more space for playing fields.
L West	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Downing Road playing field should be identified as a Local Green Space. The current plan for site B46 should be abandoned. We need our green space for our children's children, plus somewhere to go and play outside.

Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	<p>There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.</p> <p>Where development is being proposed within close proximity of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.</p>	<p>Noted. The public sewer issue is referred to in the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>The need to liaise with Thames Water due to the proximity of a pumping station is referred to in the policy.</p>
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B46	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B47	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B47	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B47	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability	

		in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B47	With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.	Noted, although this is a level of detail which is not considered appropriate to include within the allocation.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B48	The changes to the climate change allowances and how they should be applied may affect this site. Developers may need to ascertain what the new climate change flood levels are on these sites depending on a number of factors such as the size, vulnerability and lifetime of the development. Once you have made a decision on which option to take forward, the policies can be updated to include clear instructions on how climate change needs to be addressed on site. They will then need to make sure that the development is in accordance with the NPPF and the new climate change allowances.	Sequential test work has been carried out in determining which sites are to be allocated. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken which considers the effects of climate change. Evidence on flood risk that considers these issues will continue to be assembled as the plan develops.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B48	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B48	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B48	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.  Where development is being proposed within close proximity of a	Noted. The public sewer issue is referred to in the supporting text to the policy.  The need to liaise with Thames Water due to the proximity of a pumping station is referred to in the policy.

		pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in close proximity to a pumping station.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B49	Water: We have significant concerns regarding water supply services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant water supply infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted, although this site has had planning permission for some years, and much of the development is now complete, so these issues should already have been resolved.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B49	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B49	Cow Lane SPS has been refurbished/ upgraded to deal with additional flow from Dee Park, Thames Water would require consultation if changes are made to the proposed development.	
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B50	Water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the water infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	The Draft Local Plan contains more information on the proposed allocation.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B50	Waste water: The level of information contained in this document does not allow a detailed assessment of the impact on the wastewater	

		infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the Local Authority's aspiration for each site.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B51	We are happy with this existing allocation.	Noted. This forms the basis for the proposed allocation in the Draft Plan.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B51	Water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.	Noted.
Thames Water	<b>Question 19/20</b> Site B51	Waste water: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.	
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 21</b>	As the sites become available to reuse as mixed commercial/residential. The land opposite the recycling centre in Reading could then be used to replace the lost industrial land.	Agreed. The land around Island Road is proposed to be allocated for a significant amount of employment space to meet new needs, which allows some limited redevelopment of existing space. However, the scale of the need for new space means that the potential for redevelopment is limited.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 21</b>	We suggest 'Highridge', Upper Warren Avenue (RBC's original Caversham Heights School option, as set out in the comment on Q8).	Highridge was considered for development, and is likely to be suitable for some residential. However, the site is unlikely to be able to accommodate the 10 dwellings which is the threshold for inclusion in the plan.
Mr Guest	<b>Question 21</b>	<p>Our client owns land at Bridgewater Close. It effectively forms the north western quadrant of the employment uses present at Bridgewater Close. The site is currently in employment use. The premises, which were constructed in the 1960s, extend to approximately 1,115 sq m (12,000 sq ft) and are nearing the end of their economic life. It is currently located within a Core Employment Area. The I &amp; OP recognises (Appendix 1) that this is one of a number of policies that "may need to change".</p> <p>We consider that a flexible policy approach should be applied to this site on the basis of the significant need for housing over the period, the earlier recognition within the RBC evidence base that recommended "it would be appropriate for Bridgewater Close to be redeveloped for</p>	<p>The recognised significant need for new housing identified in the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment needs to be balanced against the effect of the loss of employment floorspace. The Central Berkshire Economic Development Needs Assessment identified a very significant need for new industrial and warehouse floorspace. Any loss of such floorspace would exacerbate this need, and it would not be possible to provide compensatory provision.</p> <p>In some very limited cases, there is considered to be some scope to release employment for</p>

		<p>other uses;" and our assessment of the appropriateness of this location for residential development.</p> <p>An earlier site specific analysis was however undertaken in the context of the Core Strategy in 2008 and this assessed our clients site. This concluded that "recently key occupiers have relocated from Bridgewater Close to other industrial areas in Reading. The main constraint in this location is congestion, which also affects other industrial sites in the vicinity, coupled with the fact that it is surrounded by residential uses." It went on to recommend that it would be appropriate for Bridgewater Close to be redeveloped for other uses." We consider that this analysis remains valid.</p> <p>Our analysis of the potential for residential development relates solely to our clients land although arguably it relates to the wider Bridgewater Close Estate. Equally there is no reason why the partial release of our clients site alone would not form an appropriate outcome as it forms a self contained element of the site with frontage to Portman Road and would extend the existing relationship between residential and employment uses in this location.</p> <p>The area is easily accessible by foot. It is also well served by public transport with regular bus services along Oxford Road and within 0.9 miles of Reading West station. It is situated amongst existing housing and within close proximity of existing services with 3 GP surgeries and 12 schools within 1.0 mile.</p>	<p>housing. Among other factors, these sites can be removed in isolation without necessitating the release of a much wider area. This is not the case for the sites proposed, which are in the middle of larger employment areas. It is therefore considered appropriate to retain these sites in employment use.</p>
John George Ltd	Question 21	<p>Our client's site is 2-4 Deacon Way, Reading, which is currently in B8 use. The site is located within a Core Employment Area. The site is sustainably located on the edge of a residential area, within 200m of Public Open Space and adjacent to regular bus services into Reading Town Centre. It is therefore considered appropriate for a residential use, which could assist in addressing Reading's unmet housing need.</p>	
Scott Versace	Question 21	<p>If an alternative premises can be found for the relocation of Phoenix College (to a fit-for-purpose site) then the site would be free for development of residential or mixed allocation.</p>	<p>There are no known proposals for the relocation of the existing Phoenix College, and therefore no known prospect of delivery of the site as a housing allocation.</p>
Willowside Homes	Question 21	<p>Land at Gravel Hill and Highdown Avenue, Emmer Green: this site lies within South Oxfordshire but is well placed to meet Reading's housing</p>	<p>The Local Plan cannot identify land for development in other authorities.</p>



		<p>need. It is contiguous with the built up area of Reading and would be suitable for the provision of market and affordable housing. The site extends to 2 ha and could accommodate around 25 dwellings, together with open space, reflecting the density of the surrounding area. The site is highly accessible from Reading. Vehicular access would be provided from Highdown Avenue and Gravel Hill, and public transport is available nearby. The site is currently used for the keeping of horses and is readily available for housing.</p> <p>Allocation of the site for housing would make a valuable contribution towards meeting the OAHN for Reading. A collaborative approach should therefore be taken with South Oxfordshire to ensure the site is allocated in the forthcoming Preferred Options in May 2016.</p>	<p>There is expected to be a degree of unmet need for housing in Reading. However, the Council's view is that South Oxfordshire is not the preferred location to meet these unmet needs. There are considerable issues with cross Thames travel, and substantial new housing on the edge of Reading to the north will only exacerbate these issues.</p>
Dr Megan Aldrich	Question 22	It should gradually be converted to high quality residential use, and the hideous but much used leisure centre and revolting hotel and Toby's should be upgraded as they become obsolete.	<p>Since the publication of the Issues and Options document, the Central Berkshire Economic Development Needs Assessment has been produced, which has identified a very significant level of need for industrial and warehouse space. Whilst it is possible to accommodate this level of need within Reading, large scale loss of existing floorspace will have the effects of increasing this need to a level that cannot be accommodated within Reading. This will have implications for jobs and for the overall balance of the economy. In addition, Richfield Avenue contains some a significant concentration of small units, which will be of particular significance for small and growing businesses.</p> <p>For this reason, the option the Local Plan pursues for most of the site is Option 22.1, i.e. to retain it as an employment area. However, there are some sites on the eastern fringe of the area which currently have a difficult relationship with existing residential. These can be brought forward for alternative uses without affecting the overall employment function of the area.</p>
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 22	Option 22.3 i.e. include a variety of uses include residential nearer the river and small employment/start-up units	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 22	Prefer Option 22.1 i.e. retain as employment area.	
Brian Jamieson			
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 22	OPTION 22.3 is our preferred option. However, there must be recognition of the cultural importance of the Reading Festival sited alongside, for which Reading has become internationally famous.	
Elaine Murray	Question 22	Prefer Options 22.2 and 22.3	
Thames Properties Ltd	Question 22	Thames Properties have commissioned Campbell Gordon to undertake an independent review of the demand for the current facilities within the CEA. The report reveals that there is very little - if any - demand for large industrial units across the CEA. Vacancy levels are highest in the larger units (5,000 sq.ft and above). Demand for the very large units (20,000 sq.ft and above) is very limited, as typically these occupiers have migrated away from the area to the A33 and M4 locations. Demand is strongest for the smaller workshop/office units (up to 5,000 sq.ft) with a very low vacancy rate of 1.4% in this category of unit. Overall, the Campbell Gordon report concludes that the CEA has a high vacancy rate at 36% total floorspace (compared to the 22% cited in the consultation document), due to significant vacancy levels	

	<p>in the largest size bracket. There are no services or amenities within the CEA for the occupiers.</p> <p>Thames Properties fully support the progression of Option 22.2 and endorse the formulation of a more flexible policy for this area that enables a blend of employment uses alongside leisure and retail uses. Such an approach is considered entirely reflective of the current market demand for employment uses in Reading and the locational preferences of future occupiers, and recognises that Richfield Avenue in particular is already exhibiting clear signs of change. In the event that the decision is taken to advance option 22.2 further, we would suggest that consideration is also given to the inclusion of a degree of new residential development in this area, particularly given the need to deliver new housing in the most sustainable locations and ideally on previously developed sites.</p> <p>In spatial terms, the existing CEA occupies a very strong location, being in close proximity not only to Reading town centre and all of its associated services and facilities, but also to Caversham (an area also exhibiting signs of growth and progression) and from a recreational perspective, the Thames Meadows. Furthermore, just outside of the CEA further to the north lies the Rivermead Leisure Centre, a driving range, a restaurant and two hotels. At present, there are no services or amenities within the CEA for the occupiers. A more adaptable policy, which enables the provision of additional non employment uses alongside the smaller employment uses aimed at SMEs would support existing occupiers within the CEA, while providing greater incentive for other occupiers to locate there, particularly when coupled with the benefits on offer from the wider surroundings.</p> <p>In our view the reclassification of this area to incorporate a wider range of leisure and retail uses alongside small scale employment and some residential is entirely appropriate and more reflective of the way in which Reading is evolving in both spatial and economic terms.</p> <p>We include, at Annex 3 to this submission a copy of a Vision Document for the area which indicates how the area may start to come forward in the future.</p>	<p>Within the policy on loss of employment, employment uses are not strictly defined as B class uses. In addition, the policy now contains some flexibility for sites where there is no realistic prospect of employment use and retention as employment would only result in long-term vacancy.</p>
--	--	--

Scott Versace	<b>Question 22</b>	Prefer Option 22.3: Identify the area for development for other uses such as residential.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 22</b>	<p>Prefer Option 22.3. It is important to consider the impact that Reading Festival has on this area as part of any planning decisions. Although only a once a year event, it takes a while to set up and then dismantle and clever traffic management is required around those times.</p> <p>Some of the smaller workshops along Cardiff Road and even some of the larger buildings are part of Reading's industrial heritage. Consideration should be given to the preservation and conversion of these as part of an 'industrial heritage' strategy. Retail and leisure is not necessarily going to fit the bill as a suitable use when so much else is available fairly close by in Reading and Caversham.</p> <p>Reading's 'Industrial Heritage Quarter' could provide small workshops, business centres, as well as residential conversions. Closeness to the festival location should also be capitalised on, maybe encourage small music venues, recording studios, art galleries etc.</p> <p>If flooding is a problem use mezzanine and above levels as living / working space.</p>	
Alistair Appleton	<b>Question 23</b>	I am very concerned at any proposal to change CS28 and SA16, in particular where any such change could result in a reduction of the protection afforded to public open space (or to the amount of such public open space). Reading is already over developed, with insufficient public recreational open space, such space being of huge importance for both physical and mental wellbeing. Any move to put the current open space at risk should be resisted.	In general terms, the Local Plan does not reduce the protection of existing open spaces. Policy EN8 is largely in line with existing policy CS28. In terms of specific sites, the list in EN7 is not identical to SA16, but, with the exception of significant areas outside the settlement, which national policy does not support blanket protection of and which are in any case covered by landscape, biodiversity and flood risk constraints, the amount of land protected is largely similar.
Patricia Appleton			
BBOWT	<b>Question 23</b>	Amendments are required to Policy CS36 to ensure that the policy is fully in line with the obligations of the NPPF and in order to be regarded as sound. We have amended the existing policy with suggested amended wording below.	The policy on biodiversity and the green network has been revised and consolidated, and, although the wording is not identical, it is considered that it reflects most of the elements of the suggested policy.

		<p><i>CS36: Biodiversity and Geology</i></p> <p><i>a) Development should conserve, protect and enhance biodiversity within and adjacent to development sites and seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity as a result of development. Development should incorporate and enhance features of biodiversity or geological interest (including protected species and their habitats) found within the application site into their schemes.</i></p> <p><i>On sites with recognised biodiversity or geological value, development will not be permitted where there would be a direct or indirect adverse impact on the site, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that:</i></p> <p>-</p> <p><i>i. There are no reasonable alternatives</i>  <i>ii. The need for development clearly outweighs the need to protect the value of the site; and</i>  <i>ii. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided then that harm will be adequately mitigated or as a last resort, compensated for.</i></p> <p><i>b) Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites and Habitats of Principal Importance will be safeguarded and where possible, enhanced. Permission will not be granted for any development that would result in loss or deterioration of a Local nature Reserve, Local Wildlife Site or Habitat of Principle Importance.</i></p> <p><i>c) Any development that would sever or threaten the integrity of an established wildlife link, as indicated on an adopted proposals map, will not be permitted. Where applicable, developments should be designed to protect, consolidate, extend and enhance the network of wildlife links and corridors in and adjoining the Borough, working with neighbouring authorities where appropriate.</i></p>	
<p>The Butler Partnership</p>	<p><b>Question 23</b></p>	<p>Policy CS11 should not be carried forward. Less protection should be given to existing employment sites in the centre of Reading, and this should be reflected in a revised policy within the New Local Plan.</p>	<p>Not agreed. CS11 does not protect employment sites in the centre of Reading, rather it gives criteria for considering whether change of use is appropriate. This gives clarity on what will be</p>

			taken into account.
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 23</b>	Policy DM15 should not be carried forward. Less protection should be given to public houses in the centre of Reading, and this should be reflected in a revised policy within the New Local Plan.	Not agreed. Policy DM15 does not relate to the centre of Reading. The new policy is similar to DM15, with some alterations, but again does not relate to central Reading, which is covered by a policy in the central Reading section.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 23</b>	Agree with policies to be carried forward, but I am disturbed at some suggested vague modifications e.g. to CS28 and do not agree to these without details available to CS28.	In general terms, the Local Plan does not reduce the protection of existing open spaces. Policy EN8 is largely in line with existing policy CS28.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>The local plan policy wording and supporting text for flooding will need to be updated. We suggested the following wording to be used for a new local plan flooding policy:</p> <p>Planning applications on sites greater than 1 hectare or that are in Flood Risk Zones 2 or 3 will need to be supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A flood risk assessment which demonstrates that the most appropriate layout of development on site in terms of flood risk has been applied; and</li> <li>b) Demonstration that a sequential approach has been taken within the site, directing the most vulnerable uses to the areas of lowest flood risk; and</li> <li>c) Demonstration that resilient and resistant construction methods for managing residual risk and delivering an overall reduction in flood risk have been assessed; and</li> <li>d) The provision of space for flood water storage through the use of open space or areas above ground (where appropriate).</li> <li>e) Demonstration that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and where possible reduced,</li> <li>f) Demonstration that all forms of flooding are taken into account including groundwater and surface water flooding, and</li> <li>g) Demonstration that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) are incorporated, where feasible.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the sequential and exception tests it may not be appropriate to repeat the existing national planning policy but these tests should be mentioned in the supporting text for the flood risk policy.</p>	Agreed. However, as this specifies the information that should be submitted with a planning application rather than actually setting out policy requirements, it is considered that it is more appropriate for the supporting text.

Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Part 11.20 seems to give more weight to regeneration than to flood risk. This should either be removed or this will need to be justified using local plan background evidence such as the SFRA to say why regeneration should outweigh flood risk in local planning decisions. We suggest that this supporting text be more clear and precise to help planners and developers make decisions on where to locate new development, similar to the following:          ‘appropriate weight will be given to the redevelopment of land at risk of flooding that provides significant regeneration benefits on previously developed land’. However, the functional floodplain should be safeguarded from further development unless the development type is considered appropriate in line with the NPPF.</p>	The language of this part of the supporting text has been amended to clarify that these considerations will need to be undertaken within the sequential test process.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Although DM1 mentions that the impact of surface water should be minimised it does not mention the impact that fluvial flooding could have on any new development. We suggest adding the following wording:          ‘All new development should consider mitigation and resilience measures for any increases in river flooding levels as a result of climate change’.</p>	Agreed. This wording has been added.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Reading Borough Council is now responsible for assessing surface water drainage proposals for major developments and holds responsibility for ‘local’ sources of flood risk, including ordinary watercourses, surface water and groundwater. We recommend that you consult your Authority when producing your flood risk policy. The accommodation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) into a development will need to be at the earliest stages of the design process in order to have sufficient land available. Climate Change will also need to be considered.</p> <p>Development Management policy should ensure that there are no soakaways in contaminated land. Infiltration SuDS techniques should only dispose of clean roof water into clean, uncontaminated ground. Infiltration SuDS should not be used for foul discharges or trade effluent, and may not be suitable within Source Protection Zone 1.</p>	Agreed. The flooding and drainage policy contains these elements. The policy seeks to avoid worsening of contamination effects through SuDS, and makes reference to the specific concerns expressed here.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	We wish to amend the last paragraph of CS34. We have concerns that (through the use of piling into the top of a Principal Aquifer) the	Agreed. This wording has been added.

		development itself could create pathways for vertical migration of contamination into underlying aquifers. We suggest adding 'and will not impact on the groundwater environment' to the last sentence of this policy.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Ecological buffer zones a minimum of 10 metres in width must be maintained or re-established adjacent to all watercourses. This measurement is from the top of the bank of the watercourse. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value. Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential that this is protected.</p> <p>The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act requires local authorities to have regard to nature conservation and article 10 of the Habitats Directive which stresses the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity. This should link in with green infrastructure policies.</p> <p>This is supported by NPPF paragraph 109 and 118. Ecological networks may also help wildlife adapt to climate change and will help restore watercourses to a more natural state as required by the river basin management plan. In addition, these natural green corridors through built up areas are valuable in terms of aesthetics, adding to a sense of place, and can act as corridors for people</p>	Noted. The policy on development in the vicinity of the waterway reflects the need to include a buffer wherever practicable (taking account of the urban nature of some watercourses in the town centres.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Policy CS36 should be stronger in as much as it should seek biodiversity enhancement on all development. We would suggest wording similar to the following:</p> <p>"All development proposals should be designed to maximise biodiversity by conserving, enhancing or extending existing resources or creating new areas or features. Where potential biodiversity interest is identified on a site, or the development creates an opportunity to increase biodiversity, the Council will require an ecological survey and report to be submitted which demonstrates how this will be addressed."</p>	The biodiversity policy has been reviewed to seek biodiversity net gain wherever possible.

		Please see Wycombe District Council's adopted Policy DM14. We strongly encourage you to adopt a similar policy for the new Reading local plan. Good design from the outset incorporating biodiversity opportunities on proposed development sites should be a key requirement.	
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	CS36 currently makes no mention of rivers and their associated corridors, although they are a prime example of the "network of wildlife links and corridors in and adjoining the Borough" referred to in point c) of this policy. The various rivers and streams that pass through the Reading Borough are important in terms of biodiversity, landscape and history. We urge the Council to include a policy for the protection and enhancement of river and stream corridors.  A good example of this is Wycombe District Council's Policy DM15. We strongly encourage you to adopt a similar policy for the new Reading local plan.	The proposed policy on Biodiversity and the Green Network highlights the role of watercourses as part of the Green Network.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 23</b>	Policy DM17 does not mention rivers (blue network) and this should be addressed if this policy is to be retained/amended. It may be better to retain this (more strongly worded) policy separate from the wording of CS36.	
Mr Guest	<b>Question 23</b>	We feel that it is entirely appropriate that, as RBC acknowledge, policies CS10, SA12 and CS11 should be actively reviewed to reflect the development needs of the Borough in the emerging local plan.	Noted. However, after consideration, the proposed policies are similar to existing policies.
London and Quadrant	<b>Question 23</b>	Policy CS15 sets indicative density ranges. Whilst we have no in principle objection to the retention of these indicative ranges per se, we do however believe that the general policy needs to be worded in a way to encourage significantly higher densities on brownfield sites in sustainable locations, particularly those already allocated for development within the Local Plan.  It is important to recognise the potentially transformative effect of high quality, high density development. The social and economic case should be given greater weight and must be established in order to be able to justify the quantum, mix and appropriateness of a development. These must be considered alongside "context" which is often used as a pretext for constraining developments on the grounds	The policy seeks to strike a balance between seeking the most efficient use of land and not detracting from those surrounding elements that make a site an attractive place to live in the first place. As such, it is not agreed that there should always be a presumption that the economic case overrides the 'context', rather it is a balance to be struck on a site-by-site basis. The indicative density ranges are included and set somewhat higher than the Core Strategy, although the policy notes that on individual sites a different density may be appropriate,



		of scale and massing. Larger high quality schemes should be seen as a potential opportunity for a step change in urban intensification at appropriate locations.	
London and Quadrant	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Policy RC13 was produced in a very different political and economic climate. The change in the way Councils now need to address the delivery of housing since the adoption of this policy means that this policy is unnecessarily restrictive and may ultimately result in the Council's inability to deliver their objectively assessed need for housing. Consequently, the retention of this policy in its current form may render the new local plan unsound due to its restriction on housing delivery.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise the Council's careful and thorough approach to the development of tall buildings in Reading and acknowledge the significant piece of work which went into preparing the evidence base, we do believe that a degree of flexibility is now required in light of the current requirements for housing. Tall buildings can play a significant part in delivering high quality development proposals, particularly when being used in a landmark capacity to enhance legibility and way finding.</p> <p>We suggest that this degree of flexibility is applied in the first instance to those sites already allocated within the local plan. By taking this approach, this will allow the Council to predict the areas in which a considered increase in height might take place and allow an open discussion between the Council and the developer. The onus would be on the developer to provide a robust justification in architectural and townscape terms as to why an element of height may be appropriate in that location.</p>	It is not agreed that the changes in the calculation of housing need render the policy on tall buildings out of date. The importance of matters such as heritage remain vital. Tall buildings is one way of delivering high density, but it is not the only possible approach. As demonstrated in the Draft Local Plan, around 7,700 dwellings can be accommodated in Central Reading, most at high density, without invalidating the approach to tall buildings.
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 23</b>	There doesn't seem to be a link to policies on developing/increasing the provision of primary and secondary education in relation to the plan.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared, and is summarised in section 10, that looks at education capacity.
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 23</b>	OP supports the continued recognition of Green Park as a major site for office development in CS10, but also requests that future employment policy recognises the importance of a flexible approach to uses, rather than an overly restrictive adherence to B1 uses only, in line with paragraph 21 of the NPPF. Other uses can perform an important role,	The policy on Loss of Employment Land has a degree of flexibility, particularly for those uses appropriate for employment areas,

		supporting the continued success of the Park with a range of complementary functions and services.	
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 23</b>	OP supports the continued recognition of Green Park as a core employment area in SA12.	Noted.
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 23</b>	Allowing increased densities of development by allowing taller buildings in appropriate locations is a pragmatic approach to 'to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area', as required by NPPF Paragraph 17. The consultation document sets out the objective of making Reading, including the central area, the hub of the Thames Valley, which will require additional employment space. Well-designed tall buildings in appropriate locations for both employment and residential uses could help deliver the much-needed increase in floorspace in the Borough if designed in sustainable locations providing a range of services to support communities.	The role of tall buildings is recognised in Reading, and managed through the tall buildings policy. However, most sites will not be appropriate for tall buildings. Nevertheless, efficient use of land can be achieved on many sites without tall buildings.
Universities Superannuation Scheme	<b>Question 23</b>	Policy RC13: The consultation document recognises that there is a lack of developable land in the Borough for all types of development. Allowing increased densities of development by allowing taller buildings in appropriate locations is a pragmatic approach to 'to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area', as required by NPPF Paragraph 17, bullet point 3. The consultation document sets out the objective of making Reading, including the central area, the hub of the Thames Valley, which will require additional employment space. Well-designed tall buildings in appropriate locations for both employment and residential uses could help deliver the much-needed increase in floorspace in the Borough and USS urges the Council to update this policy accordingly.	
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 23</b>	Revisions to policies and the IDP may be required in response to joint work to assess the impacts of proposed growth in Reading on the highway network within South Oxfordshire.	Noted.
Sonic Star Properties Ltd	<b>Question 23</b>	Policy CS11 should be amended to reflect national permitted development rights for changes of use from office to residential. This policy should reflect the fact that, in these instances, permitted development rights are a clear 'fall-back' position, and therefore changes of use from office to residential use should generally be considered acceptable. We consider that the policy could retain its criteria tests for changes of use of offices to other land uses.	Changes of use from office to residential, where they fall within the permitted development rules, do not need to be reflected in the Local Plan, as they will not need planning permission. These permitted development rights represent a considerable threat to the adequacy of the Borough's employment stock, and, where the

			Plan can exercise control over changes of use from office to residential, it should do so. Such applications would be judged against the criteria set out.
Universities Superannuation Scheme	<b>Question 23</b>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS11 relates to the use of employment land for alternative uses. USS requests the updated employment policy is drafted to recognise the important role that alternative employment uses outside of the traditional B1, B2 and B8 uses classes can play.</p> <p>Alternative employment generating uses such as C1, D2, retail or sui generis uses can positively contribute to sustainable employment provision and promote economic growth. Alternative uses can complement existing business functions and offer a higher density of employment opportunities and more jobs than some B uses, such as warehousing. Restricting alternative uses provides limited flexibility and does not represent the flexibility required by NPPF paragraphs 14, 20 and 21. Occupier requirements in Use Class B1, B2 and B8 are changing rapidly and there is increasing demand to operate under a range of use classes to meet market demand, for example, click and collect services.</p> <p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF requires that planning policies avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Allowing more flexible uses on existing employment sites will allow businesses to adapt to future business requirements and help avoid challenges to local planning policy that is considered to be overly restrictive and contrary to national policy.</p>	<p>Policy CS11, now EM3 in the Draft Local Plan, still retains strong protection for employment uses in Core Employment Areas, which is considered appropriate given the very significant levels of need for additional employment space. This may include some uses outside the 'B' use classes.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that the policy needs to include a mechanism for circumstances where there is no reasonable prospect of a 'traditional' employment use, and a site would otherwise be a long-term vacancy, and this is covered in the policy.</p>
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 23</b>	Agree with the policies to be carried forward.	Noted.
Tarmac			
Scott Versace			
Willowside Homes			
Environment Agency	<b>Question 24</b>	On the sites within this appendix proposed by the various rivers, please look to carry out enhancements to the river banks, the rivers and their associated corridors.	Where development sites are situated on the river bank, the importance of allowing a buffer is noted, and retain and enhance the biodiversity

			interest.
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 24</b>	As a general principle, if residential development is to proceed at 700 units year, part of the contract with the community must surely be, at the very least, to maintain existing open spaces for the growing community.	Policy EN8 on undesignated open space seeks to prevent loss of open areas unless there are strong reasons.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b>	All current green spaces are valuable. If we are to see more development, then they become even more necessary. Retain all allotment sites. Protect all wildlife heritage sites and local nature reserves. Reading old cemetery, Victoria road cemetery, Furzeplat are left off, as is the area next to Kennet Island development (part of the old Manor Farm site). Keep a frontage of natural land and protected walkways along the Thames.	Policy EN8 on undesignated open space seeks to prevent loss of open areas unless there are strong reasons. Not all spaces can be specifically listed for protection.  The boundaries of areas of wildlife significance have been updated. Where development sites are situated on the river bank, the importance of allowing a buffer is noted.
Sport England	<b>Question 24</b>	Sport England will oppose development resulting in the loss of playing field land or formal built sports facilities unless its loss is justified by a robust and up-to-date assessments of need. Any loss of sports provision should be incorporated into formal policy such that it may be considered through the policy making process and scrutinised at Examination in Public. As such, should any policy seek to allocate any existing playing field land or formal built sports facilities for redevelopment, we would strongly urge the Council to discuss this directly with Sport England.	Sport England's approach is noted. The only draft allocation in the Plan that would result in a net loss of playing fields or built sports facilities is the continuation of existing allocation WR2, relating to Downing Road. Work is underway on providing the full justification, but it is considered that the loss of the playing field would not result in adverse effects on the overall offer as long as compensatory sports provision could be made in either quantitative or qualitative terms, as referred to in the policy.
Scott Versace	<b>Question 24</b>	All green spaces should be identified as Local Green Space. For each area identified on the map hold particular significance as areas of environmental importance. Reducing the town's green spaces is only going to bring negative effects, including pollution, increased flood risk and more. Land should not be simply considered according to its monetary value but also according to its environmental capital.	The criteria for designating a site as Local Green Space are set out in the NPPF, and it is not the policy intention that all green spaces will qualify. Therefore, the sites need to be considered on a case by case basis.
Len Abery	<b>Question 24</b>	The potential sites in Appendix 5 should be designated as Local Green Space in the new local plan.	
Mrs P Ager			
Tina Allen			
Mary Bartlett			

Clive Bedford			
Lynda Chater			
Jane Chesterfield			
Mrs Sarah Chilton			
Julia Cooper			
Mrs Jenny Cottee			
Ian Duddle			
Liz Ellis			
Dave Evans			
J Fidler			
Michael Geater			
Joanne Hales			
Gordon Johnson			
K Jones			
Miss L V Jones			
Wendy Levey			
Carol Mclellan			
Natalie Pryor			
Nigel Rowland			
Katherine Slater			
L West			
Mary Bartlett	<b>Question 24</b>	All parkland within Tilehurst should be identified as local green space. We are told that we need more exercise so it is vital that these areas are kept for future generations.	
Mrs E R Smeeth	<b>Question 24</b>	All the sites mentioned as open green space already are open and available to the public. Some of them are held in trust and are	

		supposed to be inalienable and all should remain on the open green space register. Reading needs open spaces to provide “lungs” to clean the filthy air caused by too much traffic. I object to the building on any of them. Although the list is long the actual total amount of open space is not too much for the rest and relaxation of the ever increasing population and cleaning the over polluted air of a town which these days seems to have its own special weather caused by this pollution.	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG <sup>2</sup>	<b>Question 24</b> Albert Road Recreation Ground	Albert Road Recreation Ground should be designated as Local Green Space. A small heavily used park, central to residential area, featuring children's playground, good sports facilities, including a bowling green, croquet lawn and four tennis courts. Charity Commission protection as land was left in Trust.	Albert Road Recreation Ground is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 24</b> Albert Road Recreation Ground	This is a small, but intensively used, green lung in an extensive residential area. With its range of facilities (childrens' playground, tennis courts, croquet lawn, bowling green as well as quality green space) it provides recreational facilities for all ages - under-5s to 90 year olds. It is an asset to the local community. Residential development would be an outrage that contravened all public policies in favour of open space in towns, recreation and healthy living.	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Amersham Road Playing Fields	Amersham Road Playing Fields should be designated as Local Green Space. Well used playing fields including a children's playground. Supports large residential area with many young families - many without private gardens. Flood plain. NB Note correct name. Also the Allotments no longer exist.	Amersham Road Playing Fields are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Amersham Road Recreation Ground	Delete all references to Allotments, these allotments were closed very many years ago and the former allotment land was integrated into the recreation ground.	No reference is made to the allotments in the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Ardler Road Allotments	Ardler Road Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. The allotments are popular and carry a waiting list.	Ardler Road allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 24</b> Ardler Road Allotments	Important as allotments	

<sup>2</sup> Caversham and District Residents Association, Caversham GLOBE, Emmer Green Residents' Association, Friends of Clayfield Copse, Friends of Caversham Court Gardens

CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Balmore Walk	Balmore Walk should be designated as Local Green Space. Walking, Wildlife, national cycle path. Woodland, historical interest, surrounded by residential yet has a rural feel, it is enclosed by wildlife friendly hedges and is visible from Central Caversham. It has views of the South Oxfordshire countryside as well as the centre of Reading. Hugely popular for sledging. The Walk is part of the grounds of Balmore House was built in 1834 by the Robinson family, as told in Kate Summerscale's book: Mrs Robinson's Disgrace: the private diary of a Victorian lady published by Bloomsbury in 2012. <a href="http://www.cadra.org.uk/pdf/The_story_behind_Balmore_House.pdf">http://www.cadra.org.uk/pdf/The_story_behind_Balmore_House.pdf</a> . The top field is managed as conservation grassland under the Higher Level Stewardship programme.	Balmore Walk is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Beech Wood	Beech Wood should be designated as Local Green Space. Mature ancient woodland predominantly Beech with a mix of other trees including large oaks and ash trees. Walking and wildlife interest. Surrounded by residential area. The wood is very prominent on the brow of Grove Hill and is visible from a wide area. Major Landscape Feature and other designations. Well used footpath to Highdown School. Ancient woodland and designated Local Wildlife Site (Highdown Wood LWS).	Beech Wood is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Blagrove Recreation Ground	Blagrove Recreation Ground is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves - historic donation, well known;</li> <li>• Special to its community - eg Don't wreck the Rec, wedding photos in the rec, local residents evidence in support at Public Inquiry</li> <li>• Local in character - Cycle training, dog walking</li> </ul>	Blagrove Recreation Ground was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. However, it is proposed to be protected as Public Open Space.
Mrs Sarah Chilton	<b>Question 24</b> Blundells Copse	Blundells Copse should be identified as local green space.	Blundells Copse is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
K Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Blundells Copse	Blundells Wood and green space between Bramble Crescent and Bran Close should be identified as local green space.	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Caleta Close Play Area	Caleta Close Play Area should be designated as Local Green Space. A small well used children's play area in a dense residential area with many young families.	Caleta Close Play Area was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. However, it is proposed to be protected as Public Open Space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Caversham Court Gardens	Caversham Court Gardens (including allotments) should be designated as Local Green Space. A charming walled garden with terraced lawns leading down to the river Thames. Many mature specimen trees, including ancient yew, with flower borders and a lavender bank.	Caversham Court Gardens is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.

		Popular for picnics. Public events throughout the year. Green Flag and Green Heritage award winner. Charities run a Tea Kiosk. Supported by active Friends Group. The historic kitchen gardens and part of the pleasure gardens formerly belonging to Caversham Court are now RBC allotments with a long waiting list. South-facing, they are bounded to the north by the listed arc-and-buttress brick wall beneath St Peter's church, and to the west by a high brick wall stretching from the churchyard to the river. The allotments were used in the Dig for Victory campaign during WWII. Thames and Chiltern award for Horticulture in the Britain in Bloom.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 24</b> Caversham Court Gardens	Add to the description - 'and allotments'. As a former kitchen garden, these are significant to the history of the Caversham Court site. These are not statutory allotments and need protection as allotments.	Reference to the allotments has been added to the designation.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b> Caversham Park	Caversham Park should be designated as Local Green Space. It is essential green space.	Caversham Park is subject to a dedicated policy within the Local Plan that emphasises the key elements rather than being identified as Local Green Space.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Caversham Park	The parkland surrounding Caversham Park House is strategic green space in same way that that the privately owned land of the Warren and Chazey Court Farm has been mapped as Local Green Space. Chazey Court Farm like Caversham Park it is not open to the public but is equally visible over a very wide area, it forms part of the strategic open space of this area of Caversham and beyond and should be designated as Local Green Space.	Caversham Park is subject to a dedicated policy within the Local Plan that emphasises the key elements rather than being identified as Local Green Space.  Both Caversham Park and Chazey Court Farm are identified for their landscape value.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Caversham Pond	Caversham Pond should be designated as Local Green Space. In Caversham Park Village and surrounded by trees. Important residential amenity close to houses.	Chapel Hill allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
Len Abery	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It should be returned to allotments and use by the community.	
Mrs P Ager	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are local in character.	
Tina Allen Gordon	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local	



Johnson	Allotments	community and of particular local significance, and local in character.
Carol Mclellan		
Mary Bartlett	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should not be designated as Local Green Space. This site is too small for building.
Clive Bedford	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are special to the local community and of particular local significance.
Jane Chesterfield		
Joanne Hales		
L West		
Lynda Chater	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, local in character.  Planning permission for housing has already been refused for this site on the grounds that it would cause loss of open space. The existing allotment holders were evicted and the site is now overgrown and unused. This is appalling when there are many people who would be only too ready to cultivate it.
Mrs Sarah Chilton	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space.
Julia Cooper	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. They are a much valued resource for the local community - help with educating the children about healthy food and how it's grown.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves - particularly so - very hilly area- need walking distance allotments, strategically placed so views from many approaches- give daily reminder of recent past (pre-urbanisation);</li> <li>• Special to its community - Very big public reaction for such a small area of land when development proposed in the rec, local residents evidence in support at Public Inquiry</li> <li>• Local in character - nearby old cottages- reminder of recent past,</li> </ul>

		used by locals, social centre passers-by chat	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, local in character.  This small allotment site was provided with excellent facilities to serve the local community when much more to the original large site was developed. It serves the local community, in this hilly area. Allotments need to be close to homes. The site is an attractive landscape feature and is a constant reminder of history of the area. There is plenty of recent evidence of public commitment to keeping this green space	
Ian Duddle	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. They should be returned to allotment production.	
Liz Ellis	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve and special to the local community and of particular local significance. This site is very special to the former allotment holders and to the local people. It formed a small but significant community hub. It should be returned to use as allotments at the very least and protected as local green space.	
Dave Evans	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Once it is lost, we won't get it back.	
Michael Geater	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are special to the local community and of particular local significance.  This site was an allotment for 23 years giving a lot of pleasure to locals with vegetables and flowers growing most of the year long.	
K Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Should remain allotments - good for mental and physical health and healthy eating.	
Miss L V Jones	<b>Question 24</b>	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space.	

	Chapel Hill Allotments	They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. The Chapel Hill Allotments are an integral part of the surrounding community, an open green space in a built up area. As an allotment the plots were well used and worked; sadly no longer allotments but perhaps again, or some other recreational facility.	
Wendy Levey	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Shame allotment holders had to lose their plots.	
Natalie Pryor	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are close to the community they serve.	
Nigel Rowland	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. They are special to the local community and of particular local significance.  Most allotments are tucked away and do not have open access to the public. These allotments are on a school run and have allowed children to have view of what gardening and growing vegetables is all about, Many parents stopped to discuss with their children activities on the site and often engage with us in the growing of vegetables.	
Mrs E R Smeeth	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	I object to building on Chapel Hill Allotments and repeat that the town needs green lungs. This open space should be added to the existing green list.	
Tilehurst Allotments Society	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should be designated Local Green Space. The land's value has recently been demonstrated. A planning application to build on the land was refused in September 2015. This planning decision was based on many factors including value to the community, landscape and historic value. These and the evident community support show that the land meets the required criteria to be designated a Local Green Space.	
J Fidler	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments	Chapel Hill Allotments should not be designated as Local Green Space.	
Katherine Slater	<b>Question 24</b> Chapel Hill Allotments		
CADRA, Caversham	<b>Question 24</b> Chazey Court	Chazey Court Farm and Thames Islands should be designated as Local Green Space. Prominent watermeadow alongside the Thames. Grade II*	Chazey Court Farm and Thames Islands were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space,

<p>GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG</p>	<p>Farm and Thames Islands</p>	<p>listed farmhouse and Grade I listed barn. Archaeology report indicates the farmstead is located in the early manor of Mapledurham Chazey, part of the Honour of Wallingford in Binfield Hundred. Dendrochronology dates the timber of the barn and the frame of the Farmhouse around 1611. The large, impressively constructed barn has been little altered since its original construction. It is one of just 6 Grade I listings in Reading and the only non ecclesiastical.</p>	<p>but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. However, the area is protected for its landscape value.</p>
<p>CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG</p>	<p><b>Question 24</b> Chiltern Road Play Area</p>	<p>Chiltern Road Play Area should be designated as Local Green Space. An open field and recreation ground, used for ball games and dog walking. Surrounded by residential area.</p>	<p>It was agreed by the Council's Policy Committee that this site would be identified for expansion of the Henley Road Cemetery. This is reflected in the Draft Local Plan.</p>
<p>Miss Elaine Robson</p>	<p><b>Question 24</b> Christchurch Green</p>	<p>Could Christchurch Green in Redlands Conservation Area be identified as open space? It is an important landmark and local amenity, situated between busy roads, opposite a parade of shops and close to several residential streets. Pedestrians in appreciable numbers use it daily to reach their destinations or to pause on their way. It provides significant unbuilt green space, in the form of a low mound with grass, a few trees and garden-style shrubs.</p> <p>It has a long history. The Ordnance Survey map of 1879 shows a triangular island with trees, which was redrawn as a peninsula when Christchurch Rd was widened (approx. 1970). Thanks to care provided by Parks &amp; Open Spaces it remains an attractive and much-valued traditional asset that all residents would be keen to preserve.</p> <p>It could be defined as open space despite its small size and the presence of domestic pipelines (water, electricity) at depth within its border.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the small green at Christchurch Green is significant enough to merit protection as Local Green Space. However, there is a general point that, where a green is intrinsic to the character of a Conservation Area, relevant policies in the heritage section should reflect that issue. This is therefore picked up in policy EN3.</p>
<p>CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG</p>	<p><b>Question 24</b> Christchurch Meadows</p>	<p>Christchurch Meadows should be designated as Local Green Space. Large, close-cut grass meadow with specimen trees and shrubs, riverside promenade set out in early C20th for recreation. Well used fenced children's play area includes a paddling/ boating pool and picnic tables. A distinctive line of Lombardy poplars edges the George Street boundary, established after new Reading Bridge was built in 1923. The metalled cycleway running along the bank has streetlights to aid visibility in the evening. Well used for recreation and walking. Now accessed by pedestrian and cycle bridge adding to the number using the park to cross the Thames to the Town Centre and Station. Site of large</p>	<p>Christchurch Meadows are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.</p>

		community events. 1940 covenant between National Playing Fields Association and Reading Corporation registering all 26 acres as playing fields, plus a sports pavilion.	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Clayfield Copse & Recreation Ground	Clayfield Copse should be designated as Local Green Space. Large, mainly natural open space consisting of fields and native ancient woodland adjoining the Oxfordshire countryside. One field is recreational and one is managed as conservation grassland. Some woodland actively managed as hazel coppice; traditional dead hedging defines some of the ancient woodland areas. There is a wild flower meadow and other fields are being left to regenerate woodland. Clayfield Copse also features a Sculpture Trail. Supported by active Friends Group.  Designated as a Local Nature Reserve by English Nature in 1991 (and was Reading's first Local Nature Reserve) - and remains a designated LWS. Part of the meadow is managed as conservation grassland under the Higher Level Stewardship. Shown on the English Nature Reserve website under Berkshire. The important adjacent woods of Blackhouse as a small section along the eastern boundary (outside the Reading boundary) belongs to the adjacent Phillimore estate.	Clayfield Copse is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Tina Allen	<b>Question 24</b> Corwen Road	Green triangle area in Corwen Road should be identified as local green space.	It is not considered that the small green at Corwen Road is significant enough to merit protection as Local Green Space.
Councillor Rob White	<b>Question 24</b> Crescent Road Playing Fields	Crescent Road playing fields should be identified as local green space.	The Alfred Sutton Playing Fields are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Len Abery	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Leave the playing field for the children and children's children.	Downing Road Playing Field was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The site forms part of a development allocation to help to provide a replacement primary school.
Mary Bartlett	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should not be designated as Local Green Space. This school should not be demolished when more and more houses are being built therefore more school places will be required.	
Clive Bedford	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves and special to the local community and of particular local significance. My granddaughter goes to Park Lane and hopefully her children will be able to use it too.	

Lynda Chater	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It provides a small and important green space in a very dense area of housing, in addition to its use for school sports.
Mrs P Ager	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves.
Jane Chesterfield		
Mrs Sarah Chilton		
Natalie Pryor		
Julia Cooper	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Playing fields are essential for healthy living and should not be built on, especially as gardens are so small now.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves - central in a network of footpaths and an area without any POS;</li> <li>• Special to its community - Even though not POS currently people value it. It is a green lung, and visually attractive. Many people walk through the network of alleys daily, have their spirits lifted. It is central to many people's lives. More playing fields are needed. There has been no evidence provided that it is surplus to requirements . Ball kicking space is scarce -ideally it should be more available for general use There are many family houses all around and it is unrealistic to expect youngsters to go a long way</li> <li>• Local in character.</li> </ul>
Ian Duddle	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Children need open spaces to play safely.
Liz Ellis	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community

	Playing Field	and of particular local significance, and local in character. Downing Road Playing field is the only playing field in this part of Tilehurst. It serves Park Lane Primary school and provides open space to the people living close by. There is no other space that could substitute this local amenity. It must be protected for future generations.	
Dave Evans	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is special to the local community and of particular local significance.	
J Fidler			
Michal Geater			
Joanne Hales			
L West			
Tina Allen	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character.	
Gordon Johnson			
K Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It is good for physical and mental health.	
Miss L V Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. The only open green space in that area of Tilehurst, and a long term feature of the area.	
Wendy Levey	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves and local in character.	
Carol Mclellan	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. See comments made on B46.	
Nigel Rowland	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should be designated as Local Green Space. It is special to the local community and of particular local significance. These fields are a community asset and once lost will be felt by many generations to come.	

Katherine Slater	<b>Question 24</b> Downing Road Playing Field	Downing Road Playing Field should not be designated as Local Green Space. I am in favour of redeveloping Park Lane School because its current spread across 4 sites is not helpful to our children (mine are all grown up now but they had to be walked down the road to the field to play and to cross the road to the year 6 block). I do not want Downing Road playing field to be designated as green space if it means this cannot happen. In connection with this, although I think that Blaggrave Recreation Ground in the main should be designated open space, I do not think that a small encroachment on it for the purposes of the school redevelopment would be unreasonable.	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 24</b> Dumbarton Way	There are football goals and open space for leisure facilities. Clayfield Copse is very well used, when busy Dumbarton Way is often quieter.	Dumbarton Way is proposed for inclusion as Local Green Space as part of Milestone Wood and Milestone Way.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Emmer Green Copse	Emmer Green Copse (Rotherfield Way Copse) should be designated as Local Green Space. Steep former working quarry with spring at the bottom. Well used paths through and surrounded by housing. Mature woodland including Beech and Holly. Designated Local Wildlife Site (Rotherfield Way copse LWS).	Rotherfield Way Copse is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Emmer Green Copse	This is not the correct name for this site, it is known locally either as Marshland Square or Rotherfield Way Copse. Its Local Wildlife Site designation calls it Rotherfield Way Copse	Noted. The site is now referred to as Rotherfield Way Copse.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Emmer Green Pond	Emmer Green Pond should be designated as Local Green Space. Popular local feature and location of the Emmer Green village sign. One of last vestiges of the old Emmer Green Village. Green lung between housing.	Emmer Green Pond was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. Nevertheless, it is identified as Public Open Space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Emmer Green Recreation Ground and Allotments	Emmer Green Recreation Ground and allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. Recreation ground situated between housing. The perimeter hedges, a children's play area and a hard-surfaced basketball court. Used for community events. The allotments are popular and carry a waiting list. Tithe Map shows it as Common Land. May have Charity Commission protection.	Emmer Green Recreation Ground and allotments are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Furzeplat	Furzeplat (off Tredegar Road) should be designated as Local Green Space. Coppiced ancient woodland with an informal path connecting to Gravel Hill. Close to residential area. Designated Local Wildlife Site.	Emmer Green Pond was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. Nevertheless, its is subject to protection for its biodiversity value.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Furzeplat	This site is missing from the list yet it is a designated Local Wildlife Site and is publicly owned (RBC) woodland which is open access. Furzeplat	



		forms part of the remaining public open space of the Hemdean Valley and should have exactly the same designations for protection as the nearby Beech Wood and Hemdean Bottom (Bugs Bottom), there is no reason for Furzeplat to have different designations from these two adjacent sites. It should therefore be added as a Local Green Space.	
Tina Allen L West	<b>Question 24</b> Gratwicke Road	Green triangle area in Gratwicke Road should be identified as local green space.	It is not considered that the small green at Gratwicke Road is significant enough to merit protection as Local Green Space.
Councillor Rob White	<b>Question 24</b> Green Road Allotments	Green Road Allotments should be identified as local green space.	Green Road allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Grove Road Green	Grove Road Green should be designated as Local Green Space. Green opposite St Barnabas Church and Emmer Green Primary School with ornamental trees and spring bulbs planted by local community groups.	Grove Road green was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Hemdean Bottom	Hemdean Bottom should be designated as Local Green Space. Known locally as Bug's Bottom, it is a local beauty spot which retains a rural feel yet is surrounded by housing on three sides. It is formed of a wildlife rich chalk grassland meadow in a steep valley enclosed by woodland and hedges. There is a strip of mixed ancient woodland on the western slope. The chalk grassland is managed under the Higher Level Stewardship as a conservation meadow. The lowland chalk grassland habitat of Bugs Bottom is recognised as a priority habitat nationally - this habitat is rare within Reading and Berkshire as a whole. A bridleway runs through the bottom of the valley linking the residential areas into the Oxfordshire countryside. It is well used by local residents as well as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. An ancient hedgerow lines both sides of Gravel Hill, an old sunken lane. Since the closure of Gravel Hill to traffic this has become an increasingly popular route for walking and cycling. Very popular for sledging in winter. Designated Local Wildlife Site (Hemdean Bottom LWS) and other designations. Incorrectly mapped for LWS as it should show the whole site being highlighted.	Hemdean Bottom is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham	<b>Question 24</b> Henley Road	Henley Road Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. The allotments are popular and carry a waiting list.	Henley Road allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not

GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	Allotments		considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Henley Road Cemetery	Henley Road Cemetery should be designated as Local Green Space. Reading cemetery and crematorium. Large prominent open space which used to be part of the historic Caversham Park estate.	The cemetery is protected under existing legislation that does not require duplication in planning policy.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Henley Road Cemetery	This is a large area of publicly accessible open space in this area of Caversham and ought to be included as a Local Green Space	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Hills Meadow	Hills Meadow should be designated as Local Green Space. Major area of open space to the east of Christchurch Meadow. Mown grass and walkways alongside a tree-lined millstream, which eventually meets the River Thames. Grassy BMX track, a skateboarding ramp and car parking. Used for visiting events. Named after Arthur Hill, the last private owner who bequeathed other land to the Council. Well used riverside walk. Many areas planted by local volunteer groups who also help to conserve the area. Part of the meadow is managed as conservation grassland under the Higher Level Stewardship programme. Named after Arthur Hill, C19 mayor & philanthropist, last owner of site, who gave land to Reading. The Corporation agreed it should be a public park in 1928.	Hills Meadow is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Mrs E R Smeeth	<b>Question 24</b> Hirstwood	An actual open space "Hurstwood" is not known to me. As far as I can see there is Hirstwood, a small housing estate with a piece of sloping grass which certainly does not represent a wood.	Noted. This land is not referred to in the Draft Local Plan.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b> Kennet Meadows and Southcote Linear Park	Kennet Meadows and Southcote Linear Park should be identified as Local Green Space. Essential green corridor into the town. Very prone to flooding. Leave as unmanaged pasture and assorted gravel pits	Southcote Linear Park is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan. Identifying the whole of the Kennet Meadows will not comply with the NPPF criteria about not designating a large tract of land. In any case, the Kennet Meadows are still subject to landscape and biodiversity designations and flooding constraints.
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 24</b> Kennet Meadows and Southcote	Kennet Meadows and Southcote Linear Park could be considered as a candidate site for local green space designation should it fulfil the criteria. West Berkshire's Core Strategy at paragraph 2.31 identifies Kennet Valley Meadows as an important part of West Berkshire's and	Southcote Linear Park is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan. Identifying the whole of the Kennet Meadows will not comply with the NPPF criteria about not

	Linear Park	Reading's Green Infrastructure, and states that joint working is important to conserve and enhance the management of this area. Furthermore Area Delivery Plan Policy 5 (Eastern Area) of the West Berkshire Core Strategy identifies that as part of a Biodiversity Opportunity Area, a strategic approach will be taken to the Kennet Valley Meadows to ensure that the habitat continues to be able to support a diverse range of species and that the area's recreational function is maximised.	designating a large tract of land. In any case, the Kennet Meadows are still subject to landscape and biodiversity designations and flooding constraints.
Mrs E R Smeeth	<b>Question 24</b> Kennet Mouth	I object to plans for a park and ride and repeat that the town needs green lungs and the Thames Path is well used by locals and visitors alike. Folk walking and cycling along there do not need to have their lungs filled with traffic fumes from a park and ride. This open space should be added to the existing green list.	The actual areas of public green space around the Kennet Mouth in Reading Borough (i.e. the Coal Woodland) is identified as Local Green Space. However, the Kennet Mouth itself consists of paths and water, and as such does not merit protection as Local Green Space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Kiln Road chalk caves	Kiln Road chalk caves should be designated as Local Green Space. Scout packs use the caves for activities. RBC War time storage in the caves. Prominent site at junction of Kiln Rd and Peppard Rd. Protected woodland. Entrance to cave. <a href="http://www.subbrit.org.uk/sb-sites/sites/h/hanover_chalk_mine/index.shtml">http://www.subbrit.org.uk/sb-sites/sites/h/hanover_chalk_mine/index.shtml</a>	Kiln Road chalk caves were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Kings Meadow and Coal Woodland	Kings Meadow and Coal Woodland should be designated as Local Green Space. Large open space with a pleasant walk along the towpath between Reading Bridge and Kennet Mouth. The towpath forms part of the long distance Thames Path and national cycle route. Used for fairs, horse-racing, cricket and football in C19th, now a popular picnic site with groups of mature trees and willow beds established as arboretum for millennium. Susceptible to flooding in winter. The Coal woodland (historic site of GWR coal yards) is a wooded area raised out of the flood plain - towpath between the woodland and the river bank, and a small area of open space adjacent to the river which extends beyond the towpath and into the river. The woodland separates a Tesco superstore and car park from the river. In the northwest is a Grade II listed Victorian river-fed bathing station currently being restored. Opposite this is Caversham Lock Island and View Island. The playing fields are used by football clubs throughout the season, although fixtures may be disrupted by flooding. Events are staged throughout the year. Car parking by Napier Road. Play area supporting large residential development including Kenavon Drive. Part of Kings Meadow bought by	Kings Meadow and Coal Woodland are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.

		Reading Corporation in 1869 as recreation ground, and 14 acres of adjoining land given to people of Reading by George Palmer of Huntley & Palmers in 1876.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b> Kings Meadow and Coal Woodland	Kings Meadow should be identified as Local Green Space. Retain the willow beds and the parts of the arboretum still left in place	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Land at Deans Farm	Land at Deans Farm should be designated as Local Green Space. Riverside meadow area by housing on site of historic farm. Across the Thames from Kings Meadow. Important archeological finds in this area, thought to be the site of the old Caversham Manor and nationally important religious shrine. Floods in winter. Walking and informal recreation and good wildlife habitat on northern and eastern boundary.	Land at Deans Farm was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. Nevertheless, it is identified as Public Open Space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Land at Peppard Road and Lowfield Road	Land at Peppard Road and Lowfield Road should be designated as Local Green Space. Prominent public open space giving sense of place in front of the Emmer Green shops, opposite the early Victorian terraced cottages and village pond.	Land at Peppard Road and Lowfield Road was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. However, it was considered that the District and Local Centre policy RL1 should identify the importance of small areas of green space that are central to the layout and function of a centre.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Land at Stuart Close	Land at Stuart Close should be designated as Local Green Space. Woodland between Rotherfield Way and Stuart close. Informal path through it. Surrounded by houses.	Land at Stuart Close was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. Nevertheless, it is identified as Public Open Space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Land at The Warren and Blagrave Lane	Land at The Warren and Blagrave Lane should be designated as Local Green Space. Forms part of the Major Landscape Feature. Chalk pit. Upper part forms part of the skyline of the Warren Escarpment. Footpath from Upper Warren Avenue down to the Warren. Well used public right of way. Part of the Warren Woodlands Complex - Local Wildlife Site	The area of woodland at the western end of The Warren is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Mrs Sarah Chilton	<b>Question 24</b> Lousehill Copse	Lousehill Copse should be identified as local green space.	Lousehill Copse is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 24</b> Lower Southcote Allotments	Important as allotments	Lower Southcote allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.

Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields (which includes woods with trails and an organic 'social' orchard) should be given urgent protection.	Mapledurham Playing Fields are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Alistair Appleton	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space, because it provides vital green space for local residents. It is edged by houses, is very popular with local dog walkers, runners and families and has been the site of numerous local and community events, with regular and active community fundraising to try to replace the pavilion on the playing fields. It;	
Patricia Appleton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides pitches for 25 football teams. As part of the National Game Strategy, the FA works continuously with Sport England on the protection of playing fields. There are very few (not subject to flooding) playing fields in Reading;</li> <li>• is home to badgers, grass snakes, slow worms, bats and birds, which are species of principal importance to conservation of biodiversity. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a duty upon all local authorities in England to promote and enhance biodiversity in all of their functions;</li> <li>• is home to Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club which recently upgraded the facilities with support from Sports England, as part of their 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Legacy programme. MLTC now host more than 7,500 player visits per year including juniors, guests from MIND and, hopefully, soon wheelchair players.</li> </ul>	
Alastair Bainton	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space because, as a matter of principle, existing green spaces must be protected from development. No one is likely to create new urban or suburban green spaces. So the ones we have must not be regarded as a kind of land bank for developments which may be convenient. Mapledurham Playing Fields is a charitable trust bequeathed for the sole purpose of a recreation ground. A trust is something that must not be breached.	
Mr Martin Brommell	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields and Pavilion is a public green open space site which should be kept free of any new development of any sort other than those relating specifically and only to recreation and sports activities. With open space across Reading at a premium and the amount of open space per capita of population being below the	

		<p>national available average, it is of critical importance that this site is preserved exactly as it is today in order to provide the health and welfare benefits such green space affords local residents. The only enhancements to MPF should be a much improved pavilion and sporting facilities. Any other type of development such as a school, doctors surgery, shops or any forms of housing would be completely inappropriate and would have a significantly adverse impact to the area and the wellbeing of the local residents. It would also deny the residents of Reading, Caversham and Mapledurham a much loved and well used recreation ground.</p> <p>The nature of the site, which includes sports pitches, a childrens play area, basketball pitch, tennis courts and woodland area of outstanding natural beauty, are critical to the health and recreational benefits of people living and working in the nearby area and across the whole of Reading. The site has an ecological value and contributes significantly to the green infrastructure of Reading. The site is currently designated 'public and strategic open space', protected from development under policy SA16. It should also be designated as 'local green space' in the NPPF in order to benefit from the national level policy protection in the NPPF.</p> <p>Mapledurham Playing Fields and pavilion meets the criteria of being in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; the green space is demonstrably special to the local community and the site holds a particular local significance because of its beauty, recreational value as a playing field, tranquillity and richness of its wildlife. MPF is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p>	
Jane Bickerstaffe	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields (MPF) should be kept for the purpose for which it was left in Trust ie for recreation and sports purposes.</p> <p>The amount of open space per capita of population in Reading is below the national average and it is critical for the health and benefit of local residents, as well as others in Reading, that MPF remain as green space. The children in Caversham, including those at the Heights Primary School, need sports fields and MPF provides one of the only fields that do not flood in Reading in winter. The only improvement it</p>	
George			

Bickerstaffe		<p>needs is renovation of the pavilion and sporting facilities, which the Trustees have neglected badly in recent years.</p> <p>The site is currently designated 'public and strategic open space', protected from development under policy SA16. It should also be designated as 'local green space' in the NPPF in order to benefit from the national level policy protection in the NPPF.</p>	
Steve Ayers	<p><b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields</p>	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space, because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is a charitable trust bequeathed exclusively for the provision and maintenance of a recreation ground;</li> <li>• provides vital green space. Fields in Trust found that 95% of people agree that parks and play areas should be protected from development;</li> <li>• provides pitches for 25 football teams. As part of the National Game Strategy, the FA works continuously with Sport England on the protection of playing fields;</li> <li>• is home to badgers, grass snakes, slow worms, bats and birds, which are species of principal importance to conservation of biodiversity. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a duty upon all local authorities in England to promote and enhance biodiversity in all of their functions;</li> <li>• is home to Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club which recently upgraded the facilities with support from Sports England, as part of their 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Legacy programme. MLTC now host more than 7,500 player visits per year including juniors, guests from MIND and, hopefully, soon wheelchair players;</li> <li>• is designated SA16 (Public and Open Strategic Space) with areas of SA17 (Major Landscape Features).</li> </ul>	
Lucy Bureau			
Geoffrey HW Cole & Lesley L Cole			
Aidan Costelloe			
John Heaps			
John Holland			
Michael Howes			
Nancy Jarakana			
Reverend Keith Knee-Robinson			
Alastair Letchford			
Leone Letchford			
Paul Letchford			
Carol Morton			
Rohan Morton			
Alan Penton			
Pam Reynolds			
Sally Roark			
Robert			

Sherwood			
Susan Spires			
Dr Pam Stuart			
Pamela W Stuart			
Anne and Derek White			
Francis Brown	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	This area should continue to be identified as local green space because the pressure to use part of it as a school is not well founded. The population of school children in that area is low. It is far higher around the most recent major housing development, in the Bugs Bottom area. It should continue to be used as a recreational area. The expense of trying to change the trust is not justifiable. Choosing this site will only delay the provision of more suitable primary education facilities.	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields should be designated as Local Green Space. Playing Fields and Pavilion are used year round by a wide variety of groups and individuals including families, dog walkers, nature lovers, football teams, schools, play groups and the Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club. Large area of close mown grass, meadow grass with wild flower margins, adjoining an area of regenerated woodland consisting of mainly field maple, elm and oak. Recently planted community orchard. An ancient boundary bank runs along the edge of the woodland. Actively supported by many voluntary groups. Charity Commission protection as land was left in Trust.	
Barbara Garden	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space, because it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• was bequeathed in a charitable trust to local residents exclusively for recreation and dog walker;</li> <li>• provides vital green space. Fields in Trust found that 95% of people agree that parks and play areas should be protected from development. Open green space is vitally important to people of all ages for mental and physical health;</li> <li>• is in constant use. It provides pitches for 25 football teams. It is not unusual to find many different groups using it at the same time for different activities;</li> <li>• is home to badgers, grass snakes, slow worms, bats and birds,</li> </ul>	



		<p>which are species of principal importance to conservation of biodiversity. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a duty upon all local authorities in England to promote and enhance biodiversity in all of their functions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is designated SA16 (Public and Open Strategic Space) with areas of SA17 (Major Landscape Features).</li> </ul>	
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields provides vital green space and is well-used by walkers, runners, footballers and tennis players. It was bequeathed exclusively for the provision and maintenance of a recreation ground and, indeed, is covered by a charitable trust with (only) recreational objects. As such, the Charity Commission would have to be persuaded that any development proposal was in the interests of the trust's recreational objects</p> <p>Mapledurham Playing Field is designated SA16 (Public and Open Strategic Space) with areas of SA17 (Major Landscape Features). Any development would fly in the face of national and local public policies relating to open space and recreation.</p>	
Elisa Miles	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space, because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is a charitable trust bequeathed exclusively for the provision and maintenance of a recreation ground;</li> <li>• highly used by the local community and greater Reading (dog walkers, football clubs, a venue for local events (e.g, summer fetes, vintage car rallies and music festivals) and private events (e.g. , corporate events, private weddings), a playground, tennis courts and basketball courts, and are home to the EcoNet Group Friends.</li> <li>• provides vital green space. Fields in Trust found that 95% of people agree that parks and play areas should be protected from development;</li> <li>• provides pitches for 25 football teams. As part of the National Game Strategy, the FA works continuously with Sport England on the protection of playing fields;</li> <li>• is one of the very few playing fields in Reading that are 'playable' throughout the very wet winter months.</li> <li>• is home to badgers, grass snakes, slow worms, bats and birds,</li> </ul>	

		<p>which are species of principal importance to conservation of biodiversity. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a duty upon all local authorities in England to promote and enhance biodiversity in all of their functions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is home to Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club which recently upgraded the facilities with support from Sports England, as part of their 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Legacy programme. MLTC now host more than 7,500 player visits per year including juniors, guests from MIND and, hopefully, soon wheelchair players;</li> <li>• is designated SA16 (Public and Open Strategic Space) with areas of SA17 (Major Landscape Features).</li> </ul>	
John Kavanagh	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as local green space, because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is a charitable trust bequeathed exclusively for the provision and maintenance of a recreation ground;</li> <li>• is home ground for a range of youth football teams, and extremely well-used.</li> <li>• has a lot of special Wildlife. Any encroachment could be disastrous for some species;</li> <li>• it is used for a great many different forms of recreation.</li> </ul> <p>Loss of ANY of the space would be detrimental to the whole area north of the River Thames.</p>	
The Launchbury family	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields provide vital open green space, home to some of the only football pitches that don't flood and used by 25 football teams. As part of the National Game Strategy, the FA works continuously with Sport England on the protection of playing fields.</p> <p>Mapledurham Playing Fields is also the home of The Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club, with recently upgraded facilities with support of Sports England, 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Legacy programme. Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club now host more that 7,500 player visits per year including juniors, guests from MIND and, hopefully, soon wheelchair players.</p> <p>Open space, fresh air and freedom from modern stresses, providing a sense of community and invaluable mental and physical well being.</p>	

Ken Macrae	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields should be identified as a local green space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a green area surrounded by houses that is used extensively for leisure activities, both formal activities such as football, and informal activities such as dog walking.</li> <li>• It is environmentally important, especially the wooded area which supports much wildlife including bats and badgers: whilst this wildlife lives in the wooded area it benefits from being able to roam and fly over the grassed area, mostly after dark.</li> <li>• The area has a community orchard which will have environmental and community benefit once the trees mature, along with the existing environmental benefit of the 'wild' grassland beneath the trees.</li> <li>• It is of some archaeological significance with a Saxon boundary bank and evidence of stone age findings in the local.</li> </ul>	
Paul Myerscough	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields should be designated as 'a local green space' because this can be achieved without any change to its current management. It is highly valued as a playing field for many football clubs, for tennis, and for a large number of children - younger ones who gravitate to the play area, and older ones who use it as a neighbourhood meeting space as well as a facility for practice - basketball, american football, running, etc. I would advocate that the cricket green be reinstated. It is also very popular all day long with dog walkers who socialise as well as exercise here. It provides habitat for a range of wildlife that moves between the fields and the integral woodland and private gardens in the area. This includes foxes, badgers, deer and a wide variety of birdlife. I also believe there are remains of iron an age farming system on part of the land.</p>	
Robert O'Neill	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Please may I suggest the reinforcement of the protection status against urban development of Mapledurham Playing Fields for its green values within the town - a green lung for Reading.</p> <p>In 2007 when Reading had a detailed assessment of its access provision to open space it was scraping the lower limits on that recommended nationally. No additional open land has entered the public options since then. I would hope that Reading BC will ensure that in the future years there will be absolutely no increase in the footprint of building on this site. Due to its status as charitable open land, I would also hope</p>	

		<p>that it is given extended protection in recognition of the gift that was expressly made to this end.</p> <p>If Reading BC or its partners suddenly become in desperate need for additional land, I would hope that it chooses to buy-back existing property and re-uses that. Although this may seem an expensive option now, in the long term it ensures a secure balance of freely accessible open land for the future generations.</p>	
Alan Penton	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Why would any local councillor support losing a valuable and well used facility such as Maple Durham Playing Fields. Clearly they are not in touch with the views of those who it really affects. Choosing to side with the EFA and renege on responsibilities as Trustees, Reading Borough Council have conjured up a herd of "Stalking Horses" to divide an otherwise galvanised community. And then by "Lies, damned lies, and statistics" use the persuasive power of numbers to bolster their weak argument for building a school on Maple Durham playing fields and distort the true feelings of the community.</p> <p>There is, and will continue to be for years to come, a need for the provision of new schools and vital infra-structure to accommodate Reading's expanding community. This requires pre-planning in local government, forward thinking not just knee jerk reaction. Building schools on recreation fields in not the answer - just a short term fix.</p>	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>This site should be identified as Local Green Space. Accept that this site is given over to a new school in recent times, but it contains old field boundaries, old and new orchards, and access to open areas of countryside. it is very important that school buildings be restricted to the areas nearer to Woodcote Road</p>	
Jeff Taylor	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Playing Fields is a charitable trust bequeathed exclusively for the provision and maintenance of a recreation ground. Yet it seems that this open space is constantly under threat of development for housing, schools etc. Such development cannot possible be considered as compatible with the terms of the trust. Once ANY non-recreational development is allowed the terms of the trust will have been breached and further development almost impossible to stop. This will result in the loss of a vital green space which is currently and actively used for</p>	

		sports, children’s play area and diverse recreational activities.	
Pip Waite	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	As Trustees of this valuable resource (MPF) you have failed to look after the pavilion and now are in a position where you might give permission for a school to be built on this open space. I am concerned that the council cannot be trusted to fulfill any of the objectives the public might want despite spending taxpayers money on this consultation. As more housing is built at greater density, public open space becomes even more important for the public welfare. Managing open space does not include building on it.	
Andrea Warner	<b>Question 24</b> Mapledurham Playing Fields	<p>Mapledurham Paying Fields should not be built on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area was bequeathed in perpetuity as an area of recreation, specifically for all those living in the area.</li> <li>• At present, amongst other activities, it provides pitches for 25 football teams for people of all ages, children and adults alike.</li> <li>• Mapledurham Lawn Tennis Club, also part of the Mapledurham sports complex, hosts more than 7,500 player visits per year, a number which is increasing, and which includes young children as well as less able people.</li> <li>• There are children’s play areas which are always well-used by school-age and pre-school children in most weathers, as well as impromptu ball games, etc. where all can enjoy the open space without any fear of traffic or the pollution which goes with it.</li> <li>• It is home to a variety of threatened wildlife, such as bats, badgers, birds (including 2 types of woodpeckers), as well as shrubs, flowers and trees. Reading Borough Council should be supporting, promoting and safeguarding such biodiversity (Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006) for all to share.</li> </ul> <p>Destroying such open spaces deprives not only the present thousands of users of the beautiful open space, but also dispossesses all future generations of what should rightly be their inheritance. It is a disgrace that RBC should ever have considered any change of use for this area, let alone have promoted it as a good option for any building whatsoever.</p>	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA,	<b>Question 24</b> Milestone Wood & Milestone	Milestone Wood and Milestone Way should be designated as Local Green Space. In Caversham Park Village and surrounded by trees. Important residential amenity close to houses. Milestone Way is an important	

FOCC, FOCCG	Way	well used part of pedestrian spine through Caversham Park Village. It has valuable habitat and biodiversity. The wooded strip west of Caverham Park Rd may be ancient woodland and forms the boundary between Reading and South Oxfordshire.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 24</b> Mockbeggar Allotments	Important as allotments	Mockbeggar allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 24</b> New Christ Church School Playing Fields	Open Space in the South Reading Area. Previously part of a brickworks.	New Christ Church School and Playing Fields were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Oakley Road Allotments	Oakley Road Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. The allotments are popular and carry a waiting list. Includes Yew and other trees on the perimeter which were envisaged to be part of the old Caversham Cemetery.	Oakley Road allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
Councillor Rob White	<b>Question 24</b> Reading Cemetery	Reading old cemetery should be identified as local green space.	The cemetery is protected under existing legislation that does not require duplication in planning policy.
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 24</b> Reading Golf Club	As well as leisure facilities, the site has many old trees (eg Oaks, Beeches) which should be preserved. There has been a mass replanting of trees at the Golf Club in the past 2 years- which is beneficial for the environment and wildlife.	Reading Golf Club was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. Part of the site is proposed as a development allocation.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 24</b> Reading Prison	Reading Prison should be identified as Local Green Space. If this comes up for redevelopment, ensure open green space linking to Forbury Gardens and to Kennetside walkway	Reading Prison does not qualify as a Local Green Space.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 24</b> Robert Hewett Recreation Ground	This is the only green space and recreation ground within our neighbourhood and we recommend it for a permanent Local Green Space Designation.  This park was passionately saved a number of years ago by some of our BSANA residents for use of all residents in the region of the Park and especially for the children in the area to have a safe and green place to play. It is our only green space for children to play in in the area. The	Robert Hewett Recreation Ground is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.

		<p>nearest parks are at ½ KM to over ¾ KM away from the Robert Hewett Recreation Ground.</p> <p>The park is unique in its layout—forming a large concave depression in the ground, and as such has a very special look and appeal. It has been noted that this concave hollow was present on the 1877 Ordinance Survey map, and was presumably used as a gravel quarry for local roads.</p> <p>It is currently actively used as an afternoon stop -off for children returning home from the nearby Coley Primary and other schools in the area. To lose this rare patch of land to development would be a shameful act by the Council and one that should be avoided at all costs.</p>	
Clive Bedford	<b>Question 24</b> Scours Lane	Land to right of bottom end of Scours Lane currently used as a sports ground should be identified as local green space.	Land at Scours Lane, Cow Lane and Littlejohn's Farm was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria, not least because national policy states that extensive tracts of land will not qualify. However, the whole are is subject to landscape designations.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Scours Lane, Cow Lane & Littlejohn's Farm	Scours Lane, Cow Lane and Littlejohn's Farm should be designated as Local Green Space. Recreation ground and prominent water meadows next to the River Thames. The fields include a number of veteran trees and hedgerows and there is a historic notable feature Coombe Bank marked on O/S maps. Includes Reading Festival site. The long distance Thames Path runs the full length of the site and is popular with walkers and cyclists.	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 24</b> Thames Path	The map does not identify the whole of the Thames Path from Tilehurst to Sonning Lock as local green space?	A large number of open spaces along the Thames Path are identified, but not all of its extent is green space.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Thameside Promenade and Rivermead	Thameside Promenade and Rivermead should be designated as Local Green Space. Grass area by the River Thames with specimen trees. Used for visiting events. A tarmac surfaced public right of way, which is part of the Thames Long Distance path runs the length of the park. Attractive panoramic views across the river of Caversham Court gardens, St Peters Church and the treed escarpment.	Thameside Promenade and Rivermead are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Allotments	<p>Tilehurst Allotments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves - Central Tilehurst on top of hill many walk there, families use them for generations;</li> <li>• Special to its community - lots of evidence- decades of petitions</li> </ul>	Victoria Recreation Ground and the in-use allotments are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan. However, parts of the site where there is no existing allotment use

		<p>etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local in character - plot numbering pattern of allots site reflects historic use</li> </ul>	<p>are proposed to be brought forward for development.</p>
Nigel Rowland	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Allotments &amp; Victoria Recreation Ground</p>	<p>Tilehurst Allotments and the Victoria Recreation Ground should be designated as Local Green Space. This is a huge asset to the local community.</p>	
Tilehurst Allotments Society	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Allotments &amp; Victoria Recreation Ground</p>	<p>All the land on site A14 should be designated Local Green Space. It meets the criteria listed. It serves the local community. Given the extended duration of the planning disputes, and massive petitions of support from residents it is clear that the land is special to the community holding landscape, recreational and historic value.</p>	
Len Aberly	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)</p>	<p>Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It has always been green and we would like to keep it green.</p>	<p>Tilehurst Triangle was considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but was not considered to fully meet the criteria. However, it was considered that the District and Local Centre policy RL1 should identify the importance of small areas of green space that are central to the layout and function of a centre.</p>
Mrs P Ager	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)</p>	<p>Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It is the hub of the community.</p>	
Clive Bedford	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)</p>	<p>Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves and local in character.</p>	
Lynda Chater	<p><b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)</p>	<p>Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Any development on this site would destroy the heart of Tilehurst. It is a very important space for the community, providing an attractive shopping destination and space for community activities. It</p>	



		is, in essence, the 'village green', and should be protected as a green space.	
Jane Chesterfield	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves.	
Mrs Sarah Chilton			
Michael Geater			
Julia Cooper	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. An important part of the village centre.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	<p>Tilehurst Triangle is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves;</li> <li>• Special to its community - eg community events- carols, Armistice day, social meeting place, objections when bus terminus proposed; The Triangle area is improving steadily and is a growing source of pride and community identity. More benches are being provided and planting of trees and bulbs together with the mature specimens are enhancing the appearance and atmosphere. It enhances the District Centre</li> <li>• Local in character - many old postcards</li> </ul>	
Liz Ellis	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. The Triangle forms the centre of Tilehurst. It is a local heritage site and is the hub of the community. It should be protected as a place of interest for following generations.	
Dave Evans	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. Is it special to the community. A meeting place and a hub for remembrance day.	
J Fidler	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is special to the local community and of	

	Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	particular local significance. Please leave it alone. It is a feature of Tilehurst.	
Gordon Johnson	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It is the heart of the village.	
K Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. It is an oasis of green - contributes to overall look of area.	
Miss L V Jones	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. An integral part of the Village, much used and appreciated.	
Wendy Levey	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves and special to the local community and of particular local significance and local in character.	
Carol Mclellan	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character. The Tilehurst Triangle is the 'heart' of the Village; if this areas not preserved, there would be an adverse effect on the local business and hence the local economy. The knock-on effect being the local community would suffer as a result of any change of use/lack of local resources.	
Tina Allen	<b>Question 24</b>	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is close to the community it serves, special to the local community and of particular local significance, and local in character.	
Mary Bartlett	Tilehurst		
Ian Duddle	Triangle (inc		
Natalie Pryor	Walnut Way green area)		

Nigel Rowland	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is special to the local community and of particular local significance. The Triangle has been recognised as a central hub to Tilehurst and gives it a village identity. I support further improvements to this area.	
Joanne Hales	<b>Question 24</b> Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area)	Tilehurst Triangle (inc Walnut Way green area) should be designated as Local Green Space. It is special to the local community and of particular local significance.	
Katherine Slater			
L West			
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 24</b> Victoria Recreation Ground	Victoria Recreation Ground is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the community it serves - central, pleasant walk through to the shops, vistas across to Chilterns;</li> <li>• Special to its community;</li> <li>• Local in character - Old photos, historic local shows on the rec.</li> </ul>	Victoria Recreation Ground is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Victoria Road Allotments	Victoria Road Allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. The allotments are popular and carry a waiting list.	Victoria Road allotments were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. The importance of allotments is considered separately within policy EN8.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Victoria Road Cemetery	The old Caversham Cemetery, Victoria Road, should be designated as Local Green Space. Cemetery opened in 1885, no further space. Now important as a historical site and managed as a nature area. It contains many old trees and wild flowers. Close to residential area and Caversham Primary School. Immediately adjacent to, Oakley Road allotments. Designated Local Wildlife Site.	The cemetery is protected under existing legislation that does not require duplication in planning policy.
Caversham GLOBE	<b>Question 24</b> Victoria Road Cemetery	This is a designated Local Wildlife Sites, effectively a local nature reserve, which is open to the public. It is a much valued tranquil local green space which is fully accessible to the public and should be added as a Local Green Space.  Note that the Cemetery is contiguous with Oakley Road Allotments which were originally landscaped in the mid Victorian era as part of the Cemetery. Since the Old Cemetery is fully open to the public it could be argued that it meets the criteria for Local Green Space Designation more closely than that of the adjacent allotments which are only open	

		to allotment holders. .	
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> View Island	View Island should be designated as Local Green Space. Pretty, quiet and relaxing island with natural open space acquired by RBC in 1998 and transformed into a nature reserve, managed by local volunteer groups. Originally site of historic boatyard. Contains wildlife pond, wooden sculptures, canoe pontoon. Part of very popular circular walk.	View Island is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> The Warren Woodland (part)	The Warren Woodland should be designated as Local Green Space. The Warren is a narrow strip of prominent ancient woodland on a steep chalk escarpment north of the River Thames. A limited view of the Thames is available from the footpath. It is important to the setting of St Peter's Conservation Area and the view from the Thames. The full strip of the Warren Woodlands should be added here. Part of the Warren Woodlands Complex Local Wildlife Site.	The Warren Woodlands were considered for inclusion as Local Green Space, but were not considered to fully meet the criteria. Some parts of the woodlands are more significant for their landscape character rather than as accessible open space, and is therefore covered by the landscape designation.
James Lloyd	<b>Question 24</b> Waterloo Meadows (and surrounding area)	The site is significant piece of green infrastructure bordering the river Kennet. It has recreational value and interesting biodiversity. It would be great to link this area and the land on the adjacent bank to the strategic green space south of Reading.	Waterloo Meadows are proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
CADRA, Caversham GLOBE, EGRA, FOCC, FOCCG	<b>Question 24</b> Westfield Road Recreation Ground	Westfield Road Recreation ground should be designated as Local Green Space. Neighbourhood recreation area with a small children's play area. Important part of a green walk to work for large numbers of people heading to Reading or Reading Station. Well used for recreation, picnics, dog walk and hugely popular in snow. May have Charity Commission protection.	Westfield Road Recreation Ground is proposed to be Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 25</b>	Generally most changes of use of buildings do not affect the appearance of an area, but may affect the lives of residents and prosperity of an area. Flexibility of use is generally to be applauded-patterns of need change. Eg there used to be restriction on businesses being run from residential homes. Now this would seem totally out of date. The policy should refer to flexibility and change of use over the lifetime of the plan.	Noted. There remains some flexibility for changes of use, but where these are critical to the role of an area, some protections remain.
Environment Agency	<b>Question 25</b>	If the change of use results in a 'more vulnerable' or 'highly vulnerable' then the implications of this should be considered when forming policies especially if the change of use results in an intensification of a more or highly vulnerable development. You should also think about changes of use within the more and highly vulnerable	Noted. A change of use to a more vulnerable use or a highly vulnerable use would need to be considered in terms of the flooding policy. Flood risk has been taken into account in formulating site allocations.

		classifications such as 'drinking establishments' to 'dwelling houses' and the implications of this for site allocations.	
Willowside Homes	Question 25	The new permitted development rights could lead to a significant reduction in the availability of office floorspace within Reading. It is therefore appropriate for Reading to introduce a more protective policy approach to existing employment sites. Many of the sites which are proposed to be allocated for housing are in B1, B2 and B8 use. The new PD rights, together with the allocation of sites in B Class use for alternative uses, will significantly erode Reading's employment land supply, unless such sites are protected. Accordingly, it is considered that B2 and B8 sites should not be allocated for housing.	The need to protect the majority of Reading's employment land is recognised, and is reflected through policies in the employment section.
Mr Aaron Collett	Question 26	There should be a limit on the amount of these shops in Reading. They prey on vulnerable members of society, and increasing their number will only continue the cycle of people caught up in them.	A new policy on betting shops and payday loan companies has been included that seeks to prevent clustering.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 26	I don't know how to legislate against people wasting their money, I hope that public education/support services and alternatives like Credit Unions and market forces will restrict the growth. I suspect on-line gambling etc might grow and be even worse if there were too heavy restrictions on betting shops/payday loan businesses.	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 26	Ban pay day loan companies all together	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 26	Agreed for these to be in a category of their own, but we do not feel qualified to comment on what should be decided.	
Brian Jamieson	Question 26	There should be a new policy. Limitations based on evidence that both of these operations contribute to poverty.	
James Lloyd	Question 26	A new policy on betting shops and pay-day loan companies should be included.	
Scott Versace	Question 26	I would suggest seeking the advice of national charities whose concern it is to support those affected by gambling addiction and others who struggle with debt-management due to unemployment or manipulation from pay-day loan companies.	
John Booth	Question 27	There should be greater protection	
The Butler Partnership	Question 27	Less protection should be applied to public houses in the central area of Reading, where the offer of drinking establishments is already high.	The policy in the draft Local Plan is based on existing policy, with alterations to aid implementation. It is a difficult balance, in that

Mr Aaron Collett	Question 27	There really needs to be more protection of pubs in Reading, Whitley for example has lost all bar one of its pubs, two are now shops, 3 are now houses and 2 sit unused. It's a part of British culture for 100s of years and we are on the verge of losing them in this town.	<p>the need to retain pubs wherever possible is clear, but that overly protective policies will lead in many cases to vacant buildings in those locations where a pub is no longer viable. The draft policy seeks to strike that balance.</p> <p>In the town centre, the approach of less protection is appropriate, as there is a far greater choice of venues, and in many cases the role of a pub as the centre of a community is less applicable.</p>
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 27	Policy seems about right - difficult to legislate against cheap supermarket booze.	
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 27	Current level of policy marginally OK, need to increase actions and enforcements.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 27	We strongly support retaining pubs where possible and certainly protecting them from development where they anchor a district or local centre. There must be planning powers to control the change of use of a pub to a shop in light of the aggressive past policy of companies such as Tesco in buying up pubs for this purpose, which has then backfired when the company experiences financial setbacks, such as in the sad case of the former pub next to Goring Station in Oxon.	
Brian Jamieson	Question 27	The current level of protection is adequate: no more, no less.	
Sonic Star Properties Ltd	Question 27	<p>The current policy (DM15) is satisfactory as it provides sufficient caveats for the change of use of pubs in situations where they are not the only facility in the centre. We do not consider that the policy should contain greater protection.</p> <p>However, if greater protection is proposed, then this should be subject to an allowance for the loss of a public house where it has been vacant for a period of time, or a viability assessment shows that the use is no longer financially viable.</p>	
Scott Versace	Question 27	A greater protection of local pubs should be enforced due to the community support they provide. With fewer meeting places in an ever-growing town, the risk and my concern is that areas will lose their sense of community and people will become less outward-focussed.	
Evelyn Williams	Question 27	Protection should be the same for pubs within the central area as those outside.	
James Lloyd	Question 27	There needs to be more support for communities to participate in Neighbourhood planning and encouraged to conserve buildings of community interest as part of this process	This is not a matter for the local plan.
Mrs Jenny	Question 28	Only relatively few houses will be built annually in Reading. If	The proposed policy is based on option 28.2. It is

Cottee		significant improvements are to be made into the total housing stock 100% new builds should be accessible and adaptable i.e. Option 28.2	considered that this is an achievable standard for new homes, in line with existing requirements regarding Lifetime Homes, which ensures that residents can remain in their homes as their needs change.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.3	
James Lloyd			
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 28	OPTION 28.2 is our preferred option, on the grounds that houses should be treated, first and foremost, as 'Lifetime Homes' rather than financial investments and therefore ALL new builds should be made accessible and, most definitely, adaptable.	
Brian Jamieson	Question 28	Agree with Option 28.2. ALL new homes should at least be future-proofed against infirmity and disability. This will save resources in the long-term	
Elaine Murray	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.1.	
Scott Versace	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.4 - Less than 50% accessible and adaptable	
Evelyn Williams			
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.2. Essential to increase resilience of homes in reading for future use. We would expect new homes to be usable for different stages of life and family use; including that larger houses should be capable of easy division into two households	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.1. SDRL welcome the principle of the standards as they will ensure that there is a base quality of design delivered universally. Additional standards should only be proposed if it can be demonstrated that local circumstances justify doing so. In turn, if it is decided to impose such standards, it will be important to consider whether they should applied in a targeted way e.g. on certain types of tenure (private/affordable, owned/rented etc) dwelling or in certain locations.	
Tarmac	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.4	
University of Reading	Question 28	In the interests of greater flexibility the Plan should not seek to include additional optional standards over and above an established minima for Category 2 purposes. Furthermore, there appears to be no rationale behind options 28.2 - 28.4, which appear somewhat arbitrary and do not appear to be supported by any evidence, as required by the PPG.	
Willowside	Question 28	Prefer Option 28.4. The Local Plan should seek 10% of new homes to be	

Homes		accessible and adaptable dwellings in accordance with Part M of the Building Regulations, subject to the characteristics of the site and viability of the scheme.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 29</b>	Wheelchair access needs to be a feature of more homes in Reading. Since there are so many inaccessible houses at present at least 50% of new homes should be wheelchair accessible.	The proposed policy is within Option 29.3, in that a proportion of 5% is set for developments of 20 units or more. This is only slightly below the 7% discussed in the options, and results from more detailed work.
Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.3	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 29</b>	OPTION 29.2 is our preferred option in order for wheelchair bound persons to have a reasonable choice of home.	
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 29</b>	Agree with Option 29.2. Home provision for disability will save resources.	
James Lloyd	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.2. With an ageing population homes need to be adaptable and there is evidence of the health benefits of people being able to stay in their own homes. The cost of moving people into social care is on the council as a statutory cost so why not place this cost of adaptable buildings on private developers to save/ or at least delay public spending later on.	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.1.	
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.2. It should be towards 100%	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.1. SDRL welcome the principle of the standards as they will ensure that there is a base quality of design delivered universally. Additional standards should only be proposed if it can be demonstrated that local circumstances justify doing so. In turn, if it is decided to impose such standards, it will be important to consider whether they should applied in a targeted way e.g. on certain types of tenure (private/affordable, owned/rented etc) dwelling or in certain locations.	
Tarmac	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.2	
University of Reading	<b>Question 29</b>	The Local Plan should seek to secure a proportion of new homes to be wheelchair accessible or adaptable (Category 3). The PPG is clear (paragraph 005) that local planning authorities should plan to create safe, accessible environments and promote inclusion and social	



		<p>cohesion; local planning authorities should take account of evidence that demonstrates a clear need for housing for people with specific housing needs, and plan to meet this need. The PPG is also clear that local planning authorities should have clear understanding of housing needs in their area, including those with specific housing needs: this should materialise through the wider housing need assessment.</p> <p>Accordingly, we would suggest that the Plan makes provision for a proportion of 'at least 7% wheelchair accessible/adaptable,' which is not currently specified as an option under question 29. This is on the basis that 7% reflects an accurate assessment of the identified housing need in Reading for specialist housing for older people, as set out within the Berkshire SHMA.</p>	
Scott Versace	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.3. This should be comparative to the number of residents currently using wheelchairs.	
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 29</b>	Prefer Option 29.2. The Local Plan should seek 10% of new homes to be wheelchair accessible or adaptable dwellings in accordance with Part M of the Building Regulations, subject to the characteristics of the site and viability of the scheme.	
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 30</b>	The answer is the third option - water is a precious resource that we should not be wasting.	The proposed policy is based on option 30.3, i.e. that all new homes should meet the raised water efficiency standard. This relates to evidence about the level of water stress in the area. It should be noted that compliance with existing policies on the Code for Sustainable Homes would have meant exceeding this on major sites.
John Booth	<b>Question 30</b>	Prefer Option 30.3 - All new dwellings comply with standard.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee			
Dr Antony Cowling			
Reading Urban Wildlife Group			
Scott Versace			
Evelyn Williams			
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 30</b>	Prefer Option 30.1	
Elaine Murray			
Emmer Green	<b>Question 30</b>	OPTION 30.3 is our preferred option, since water efficiency should be a	

Residents' Association		major factor in our future housing and lifestyles.
Environment Agency	Question 30	You should be looking to provide a policy on water efficiency. A more restrictive housing standard of 110l/per/day should be applied due to the fact that the South East of England is in an area of 'serious' water stress.
Brian Jamieson	Question 30	Agree with Option 30.3. As far as practical, extensive compliance will save resources as well as costs for homeowners themselves.
James Lloyd	Question 30	Prefer Option 30.3. If the town is to meet its future carbon targets water efficiency is important as clean water requires a large amount of power to clean it to drinking standards so it is only sensible we are all frugal with our use of water. With the large amount of older homes a good place to start would be to focus our effort and share on new build.
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 30	This could be a serious problem and improvements are needed throughout Reading, not just for new development. As well as water supply, waste water treatment is also an issue. Thames Water has a duty to supply but may find it increasingly difficult. Catchment Climate Change Risk Assessment should be consulted.
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	Question 30	Prefer Option 30.1. SDRL welcome the principle of the standards as they will ensure that there is a base quality of design delivered universally. Additional standards should only be proposed if it can be demonstrated that local circumstances justify doing so. In turn, if it is decided to impose such standards, it will be important to consider whether they should applied in a targeted way e.g. on certain types of tenure (private/affordable, owned/rented etc) dwelling or in certain locations.
Tarmac	Question 30	Prefer Option 30.2
University of Reading	Question 30	Given this is an optional requirement and that water efficiency is addressed via the Building Regulations process it is considered unnecessary to include further prescriptions within the new Local Plan. In the interests of clarity and flexibility we would suggest that the Council proceeds with Option 30.1, i.e. do not require compliance with any standards over and above the minimum in the Building Regulations.
Willowside	Question 30	The increased water efficiency standard is onerous and there should be

Homes		no requirement for all schemes to meet it. Schemes should be assessed on an individual basis having regard to site characteristics and viability.	
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 31</b>	The answer is the third option - we do not want a situation like London with people paying £1000 a month rent for a room they cannot even stand up in.	The proposed policy is based on a version of option 31.2. It recognises that there will be particular difficulties in achieving the national space standards in central Reading, and that rolling out the standard in the centre could result in failing to deliver the housing required. However, elsewhere compliance with the standard is achievable, and is being achieved on a variety of schemes across the Borough, and would assist in achieving a high quality of life.
Dr Megan Aldrich	<b>Question 31</b>	Prefer Option 31.3 - All new dwellings comply with standard.	
Mrs Jenny Cottee			
Brian Jamieson			
James Lloyd			
Elaine Murray			
Reading Urban Wildlife Group			
Scott Versace			
Evelyn Williams			
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 31</b>	Prefer Option 31.1	
Caversham and District Residents' Association	<b>Question 31</b>	We have noticed several applications recently which have proposed the creation of unacceptably small places to live, both in houses which are already sub-divided and in new conversions. We feel concerned at the poor living conditions that would inevitably result. We therefore support Option 31.3.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 31</b>	OPTION 31.3 is most definitely our preferred option, since it should be a basic human right to a minimum space standard, without exception.	
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	<b>Question 31</b>	Prefer Option 31.1. SDRL welcome the principle of the standards as they will ensure that there is a base quality of design delivered universally. Additional standards should only be proposed if it can be demonstrated that local circumstances justify doing so. In turn, if it is decided to impose such standards, it will be important to consider whether they should applied in a targeted way e.g. on certain types of tenure (private/affordable, owned/rented etc) dwelling or in certain locations.	

Tarmac	<b>Question 31</b>	Prefer Option 31.2	
University of Reading	<b>Question 31</b>	On the basis that there is no apparent evidence to support the inclusion of nationally described space standards within the new Local Plan, we would suggest that there is no justification for doing so at the present time. National planning guidance is clear that where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification, covering need, viability and timing. We are not aware of any published evidence to this effect.	
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 31</b>	Require a flexible approach. The NDSS provide a sound basis for the consideration of new residential schemes. However, they are prescriptive and do not take account of the individual circumstances of each scheme. There may be occasions when a minor deviation from the standard would be appropriate, for example, on tightly constrained sites. It is considered onerous for all schemes to meet the standard and each site should be considered on its merits.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 32</b>	In order to ensure that sustainable design and construction policies are in line with the policy objectives of the NPPF (para 9, 17 & 118) and is therefore considered sound, we recommend that policies include the following wording;  "Development proposals will be expected to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments. Proposals should seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity by providing, conserving and enhancing biodiversity and create linkages between green spaces and wildlife corridors."	This is covered by the draft policy on biodiversity and the green network.
John Booth	<b>Question 32</b>	Design in sun-shading and ventilation for hot summers Design in contingency for higher rainfall episodes If any risk of flooding electrics should be at suitable height Pumping systems to keep sewage flowing in floods Permeable hard standing for vehicles	The adaptation to climate change policy covers these matters, albeit in a level of detail appropriate for the Local Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 32</b>	SUDS schemes should be a requirement for all schemes- there are few 'major' development schemes in Reading so it is not sensible to exclude say under 10 house schemes.	The policy on flooding and drainage encourages smaller schemes to also incorporate SuDS wherever possible.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 32</b>	Clearly it is best to have fewer policies and ones that reflect current practice, but resource constraints might produce delays. We do not want any delays to the publication of the draft document in 2017. An updated local plan is needed even if not quite as good as it could be.	Noted.

Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 32</b>	Adopt Passivehaus or Minergie standards, use permaculture philosophies.	The Government has sought to restrict the use of sustainability standards for new housing. Nevertheless, the Council is intending to require zero carbon homes on major new schemes.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 32</b>	<p>We would like to register our concern at the government's removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes and its replacement with minimal building regulations standards.</p> <p>Of greater concern is the acceleration of housebuilding by developers resulting in the quality of future new builds in our location being compromised, since the national housebuilders are allowed to self-regulate their workmanship. In light of recent large building estates in Berkshire that have fallen well short of standards (e.g. Loddon Park in Woodley) we feel that it is a great opportunity for quality of build to be enshrined in the Local Plan for ALL new builds. This is a national problem that has been highlighted by Parliament's own Built Environment Select Committee.</p>	Noted. The Draft Local Plan intends to tackle this issue by requiring zero carbon homes for major new-build housing schemes.
James Lloyd	<b>Question 32</b>	Reading could be more ambitious. We should be demonstrating excellence. Demand is higher than supply so we can demand more from our developers. Reading like Växjö in Sweden could aspire to be the "greenest city in UK". We are aiming to half the CO2 emissions per resident of Reading over the plan period which is what Växjö has already achieved. But noting they have halved the emissions without sacrificing growth:90% increase per capita GDP over the same 20 year period.	The Council is seeking to achieve the most ambitious standards possible within the national framework that has been set. This includes requiring zero carbon homes for major new-build housing schemes and increasing the expectations for non-residential schemes.
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 32</b>	Greening the space eg provision of green spaces and planting of street trees. Environmental benefits as well as making space more visually appealing.	The Draft Plan includes requirements in terms of provision of green spaces and tree planting.
Natural England	<b>Question 32</b>	The England Biodiversity Strategy published by Defra establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The Plan should reflect these principles and identify how the Plan's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained. The NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment 'by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future	The existing approach to the Green Network is built around the need to maintain and establish links between habitats, and this approach is retained in the Draft Local Plan.

		pressures' (NPPF Para 109), which should be demonstrated through the Plan.	
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Question 32	It is important that policies took account of the risks of extreme events	Noted. The adaptation to climate change policy seeks to cover this issue.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 32	Ventilation - as we get periods of warmer weather, very important to consider ventilation in new developments, particularly high rise where safety issues may take over.	The policy on adaptation to climate change requires consideration of ventilation.
Evelyn Williams	Question 32	Consideration of flood resilient features for properties on flood plain and close to flood plain developments such as Lo n'Store.	The policy on flood risk, as well as allocations for sites at risk of flooding, ensure that development addresses these issues.
Dr Megan Aldrich	Question 33	Historically RBC has done a very bad job of protecting heritage assets, with a piecemeal policy where individual buildings may be protected , but the environment which surrounds them has been allowed to become completely degraded by inappropriate development which occasionally borders on the grotesque, such as the treatment of Reading Abbey. In many respects, the centre of Reading has lost its soul, which has consequences for the well-being and social cohesion of residents. It is not just listed buildings but also conservation areas which are under intense and repeated threat. If Reading is actually serious about leveraging its cultural assets, there needs to be an overhaul of attitudes and practices.	The policies and proposals for heritage are substantially expanded in the Draft Local Plan when compared to existing plans. Whilst the Local Plan cannot be the only piece of the jigsaw, it nevertheless illustrates how essential to the plans our heritage is.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	Question 33	We are currently working to re-evaluate our area and encourage the Council to do the following:  a.) Place the most current CA Appraisal of this area on the website in the Russell St / Castle Hill CA link area. We hope that this will be updated by the end of this year.  b.) List all current and future Article 4 directions that affect CAs. The list to clearly show Article 4 directions that affect the Russell St/Castle Hill CA and all CAs should be available from the CA link area.  c.) We ask that basic information is given on the web-site about the area's amenities and reasons for its listing as a CA on the opening to the link.	These are not matters that are within the remit of the Local Plan to address.

		<p>Additionally, efforts should be made once again by RBC, as in prior years, to provide clear and coherent advice via paperwork and leaflets available through estate agents, and community groups to residents and owners of homes in our CA and other CAs about the area's architectural significance and to understand what is to be conserved and valued in the area. Also suggestions to landlords and owners about how to enhance and not degrade the area should be published by the Council and made consistently available going forward as standard operating procedures. This system of public education needs to be included in the Plan going forward.</p>	
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>We are conscious of the fact that Reading has been judged to be a town in the top 16th percentile for historic assets. We consider our area to be one of those assets- and are very conscious of encroachment of the Town Centre in over-shadowing what was originally developed as a neighbourhood for Reading's middle and upper middle class professionals and working class. This area needs to be enhanced for locals and visitors to recognise and appreciate that aspect of Reading's history.</p> <p>To highlight our concern: The scale and views from our most well-known heritage asset, Reading Abbey, has undergone dwarfing by surrounding new tall buildings and arterial roads over past years. We have concerns that this area too, will be treated as an area for encroachment and dwarfing by the Town Centre and that the heritage character of the area and its setting is enhanced and not damaged by new development and infill. For example, we currently have in our CA, valued views northwards from our side streets across to the green hills of Caversham. Those important CA views need to be protected. This area has little opportunity for any more new build in remaining brownfield areas and we wish that the relationship of a residential community to the busier Town Centre with our 4 story terraced houses be maintained.</p>	<p>Noted. Whilst views within the conservation areas would generally be considered within existing policies, longer range important views into and out of the areas were not reflected in policy. A new proposed policy on heritage views is included to try to fill this gap.</p>
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>New development should be sensitive to, recognise and respect the scale, design, materials and setting of historic assets and houses within this CA, as well as their historical and local significance.</p>	<p>Noted. Policies should ensure that these matters are taken into account.</p>
Baker St Area	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>We wish to have a Plan for regeneration and improvement made along</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan must balance the need to</p>

<p>Neighbourhood Association</p>		<p>the Oxford Road as whole from the Town Centre to the Norcot Roundabout. This Road affects our CA directly and contributes to the less- than -savory living conditions in some of the streets off the Oxford Road. This includes an important request for repairing and revitalising the Victorian Keep- owned by the Council, which has long ago fallen into disrepair. The history of the Oxford Road needs to be one that is focused on in the Plan and improvements made to retain its unique charm and flavour to newly arriving immigrant populations that seem to flock naturally to this area.</p> <p>This is the main West Reading pedestrian artery and an important shopping street for many of the immigrant communities in Reading. Whilst the street has always enjoyed a diverse reputation, and a certain unique spirit, this has not always been positive. The continuing degradation of the building and shop stock needs to be arrested and an action plan devised for the better management of shop waste and street furniture.</p> <p>Organisations such as Reading CIC and Reading BID, need to take root in the area, to get the shop -owners and the local communities to work together along the Road to capitalise on revitalisation improvements together. We wish to see this encouraged in the Plan and developed. If this street remains unchecked, and such a system not implemented, there will be further shop quality and community degradation that will continue to see the Road deteriorate to the loss of the entire town.</p>	<p>promote key elements of the strategy, such as the preservation of heritage assets and the role of district centres, such as the Oxford Road, against the need to avoid getting into very significant levels of detail on specific centres. Whilst the draft policy on district and local centres highlights the need for environmental enhancements, looking in more depth at specific centres would more appropriately be a matter for Supplementary Planning Documents. Production of such documents would be a matter that would need to be considered in terms of available resources.</p>
<p>Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association</p>	<p><b>Question 33</b></p>	<p>As the westernmost reaches of Abbey Ward, and a vital area in the early 19th century development of the town, we ask also, in anticipation of higher tourist and visitor traffic due to the Abbey revitalisation that our CA and the Oxford Road- (only a step outside the Town Centre) are given due consideration, so that visitors see the charm of Reading and not -as soon as they start heading west from the Town Centre, an ASB-ridden urban blighted CA.</p>	<p>Noted. The setting of the conservation area should be given consideration in determining applications, in line with policy. Where specific proposals are made, in particular the West Side Major Opportunity Area, this reflects the need to take account of the neighbouring conservation areas.</p>
<p>Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association</p>	<p><b>Question 33</b></p>	<p>We support the Community Activists' submission that requests that the current list of locally important buildings that has fallen into disuse/ abeyance, should be re-launched, perhaps renamed, and the method of local listing/ placing assets on the Register should be reviewed to allow more input from Community and Volunteer Groups so that it becomes</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan contains a policy on locally-listed buildings, and the criteria for inclusion are set out in an Appendix.</p> <p>It is not clear what purpose it would serve to</p>



		an active register. We feel it entirely appropriate to request that all CAs, inclusive of this one, should be listed on this register, as well as individual buildings of import. This needs to be brought into better focus on the Council's website.	place Conservation Areas on the local list, since they already benefit from a more powerful protection.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>The lack of adequate planning controls for CAs allow easily for ruination of the visual appeal of a CA by neglectful and unsympathetic landlords and owner-occupiers. Article 4 Directions are the only legal method of pro-active protection against this gradual ruination of Reading's CA environments. We are requesting that methods and manpower be implemented to allow Article 4s to be applied wherever necessary in our town to maintain and improve the quality of our CAs.</p> <p>We encourage the positive and pro-active use of Article 4's for CAs to become part of the Local Plan. We feel confident that RBC can and should continue to find creative ways of dealing with the difficult issues of application and enforcement, and to try new methods of procedures, so that CAs that urgently need Article 4's put in place (such as ours), can utilise this tool which will help to mitigate past and future damage.</p>	Extension of conservation areas or designation of new Article 4 directions is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Our CA has some polychromatic brickwork that is rapidly disappearing under stone cladding or other unsympathetic rendering work by unconcerned owners and landlords. Also right to the west of this Conservation Area are more streets wherein this brickwork exists along with frequent unique terracotta features which are assets that we would not wish to see disappear or be degraded. Together, these all help to tell the story of the development of West Reading.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to extending this Conservation Area to include some of these outlying buildings and flats, or into possibly creating a new CA or listing a Heritage Asset Area for the area to our west to highlight some of this attractive heritage. Possible Article 4s could be placed on these houses and streets to prevent further damage and this should be encouraged where it is needed.</p>	
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands	<b>Question 33</b>	The term 'historic environment' needs to be defined and we believe that the existing categories of accepted historic asset should be reviewed and extended so that the term in the New Local Plan would include not only listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks and gardens but also emphasise and include:	The term heritage section covers a wide variety of types of asset within the policies it contains, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas, ancient monuments, areas with archaeological potential, locally-listed buildings, heritage views and areas covered by

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Article 4 Directions which protect local buildings</li> <li>• Buildings on a revitalised and reactivated Reading Heritage Assets Register/Locally listed Buildings List</li> <li>• Reading River Views and waterways ( the setting of the Thames, the Kennet, the Holybrook and their associated parks and gardens)</li> <li>• Reading’s unique heritage of polychromatic brickwork</li> <li>• Other historic gardens or green spaces (even where not in public ownership)</li> <li>• Local streetscapes which capture the character of different periods</li> </ul>	article 4 directions due to their historic character.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands	<b>Question 33</b>	We believe that the New Local Plan should reprioritise the historic environment and develop a proactive strategy to better conserve and enhance Reading’s historic assets and positively contribute to the quality of life in a rapidly changing town.	The policies and proposals for heritage are substantially expanded in the Draft Local Plan when compared to existing plans. Whilst the Local Plan cannot be the only piece of the jigsaw, it nevertheless illustrates how essential to the plans our heritage is.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Raising awareness of the value of all historic assets listed above is a vital primary issue. Community Groups and Voluntary bodies can play their part in this, however RBC should aim and plan to do more.</p> <p>We were recently thrilled to see Conservation Areas listed on the front contact page of the new Council website, and it is good to see that now in two clicks you can be at a map of Conservation Areas, but this can be expanded with the latest Conservation Area appraisals by area and making any Article 4’s for each Conservation Area available for review in that Area’s section. These are not minor cosmetic issues but are fundamental to the raising of awareness, and reprioritising attitudes to the historic environment.</p> <p>Additionally, efforts should be made once again by the Council, as in prior years, to provide sound advice via paperwork available through estate agents, and community groups to advise residents and owners of homes in Conservation Areas about the area’s architectural significance and to understand what is being conserved and valued in the area. It is recognised these need to be accessible in other languages than English. If it were possible a direct mailing of such info / leaflets to owners of properties (perhaps via the ratepayers list) would be a positive initiative.</p>	These are not matters that are within the remit of the Local Plan to address.

		<p>We wonder also how the RBC legal team respond to property searches related to Listed Buildings and those in CAs and whether this may present an opportunity to identify to potential new owners what is expected of owning LB or being in a CA - some brief bullet points and links to website etc.</p>	
<p>BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands</p>	<p><b>Question 33</b></p>	<p>Reading's national and regional image needs to be considered in any vision set out for its future in a new Local Plan. With regard to the historic environment, the reputation of the town does not reflect Reading's assets. A study by the Royal Society of Arts places Reading in the top 16% of towns and areas in England for historical assets. The town can improve its reputation through playing to its assets. In terms of these assets, comparable towns and cities include Winchester (top 25%) Hereford (top 15%) and Guildford (top 11%). Many of these towns have more detailed information about local history and heritage than Reading. Likewise, many towns comparable to Reading have an easy to understand network of signs relating to historic sites and walks, while Reading's assets are hard to locate. It is by having better information, more easily available to residents on the web-site that we can most easily state their import to the town overall.</p> <p>To highlight the most obvious example: the scale and views from our most well-known heritage asset, Reading Abbey has undergone dwarfing by surrounding buildings and roads over past years. Other historical assets and areas in our town need to be better respected, rather than be subsumed in modern fabric and infill altogether. The scale and surrounding of historical assets with views of them and from them, need to be carefully considered in light of how the new development will relate to and enhance the historic asset or area. In France, scheduled ancient monuments are automatically protected by a wide perimeter around which there cannot be placed any modern infill without strident substantiating evidence to the ability of that proposal to the enhancement of the listed building itself. We need to look at ways we can be as prudent in our thinking on our historic structures as the French are.</p> <p>Signage is a very important factor, both for visitors and local people.</p>	<p>It is agreed that Reading can make more of its heritage, and the Plan seeks to achieve this.</p> <p>The need to ensure that the setting of heritage assets is protected is acknowledged. However, with the development needs of the Borough, and the poor quality areas that are often already in close proximity, there is a clear role for new development close to heritage assets. The plan aims to ensure that new development sits comfortably alongside historic buildings, and where possible enhances their setting.</p> <p>The role of signage and interpretation is highlighted in e.g. the conservation areas and Abbey Quarter policies.</p>

		Current signage of historical assets is poor or non-existent and Conservation Areas are not marked out by separate street signs, losing an important opportunity to improve awareness.	
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands	<b>Question 33</b>	New development should recognise and respect all historical assets in terms of scale, design, materials, setting, local and historical significance, views of and from. Better documentation and awareness of historic assets will be important to support this. There is considerable scope for a much better relationship between existing planning policies and heritage assets, Conservation Areas and Listed buildings	Noted. The planning policy approach has been substantially improved from existing policies.
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Revitalise and re-launch a Reading Heritage Assets Register/ List of locally important buildings. The current list of locally important buildings has fallen into disuse/ abeyance. It should be re-launched, perhaps renamed, and the method of local listing/ placing assets on the Register should be reviewed to allow more input from Community and Volunteer Groups so that it becomes an active register. Consideration should also be given to allowing areas or streets on the register, as well as individual buildings. This needs to be brought into better focus on the Council's website.</p> <p>As this will not have the force of National Listing it must be used actively in determination of Planning Applications and be specifically endorsed in the Local Plan. (It is noted that two of the 5 items currently on the Local List are within the boundary of the Elvian School site. Some of the planning officers' alternative suggestions for configuration will lead to their retention and others to their demolition... a rot that started when the owners removed all the windows years ago. If demolished 40% of the existing Local List will be lost.)</p>	The Draft Local Plan contains a policy on locally-listed buildings, and the criteria for inclusion are set out in an Appendix.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	Create or make available character assessment toolkits on the Council's website. Assuming the current training of Volunteers and Council Officers to undertake Conservation Area re-appraisals is successful and leads to updated appraisals and action plans, then the toolkit could be made available on the Council's website to support wider local involvement.	The Council will continue to review the information available on the website, although this is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			

Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	Commit to regular assessment of existing Conservation areas with a clear action plan for each area. Local volunteers may be able to assist with reviews where appropriate. The important result is that action plans should be drawn up. These plans should feed in to all routine maintenance and replacement programmes for the public realm.	Work is underway with the CAAC to use local expertise to assess conservation areas, and this may provide a model going forward.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	Consider the extension/ creation of new Conservation Areas or Heritage Asset areas. Reading has exceptional areas of polychromatic brickwork. This brickwork of red, grey and yellow is probably unique in England in its diversity and extent. It covers the range of dwelling type from modest terrace to larger houses. Built during the expansion of Reading in the Victorian and Edwardian eras, this inheritance has for the last 100 years been undervalued. Some areas featuring coloured brick are included in existing Conservation areas, most are not. Consideration should be given to extending existing Conservation areas, creating new ones, or placing relevant important streets/areas on the Heritage Assets Area List or creating Article 4's to protect areas of extant polychrome brickwork in the town.	Designation of conservation areas or new Article 4 directions is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	Undertake a Reading river Views Study. The river Thames and its setting is a national as well as a local asset. Taken together with the Kennet and Holybrook, Reading's waterways are great historic and environmental assets to the town. A Reading River Views study, possibly involving volunteers, included as part of the Local Plan would contribute to and inform Council policies - planning policies, heritage policies, landscape policies, site specific planning briefs, arts and leisure policies, tourism policies, habitat and bio diversity issues. It would also draw consideration to valuing the spaces near the rivers, so that rivers are not over- developed and views obliterated.	The Council considered the benefits of a river view study, and considered that it would be preferable to deal more generally with heritage views. This has led to a specific heritage views policy, into which the CAAC has had considerable input.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	Officer Resources. Given the ranking of Reading referred to above, in the top 16% for historical assets, the current Conservation Officer resource in Reading is inadequate. Swindon in comparison which has a low ranking for historical assets (in the bottom 21%) has a full time Conservation Officer. It is abundantly clear that this is not the role of Historic England and they will not fill this gap. There are many examples of	It is not the role of the Local Plan to make commitments regarding officer resources over a 20-year period.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			

		<p>missed opportunities to conserve important historic assets - even those with Grade I listing - which may have had a different result with greater Conservation Officer input. Whilst current Budget constraints are recognised, the proposed Plan period covers 20 Years. There should therefore be a commitment in the Plan to increase Conservation Officer Resource as soon as possible to match the needs and extent of the historic environment.</p> <p>Likewise whilst successful efforts have been made by Enforcement on high profile breaches ( e.g in Castle Hill) , constraints on Enforcement Officers and legal assessments of the risks and benefits have, inevitably, contributed significantly to the deterioration of historic assets, including Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. There should be a commitment in the Plan to extend the range of enforcement measures appropriate to historic assets.</p> <p>With the current existing relaxed planning policy at the national level, Conservation Areas have little to no protection in terms of owner - initiated development often at the detriment of the Conservation Areas. As. Article 4s are the only legal method which offers the possibility of some of constraint against this gradual ruination of Conservation Area environments. We are requesting that methods and manpower be implemented to allow Article 4s to be applied wherever necessary in our town to maintain and improve the quality of our CAs. This needs to be a long-term goal, and Article 4s need to be considered long before detrimental impact may have an irreversible result.</p>	
<p>Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association</p> <p>BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands</p>	<p><b>Question 33</b></p>	<p>Heritage Champion and Regular Forum.</p> <p>The role of Heritage Champion is important in representing local views on heritage, helping influence planning decisions and in supporting local historic environment services. Champions can make sure that local plans and strategies capture the contribution that the local historic environment can make to the success of an area. This is critical to the enhancement and protection of historic assets in Reading and the role needs to be developed and expanded.</p> <p>It is not a job to be done alone and the Voluntary Groups represented see themselves as providing support and communication channel in</p>	<p>The role of a heritage champion or forum is not within the remit of the Local Plan.</p>

		achieving the objective. Reading needs and deserves a regular forum to ensure that broad measures are in place and ongoing issues receive the necessary attention.	
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Look at best practice of other authorities with the same budget constraints as Reading.</p> <p>A consultation with other towns of similar size and with similar budget constraints should be undertaken to understand and implement good practice techniques in positively maintaining and improving their CAs and historic assets. Again, we point to Swindon for example in this case, with less assets but greater energies expounded on their Conservation than we currently employ. This is only one example, and studies can bring to light better options through sharing knowledge. It is not all about ongoing resource commitment, it can be as simple as how information flows through from web searches. A simple search of Swindon Conservation Areas brings this link.</p> <p><a href="http://swindon.gov.uk/conservationareas">http://swindon.gov.uk/conservationareas</a> as the very first item you see. In it each of the 28 CAs are listed with access to the individual area appraisal and map, at the end is the CA SPG. The next item on the websearch is a slightly different presentation of the same thing;</p> <p><a href="http://ww1.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/listedbuildingsconservationandtrees/Pages/ep-planning-conservationareas.aspx">http://ww1.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/listedbuildingsconservationandtrees/Pages/ep-planning-conservationareas.aspx</a></p> <p>Undertaking exactly the same search for Reading produces this as the first item <a href="http://beta.reading.gov.uk/article/2419/Planning">http://beta.reading.gov.uk/article/2419/Planning</a> and this as the next <a href="http://www.reading.gov.uk/article/8056/Conservation-areas">http://www.reading.gov.uk/article/8056/Conservation-areas</a>. The fourth area listed gives access to <a href="http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/2584/Conservation-Areas-Maps/pdf/Conservation-Areas-Merged.pdf">http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/2584/Conservation-Areas-Maps/pdf/Conservation-Areas-Merged.pdf</a></p> <p>This is not to suggest Swindon is best in class but their way of presenting the information seems easier to access.</p>	The issues with the way that information is presented on the website are noted, although are not for the Local Plan to deal with.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Draft Heritage Statement</p> <p>This document is to be commended; it has however remained in Draft for 2 years and comments made when it was first issued have still not been addressed. Many points and recommended actions in it overlap with the points made above. It should be reviewed and included in the</p>	The content of the Heritage Statement has informed the development of the Local Plan. However, this document does not form part of the Local Plan in itself.
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic			

Society and Redlands		new Local Plan. A stronger and specific action plan with projected time scales could be included incorporating points above. It should be directly accessible and promoted on the website.	
Baker St Area Neighbourhood Association	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>The Abbey Quarter.</p> <p>The achievement of funding for the regeneration of the Abbey Quarter is to be celebrated and commended. The new Local Plan should allow for the on-going achievement of this in the plan period to be used as a Catalyst and Springboard for the re-prioritisation of Reading's historic environment as a whole as set out in this paper.</p> <p>Engaging actively with the local Reading CIC and Reading BID to promote proper businesses reflective of a town that is able to promote tourism, is to be highly encouraged, and we urge that pointed and specific actions with these organisations to promote businesses towards this end be part of the new Local Plan. Such improvements must be Council - led and promoted actions.</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan includes a specific policy that supports the Abbey Quarter project.</p> <p>In terms of engagement with CIC/BID, culture and heritage makes up a large element of the Reading 2050 project, one of the lead organisations of which is the CIC.</p>
BSANA, CADRA, Reading Civic Society and Redlands			
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 33</b>	Specific sites being allocated where they are considered to provide an opportunity to enhance the historic environment. The Butler is a site that would lend itself to such an approach. Indeed, the significance of the Grade II listed building is compromised by incongruous rear extensions, and an existing car repair workshop. The removal of these buildings, and the site's appropriate redevelopment provides an opportunity to enhance the historic environment.	Noted. The area at the rear of the Butler is now incorporated within site CR12c.
Mr Aaron Collett	<b>Question 33</b>	I think historically Reading needs to shout about its place in the history of the county and the country. Maybe an initiative to showcase off the history of this town over the summer?	Noted, although this is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 33</b>	Ease of recognition and increasing public awareness –e.g. pointers regarding use of different materials, more blue plaques.	Policies are now included relating to specific enhancements within conservation areas, and to using new development to better reveal the relationship with heritage.
Dr Antony Cowling	<b>Question 33</b>	Reduce the size and number of conservation areas, this is a positive move, fewer better ones would be a benefit.	Designation of conservation areas is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 33</b>	We are aware of the working group in collaboration with Historic England and are happy to see the outcome of this pilot scheme that will influence policy on the historic environment. We also support CADRA's call for there being a 'Heritage Forum' set up as part of RBC's 'Arts and	Noted,



		Heritage Forum’.	
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>An adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence base to underpin the strategy and policies of the Local Plan is really the starting point.</p> <p>We are aware of the Council’s series of Conservation Area Character Appraisals, the Culture and Heritage Strategy 2015-2030 and the Berkshire Historic Environment Record. Other sources of information on the historic environment include the National Heritage List for England, the Heritage at Risk Register and the Historic Landscape Characterisation due to be completed this summer. However, we are not clear if the Council has other historic environment evidence e.g. is there an extensive urban survey of Reading or other townscape or characterisation study? Is there an urban archaeological database? Is there a list of locally important heritage assets? Has the Council undertaken a survey of grade II buildings at risk?</p> <p>We will expect the Council to have an adequate, up-to-date and relevant historic environment evidence base and to demonstrate in the Local Plan how that historic evidence base has informed and influenced the Plan’s policies and site allocations. We may be able to assist the Council with additional studies e.g. an assessment of the significance of the waterways in Reading.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will continue to assemble evidence on the historic environment which will be compiled for the submission stage.</p>
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>We consider that the positive strategy required by the NPPF should comprise recognition throughout the Plan of the importance of the historic environment, of the historic environment’s role in delivering the Plan’s vision and the wider economic, social and environmental objectives for the Plan area, and of the potential impacts of the Plan’s policies and proposals on the historic environment. The strategy should include strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, as also required by the NPPF.</p> <p>We think the words “positive”, “enhancing” and deliver” are significant, and we believe that the Plan (and Council) should be proactive in the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. We therefore welcome the recognition that a positive strategy goes beyond merely a general protection policy and involves using heritage assets to inform how new development should take</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that the Draft Plan contains a positive and proactive strategy as required by the NPPF, not only through the heritage policies and the policy on the Abbey Quarter, but also throughout the plan, and in particular in the area-specific sections and site allocations.</p> <p>However, any consideration of future measures must be balanced against the likely availability of resources.</p>

		<p>place.</p> <p>However, it is our view that a positive strategy should also go beyond that and we therefore look to local plans to contain commitments to positive measures for the historic environment e.g. a programme of completing and reviewing conservation area appraisals, the implementation of Article 4 Directions where the special interest of a conservation area is being lost through permitted development, the completion of a list of locally important heritage assets or a survey of grade II buildings at risk. The Council's initiative for conservation areas at risk is a good example of a positive action.</p>	
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	We welcome the reference to heritage in the foreword to the document as an indication of the Council's positive and proactive attitude towards the historic environment of Reading and the recognition of the vital importance of the historic environment to both the character of Reading and the quality of life of those within it in paragraph 5.25.	Noted.
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	We welcome the intention to retain the core objective to "Maintain and enhance the historic, built and natural environment of the Borough through investment and high quality design" .	Noted.
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	We would like to see the Vision for the new proposed Local Plan include the conservation and enhancement of the Borough's rich historic environment and the heritage assets therein, both designated and non-designated, and their settings, as part of the positive strategy. We would also welcome the Vision including a greater appreciation of and access to the historic environment and heritage assets and a reference to new development conserving and enhancing the historic environment.	The vision of the Draft Plan makes enhanced reference to the importance of the town's heritage.
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	The NPPF requires the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment to include heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. We welcome the Council's initiative in seeking to tackle conservation areas at risk but on the Historic England 2015 Heritage at Risk Register there are also three very significant assets at risk in the Borough: the grade II* St David's Hall, the grade I Chazey Farm barn and Reading Abbey, which is a Scheduled Monument. It should be noted that outside London the	Noted. The importance of tackling heritage at risk is referred to. However, any consideration of future measures must be balanced against the likely availability of resources.

		<p>Register does not include grade II listed buildings at risk, and that other heritage assets may become at risk during the life of the Local Plan. We therefore suggest including wording within local plans along the lines of:</p> <p>“The Council will monitor buildings or other heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, proactively seeking solutions for assets at risk through discussions with owners and willingness to consider positively development schemes that would ensure the repair and maintenance of the asset, and, as a last resort, using its statutory powers”.</p>	
<p>Historic England</p>	<p><b>Question 33</b></p>	<p>We will be looking in the Local Plan for a detailed development management policy or policies setting out the requirements of development proposals and providing a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal as required by paragraph 154 of the NPPF.</p> <p>This should include criteria for assessing the potential impact of development proposals on the significance of all relevant heritage assets, both designated and non-designated.</p> <p>The policy should reflect paragraph 132 of the NPPF that any harm or loss of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, most often in the form of public benefits. In accordance with paragraphs 132 -135 of the NPPF, the more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be given to its conservation.</p> <p>We would expect the development management policy or policies to set out what is required of applicants e.g.</p> <p>“Applications which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets will be expected to;</p> <p>i) describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise; at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal; using appropriate references such as the Historic Environment</p>	<p>Noted. A detailed development management policy setting out expectations is included at EN1.</p>

		<p>Record and, if necessary, original survey (including, for assets of archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation); and</p> <p>ii) to set out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and a suggested mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets as well as recording loss and advancing knowledge.</p> <p>Where development is permitted that would result in harm to or loss of the significance of a heritage asset, developers will be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of that asset, in a manner appropriate to its importance and the impact, and to make that evidence publicly accessible."</p>	
Historic England	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>The policy or policies could also address issues such as important views or tall buildings. The Council should consider or not it is appropriate to identify land where development would be inappropriate for its historic significance (e.g. Thames Meadows or other green spaces ?). It may also be appropriate to consider a policy or policies protecting areas of special townscape character that create a sense of place, but which do not merit conservation area status. We would welcome a policy promoting good design that respects its historic context.</p>	<p>Noted. Some elements of this, e.g. heritage views and promotion of good design that takes cues from its historic context, are included within the draft plan. Blanket protection of areas (other than conservation areas or other designated assets) will not be appropriate given the need to meet development needs in Reading, but the policies seek to ensure that development makes a positive contribution.</p>
Simona Kermavnar	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Reading does not seem to appreciate its past, which is a huge pity. Reading has a magnificent history, but a tourist is not aware of that as it is not marked. There should be plaques, noticeboards etc.</p> <p>To stress only one aspect: there are hundreds of brick buildings from 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century in Reading. These are beautiful houses but they are simply lost in the flood of ugly "modern" buildings, and many were already brutally ruined. The architecture of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was maybe not appreciated few decades ago, but now it is because it was in many cases simply destroyed as "not important" comparing with "important" older buildings. But beauty in art and architecture is of course not measured only with age.</p>	<p>It is agreed that Reading has not always made the most of its substantial heritage. The Local Plan sets out a positive and proactive strategy to better draw on the substantial heritage interest that we have.</p>
James Lloyd	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>The strategy should be to look to increase the amount and area of conservation areas. With an increase of new build we should be also</p>	<p>Designation of conservation areas is not within the remit of the Local Plan.</p>

		aiming to increase the amount of everyday we handover to future generations.	
James Lloyd	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>As well as finding sites for development the plan should also look to find specific sites of everyday heritage interest that are presently not in conservation areas but because of local provenance they should be conserved. These could be of natural or historic beauty or interest.</p> <p>One area would be Elgar Road because of the links of the buildings to the historic brickworks with interesting design features displaying local craft. Waterloo meadows could also be given greater protection celebrating its heritage and linking it to the strategic green space to the south of reading bordering the river Kennet.</p>	The Draft Local Plan contains scope for identifying locally significant buildings and structures. However, the protection of large areas that do not qualify as conservation areas will not be possible given the substantial needs for new development within the Borough.
James Lloyd	<b>Question 33</b>	With some new permitted development right greater steps should be made to protect everyday heritage and extend some conservation areas to protect important vernacular building of local beauty and heritage value. I would be concerned about external wall insulation being fitted to traditional pre 1919 brick buildings that give the town a distinctive character. These will be seen as no different to the stone cladding which was popular in the 1980 and has done damage to the character of some streets in Reading.	Exercising this kind of control would require an Article 4 direction. Whilst this has been done in some areas of Reading noted for their patterned brickwork, it carries significant resource implications which must be judged against any benefits it brings.
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 33</b>	Turning the prison into a museum? Similar to Milestones in Basingstoke - with displays concentrating on Reading's historic past.	The potential for the prison to include some cultural/heritage element is noted. However, this is likely to form only one element of any designation.
Reading Abbey Quarter Project Team	<b>Question 33</b>	Heritage is widely recognised as an asset in supporting economic development. RBC and partners should continue to engage the commercial sector in mutually beneficial projects within the Abbey Quarter, promoting the Abbey Quarter brand and concept, and encourage further enhancements to its historic environment, by creating an attractive environment for high-quality commercial investment within the Abbey Quarter. The local plan should help encourage the town's public, private and voluntary sectors to work together to raise the profile of Reading's rich heritage, by marketing its heritage attractions and assets, to change perception of Reading and increase participation and engagement with its heritage.	Noted. The Draft Local Plan contains a policy on the Abbey Quarter, and this has had input from the Abbey Quarter Project Team, and reflects the points made.

		<p>The Council’s progress in both protecting and enhancing the Abbey Quarter should be formally recognised within the strategy and its positive contribution to the town centre both identified in the local plan and respected by future development. There are opportunities to improve the conservation and enhancement of Reading’s heritage within this policy framework.</p> <p>The Council’s public consultation for the Reading Abbey Revealed project has shown the high importance that residents and visitors attach to the Quarter’s historic environment. Reading Borough Council has successfully secured external funding through the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) of £1.77m to support the conservation of the Abbey Ruins and the Abbey Gateway (both Scheduled Monument and Grade I listed).</p> <p>Meanwhile the significance of Reading Abbey to the historical development of Reading as a place and the pivotal role its restoration plays in delivering the aspirations for the future of culture and heritage in the town is fully acknowledged in the Cultural &amp; Heritage Strategy 2015-2030 and the Outline Development Framework for the Reading Prison site.</p> <p>The opportunity to formally recognise, protect and enhance the Abbey Quarter’s historic character within the local plan would also follow-up on the recommendations in the last Market Place/London Street Conservation Area Appraisal. This recognised that ‘consideration should be given to designating a new conservation area to the west, based on the 19th century re-development of the town centre (i.e. Friar Street and Broad Street), and a new conservation area to the east based on Forbury Gardens and the site of the former abbey’.</p> <p>This local plan is the ideal opportunity to implement this recommendation and recognise the Council’s proactive and holistic approach to enhancing and protecting the Abbey Quarter as Reading’s Heritage Quarter including the former prison site. The Reading Abbey Revealed Conservation Plan provides an assessment and overview of the Quarter’s built heritage.</p>	
Reading Abbey	Question 33	The strategy should take more positive approach to identifying,	It is agreed that a more positive strategy is

Quarter Project Team		enhancing and protecting Reading's heritage assets. A particularly issue are illegal alterations to listed buildings especially replacement windows and doors, leading to the piecemeal erosion of historic character in some conservation areas (e.g. Castle Hill/Russell Street).	required, and this is contained within the plan. Illegal alterations to listed buildings are, however, an enforcement matter.
Reading Abbey Quarter Project Team	<b>Question 33</b>	<p>Character appraisals of conservation area can identify both features that should be preserved or enhanced and areas where enhancement through development may be desirable. There are opportunities to improve the conservation and enhancement of Reading's heritage by updating Reading's conservation areas.</p> <p>A more proactive approach could involve a closer relationship working with the voluntary groups such as the Civic Society and Resident Associations.</p>	Agreed. The Council is working closely with local groups on the Borough's conservation areas through the Conservation Area Advisory Committee.
Reading Abbey Quarter Project Team	<b>Question 33</b>	The process for locally listed buildings in Reading could also provide the opportunity for communities to proactively nominate buildings and structures that they believe fit the published criteria. This ensures that buildings of local historic and architectural value to Reading's distinctiveness and character are recognised and taken into account when changes affecting the historic environment are proposed.	The plan does not prevent nominations for local listing of buildings in this way. However, any consideration of future measures must be balanced against the likely availability of resources.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 33</b>	Series of historical walks, including the little walkways with interpretation boards and apps to download	This matter is considered to be too detailed for the Local Plan.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 33</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrate pride and awareness of the historic environment and Reading's history by making sure that historic sites, names etc. are always spelt correctly. For example: Simonds Maltings is currently known as 'Simmonds Maltings' (double m), Boorne-Stevens Close (off East Street) has a sign spelt 'Bourne-Stevens Close', Robert Hewett Recreation Ground was spelt Robert 'Hewitt' Close in the 2014/2015 S106 schedule on the RBC website.</li> <li>2. Find creative ways in which historic buildings can be modernised/re-used/redeployed. For example historic buildings such as Reading Town Hall may become unattractive because they are expensive to run, lack of flexibility and poor heating efficiency.</li> <li>3. Recognise that in 2016 some post war buildings should be considered as part of the historic environment.</li> <li>4. Have a strategy within housing planning policy for Reading's historic housing stock.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. On some specific sites identified in the plan, the re-use of buildings is advocated. The policies on heritage need to be operated in a way that allows for beneficial uses.</li> <li>3. Noted. The criteria for local listing includes post-1939 buildings.</li> <li>4. It is not clear what such a strategy would entail.</li> <li>5. The industrial heritage of the Borough is important, and it forms part of the overall heritage picture rather than being a distinct entity.</li> <li>6. Designation of conservation areas is not within the remit of the Local Plan.</li> </ol>

		<p>5. Develop an industrial heritage strategy.</p> <p>6. Consider the possibility of there being other conservation areas in Reading, beyond those already designation. If Reading values its heritage it should consider the designation of an area of working class housing such as the Milman Road and Swainstone Road area for conservation area status. (Note that the redevelopment of the Spring Gardens area in the 1970s left 61-69 Waterloo Road as an example of the type of housing that existed in the area.)</p>	
John Booth	Question 34	Bus routes, cycleways, walkways, green-space, district heating, ground-sourced heat - if we are investing money, energy and carbon - all scarce resources - need to build to last.	Noted. These matters are mostly covered within the policy on infrastructure provision.
Ian Campbell	Question 34	To support growth in a popular area like Reading and its environs fast and frequent public transport is essential. Unlike many other locations in the Home Counties around London, Reading already has above average public transport links to London by rail. But convenient public transport around Reading and its environs and the remainder of the Thames Valley is weak. If most of the new building is crammed into the town centre this handicap matters less. If major new house building takes place on greenfields beyond Reading's boundaries, in order to reduce private car reliance to the low levels expected in the future, fast, frequent and comprehensive sub-regional rapid transport solutions will be needed. This will only be possible with the benefit of 'land value capture' to fund mass rapid transport systems.	It is agreed that any major urban extensions or new settlements outside the urban area will require high quality public transport provision. The Council is working with its neighbours to ensure that any such development is supported by timely delivery of the necessary infrastructure.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	Question 34	Re-routing of through traffic over an additional Thames Bridge should be a primary policy. A new bridge would benefit both Caversham and the wider Borough of Reading.	Noted. The Council continues to work with its neighbours towards the provision of improved cross-Thames travel, and this is reflected in the Local Plan.
Mr Aaron Collett	Question 34	The biggest area I feel needs investment is the road and traffic system, Reading is becoming a shortcut for those who want to circumnavigate the M4 causing massive tailbacks especially on the IDR. More incentives to use park and rides, buses and consider a Relief road bordering Reading that takes the traffic away from the centre of the town?	Noted. There are a number of major transport projects being drawn up to try to relieve pressure from the roads, set out both in the plan itself and in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	Question 34	The first point is that we need very significantly more housing within the travel to work distance of what is referred to as Reading ,but is considerably bigger than the Borough- at prices people can afford to pay. Cash incentives/land availability are needed to make for needed	The importance of providing housing is acknowledged, and is an essential element of the plan.



		<p>housing development.</p> <p>Of the headings listed education and health facilities are needed to match development and remedy current shortages.</p> <p>Given the anticipated growth within and close to the borough boundaries leisure and cultural facilities need upgrading and land must be allocated for this. To still refer to Reading as a city, and have such massive dwellings growth targets whilst relying on London or TV for cultural life is inconsistent.</p>	<p>In terms of education and health, the Council is continuing to work with its partners to address the needs created by new development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan looks at this issue, and this work will continue as the plan develops.</p> <p>The Retail and Leisure Study identifies specific leisure facilities required, which is set out in the relevant section.</p>
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 34	Light rail, renewable energy , dedicated cycle routes	The infrastructure delivery plan considers renewable energy and cycling infrastructure. The Local Plan identifies cycle routes where improvements will be sought and also the specific scheme for NCN route 422. In terms of light rail, the MRT scheme explored this option, but is now a bus-based scheme.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 34	Of particular concern in Emmer Green is: quality of roads; provision of public transport; schools, libraries and educational facilities; health facilities; provision of public green spaces for health and leisure; provision of social and community centres with activities for all ages.	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers these matters in more detail insofar as they are needed to support growth.
Foudry Properties Limited	Question 34	Foudry remain supportive of the future investment in the Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) and this will be important to the success of South Reading's further growth. It is understood that the MRT route will follow the A33 in this locality. Foudry contends that the safeguarded route for MRT could and should avoid impacting directly on this site as further loss of developable land will adversely affect delivery options.	Noted.
Highways England	Question 34	The M4 is currently subject to congestion at peak hours and we would be concerned if development impacts were not appropriately mitigated. We welcome the inclusion of sustainable transport schemes as in line with NPPF in order to manage down the demand on the M4. We welcome a meeting with Reading Borough Council if any improvements are identified that have the potential to directly or indirectly impact the M4 in order to facilitate delivery of the Local Plan. These should be identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.	<p>Transport modelling of the proposals is currently underway, and the report will be shared with the Highways Agency when available. Sustainable transport schemes continue to make up a key part of the overall strategy.</p> <p>The Smart motorway plans are included within the Plan and shown on the Proposals Map.</p>

		You will be aware of the Highways England proposal to deliver a Smart Motorway Scheme between M4 Junctions 3 to 12. There is not a detailed programme of works or detailed design for the M4 Smart Motorway scheme. This is currently being developed and will determine the scale of works that would impact on these sites if they were taken forward.	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 34</b>	Schools, roads - and a strategy for town centre and improved bridge crossings over the Thames	Education and transport infrastructure is covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, a summary schedule of which is in the Implementation section. This includes improved crossing of the Thames, which is also highlighted elsewhere in the Local Plan.
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 34</b>	The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule produced in March 2014 identifies Green Park railway station as a piece of transport infrastructure that could be funded using CIL revenue. Securing the necessary additional funds to complete the scheme will provide a sustainable transport connection between south Reading and the town centre, allowing workers on Green Park to be less dependent on cars for commuting, as well as providing similar benefits for other local sites, such as Green Park village, Island Road (site A31), Madejski Stadium (site A32) and Worton Grange (site B37). OP therefore encourages Reading BC to prioritise CIL funding for the completion of the station.	Noted. Green Park station and interchange is identified as a project appropriate for CIL funding on the Council's Regulation 123 list.
Oxford Properties	<b>Question 34</b>	Completion of the MRT link between Mere Oak Park & Ride and Reading town centre must be a priority. Without it, future development not already accounted for in South Reading, will be constrained by the impact on the road network.	Agreed. South MRT is a priority for the Council. More information on implementation and timescales is available on the Council's website.
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 34</b>	Transport: Oxfordshire County Council will work with Reading BC and other partners to assess the transport impacts of Reading's growth on the highway network within South Oxfordshire and to identify appropriate mitigating measures.  Oxfordshire County Council also supports the development of the rail network in Reading as a means of further encouraging public transport use, especially for journeys to work.	Noted. Transport modelling of the proposals is currently underway, and the report will be shared with Oxfordshire County Council and South Oxfordshire District Council when available. Sustainable transport schemes including rail continue to make up a key part of the overall strategy.
Oxfordshire	<b>Question 34</b>	Education: Given the movement of school pupils across the local	Noted. The Council has asked Oxfordshire County

County Council		authority boundaries between Reading and Oxfordshire, Oxfordshire County Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the borough council any possible implications for the demand and supply of school places in both authorities relating to the new Local Plan.	Council for further details on cross boundary movement of pupils, and will continue to liaise as the plan develops. Where developments are proposed on the edge of Reading in South Oxfordshire District, this is a matter which should also be considered, as there is not likely to be scope to accommodate a significant increase in Oxfordshire pupils in Reading schools.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 34</b>	Cycleways, pedestrian routes, buses, bus shelters, seating at bus stops. Consider ALL new development to have 20mph speed limit and pedestrian priority zones (can't remember the terminology: the space is neither pavement nor roadway, cars are on sufferance)	Noted. There are a number of sustainable transport projects being drawn up, set out both in the plan itself and in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Speed limits is not a matter for the Local Plan.
Sackville Developments (Reading) Ltd	<b>Question 34</b>	It is critical that the Council's Infrastructure plan mitigates the requirements that new development creates (e.g. education, health, community facilities and transport). It should not be used to address a backlog of investment. The infrastructure plan should target investment in areas where new development is proposed to maximise the benefits and help to act as a catalyst to future investment. In particular, we recommend investment in public realm and transport to ensure that the town centre thrives and this is delivered in a timely manner.	Noted.
Tarmac	<b>Question 34</b>	A town with the ambition and continuous track record of economic success requires modern infrastructure provision. Appropriate roads, power supply, drainage networks, water supply are all vital to support an expanding local and sub-regional economy.	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers these matters in more detail insofar as they are needed to support growth.
Thames Water	<b>Question 34</b>	A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it requires to serve it and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.  Paragraphs 156 and 162 of the NPPF and the NPPG ref Reference ID: 34-001-20140306 relates to water and wastewater. We consider a specific Policy on water and sewerage infrastructure, within the Local Plan, is required. Suggested policy:	The importance of provision of water and sewerage infrastructure is acknowledged. However, it is not the Council's intention to have a separate policy on all matters. Policy EN16 ensures that water and sewerage infrastructure is sufficient.

		<p><i>PROPOSED POLICY - WATER AND SEWERAGE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY:</i>  <i>Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site service infrastructure where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>sufficient capacity already exists or</i></li> <li>2. <i>extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development which will ensure that the environment and the amenity of local residents are not adversely affected.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, the developer should set out how the infrastructure improvements will be completed prior to occupation of the development."</i></p> <p>Text along the following lines should be added to the Local Plan to support the above proposed Policy:</p> <p><i>"PROPOSED NEW POLICY SUPPORTING TEXT:</i>  <i>The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing infrastructure. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by the water company, the Council will require the developer to set out how the infrastructure will be delivered ."</i></p>	
Universities Superannuation Scheme	Question 34	USS considers the proposed Mass Rapid Transit Scheme along the A33 corridor to be important to support the vitality of the Borough, improving transport options for commuters and improving public transport connectivity in the area.	Noted. This policy is being actively brought forward at the current time.
University of Reading	Question 34	The University would record its support for the delivery of a third Thames Bridge. A third Thames Bridge is considered critical to the future of Reading and must be considered as a fundamental requirement in terms of strategic infrastructure.	Noted. The Council continues to work with its neighbours towards the provision of improved cross-Thames travel, and this is reflected in the Local Plan.
Scott Versace	Question 34	Sustainability should be at the forefront of any infrastructure planning.	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers

		Water, energy, recycling and other waste management as well as transport and more.	these matters in more detail insofar as they are needed to support growth.
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 34</b>	When the Council is preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to support the Local Plan, consideration will need to be given to the impact upon West Berkshire infrastructure given the linkages between the eastern-most part of West Berkshire and Reading and the likelihood of cumulative impacts from developments in West Berkshire and Reading.	Noted. The Council will continue to cooperate with West Berkshire Council in considering the infrastructure requirements of growth across the area.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 34</b>	Gas; Water and sewage; Electricity; Wifi and phone; Parking; Road network, cycle network, pedestrian zones and footpaths; Public transport; Allotments; Schools; Doctors	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers these matters in more detail insofar as they are needed to support growth.
Willowside Homes	<b>Question 34</b>	The Regulation 123 list should be split into geographic areas in order to ensure CIL receipts are benefiting the whole Borough, not just Central and South Reading.	CIL Regulations ensure that 15% of receipts are spent in the local area, and the Council will continue to comply with these requirements.
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 35</b>	Agree with separate plan, but not convinced of 'joint'.	Noted. Work is now underway on a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan covering Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Bracknell Forest Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Consultation on Issues and Options is due to begin in Summer 2017. This is considered to be the most robust approach, given that minerals and waste issues usually need to be dealt with on the basis of a wider geographical area.
Emmer Green Residents' Association	<b>Question 35</b>	Agree with separate joint plan, but only with the proviso that any future controversial industrial extraction requests, such as fracking, is fully open to public consultation and any decision taken would not be to the detriment of the health and wellbeing of local residents.	
Hampshire County Council	<b>Question 35</b>	<p>Hampshire have historically provided around 30,000 tonnes of marine-won and around 96,000 tonnes of land-won aggregate to Berkshire, although early indications are that this has significantly reduced since 2009.</p> <p>It is noted that Reading is a net consumer of aggregates, although the limited amount of secondary or recycled aggregate it does produce is still of great value to the overall aggregate supply for both Reading and the surrounding authority areas. Secondary and recycled aggregate can have potential to be used as a substitute for primary aggregate reducing the need to import, or extract primary materials. The NPPF encourages existing aggregate recycling operations to be safeguarded as a means to protect operations from potential encroachment which may jeopardise the production and supply of recycled and secondary aggregate.</p> <p>Despite Reading being covered by urban development, there remains potential to recover previously sterilised aggregate resources as an</p>	

		<p>integral part of redevelopment projects.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council welcome any opportunity to share examples of best practice in support of a joint minerals local plan.</p>	
Brian Jamieson	<b>Question 35</b>	Agree with a separate joint Minerals Local Plan. It would be sensible to work together.	
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 35</b>	A separate joint Minerals Local Plan, prepared with other Berkshire UAs, would be an appropriate approach and would be preferable to either including minerals policies in the new Reading Local Plan or preparing a separate minerals local plan for Reading alone. But the Issues and Options paper does not say what would happen in the event that the other Berkshire UAs do not agree to preparation of a joint plan. Reading BC should make clear what its fall-back position is, with commitment to either including minerals policies in the new Reading Local Plan or preparing a separate minerals local plan for Reading alone.	
BBOWT	<b>Question 35</b>	Agree that a separate joint Minerals Local Plan is the correct approach.	
John Booth			
Elaine Murray			
Reading Urban Wildlife Group			
James Lloyd	<b>Question 35</b> <b>Question 36</b>	I think it is important that the local plan includes all considerations and is as strategic as possible. We should not be considering waste and minerals separately.	
Surrey County Council	<b>Question 35</b> <b>Question 36</b>	As Minerals and Waste Matters are not included within the scope of the plan, we assume that the Duty to Cooperate on Minerals and Waste issues will apply to the Joint Minerals and Waste Plans as they progress and that you will engage with the County Council at a later date through this joint process.	Noted. The Duty to Cooperate will apply to the Council and its partner authorities in undertaking Minerals and Waste planning.
West Berkshire Council	<b>Question 35</b> <b>Question 36</b>	We would agree that the both the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire and the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire are somewhat dated. An up to date Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan would provide a more robust policy context for Reading Borough Council to determine planning applications for minerals and minerals associated development, and waste development.	Noted. Work is now underway on a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan covering Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Bracknell Forest Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Consultation on Issues and Options is due to begin in Summer 2017. This

		It is for Reading Borough Council to determine the most appropriate method for developing and adopting an up to date and appropriate minerals and waste policy framework but it is recognised that joint working may be an appropriate approach.	is considered to be the most robust approach, given that minerals and waste issues usually need to be dealt with on the basis of a wider geographical area.
Mr Aaron Collett	Question 36	I think a joint plan for waste management is the correct thing to do, in fact. I think that it's a success for this and the other local councils involved. I think maybe lessons from this can be taken and used across other areas - education for instance.	
BBOWT	Question 36	Agree that a joint waste plan is the correct approach	
Dr Antony Cowling			
Brian Jamieson			
John Booth	Question 36	A joint plan may be the correct approach, but would certainly like to see waste dealt with very locally to avoid transportation costs not shipped miles away for incineration. Perhaps circular economy will require local warehousing to bulk up different types of material.	
Emmer Green Residents' Association	Question 36	It fully makes sense to jointly plan and execute our waste management with neighbouring councils since this is a problem of a much wider nature. Furthermore, it would be a sensible approach for Reading to adopt SODC's recycling model, which includes door-to-door collection of glass and compost for incinerating (including bones). A joint Waste Local Plan must also actively encourage reducing waste creation as a front line measure to save raw materials and the energy and chemicals involved in recycling.	
Hampshire County Council	Question 36	Reading currently exports large amounts of CD+E waste to facilities in Hampshire, with insignificant levels of waste sent to Hampshire's limited landfill capacity. Hampshire also currently exports large amounts of CD+E Waste to Reading, along with a minor, yet significant amount due to its nature of specialist clinical waste.  National Planning Policy for Waste seeks to ensure that the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the efficient operations. Safeguarding of waste management infrastructure providing strategic capacity to both	

		<p>Reading and surrounding authority areas could be an effective tool for addressing this aspect of national policy.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council welcome any opportunity to share examples of best practice in support of a joint waste local plan.</p>	
Hampshire County Council	<b>Question 36</b>	<p>Reading currently exports large amounts of CD+E waste to facilities in Hampshire, with insignificant levels of waste sent to Hampshire's limited landfill capacity. Hampshire also currently exports large amounts of CD+E Waste to Reading, along with a minor, yet significant amount due to its nature of specialist clinical waste.</p> <p>National Planning Policy for Waste seeks to ensure that the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the efficient operations. Safeguarding of waste management infrastructure providing strategic capacity to both Reading and surrounding authority areas could be an effective tool for addressing this aspect of national policy.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council welcome any opportunity to share examples of best practice in support of a joint waste local plan.</p>	
Elaine Murray	<b>Question 36</b>	<p>Do not agree that a separate joint waste plan is the correct approach</p>	
Oxfordshire County Council	<b>Question 36</b>	<p>A separate joint Waste Local Plan, prepared with other Berkshire UAs, would be an appropriate approach and would be preferable to either including waste policies in the Reading Plan or preparing a separate waste local plan for Reading alone. Paragraph 5.38 states: 'A separate Waste Local Plan, ideally prepared jointly with neighbouring authorities, will be required'. This is a stronger position than is the case for minerals but it is still not clear what would happen in the event that the other Berkshire UAs do not agree to preparation of a joint plan. There should be clear commitment that, in such event, either waste policies will be included in the new Reading Local Plan or a separate waste local plan will be prepared for Reading alone.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.36, the sentence: 'Reading's municipal solid waste, which includes household waste, after being sorted at Smallmead, then goes to the energy from waste plant in Slough, with the residual waste</p>	



		left after that process currently mainly being landfilled in Oxfordshire' does not seem correct. As written, it appears to be saying that residues from the Slough EFW plant are currently landfilled in Oxfordshire. It is our understanding that there are no landfill sites in Oxfordshire that are permitted to take this type of (hazardous) waste. We wonder if the sentence is intended to mean that residues from Smallmead are landfilled in Oxfordshire.	
Evelyn Williams	<b>Question 36</b>	Agree with separate plan, but not convinced of 'joint'.	
John Booth	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>South East Plan had cross-cutting policies CC1 to CC3 on Sustainable Development, Climate Change, and Resource Use (achieving sustainable levels of resource use; reducing greenhouse gas emissions; adapting to climate change; stabilising the ecological footprint).</p> <p>Reading Climate Change Partnership has a Vision that 'Low carbon living will be the norm in 2050' and a target "we will work to reduce the carbon footprint of the borough in 2020 by 34% compared with levels in 2005." Would like to see commitment to similar sustainability assessments and targets for Reading LA and TV Berkshire LEP area.</p>	The Climate Change Strategy feeds into the Local Plan, and the plan seeks to provide development that helps to accord with those aims. A range of policies seeking high standards of new development are included.
The Butler Partnership	<b>Question 37</b>	A specific policy that recognises the need to provide additional hotel accommodation in the Borough, and supports such development.	There has been a substantial amount of hotel development in recent years, and it is not clear that there is a significant additional need that should be fulfilled. Nevertheless, policy CR4 includes general support for leisure and tourism uses in the centre.
Ian Campbell	<b>Question 37</b>	There is an opportunity for wealthy areas like Reading and the Thames Valley to raise very substantial capital funding through land value capture. Overcoming Reading's need for new infrastructure, and as a means of financially compensating residents whose lifestyle or financial expectations are hurt by new building, land value capture is a rare opportunity for a wealthy area to maintain wider support through targeted compensation. It is an opportunity for Reading and its Thames Valley neighbour councils to raise billions, not millions of pounds for its area. Does Reading Council intend to ignore this immense source of community generated wealth?	It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to introduce new models of taxation.
Mrs Jenny Cottee	<b>Question 37</b>	Sound and light as well as air quality should be included -i.e. shielding dwellings from noisy surroundings (e.g. development near railway	Noise and light pollution are dealt with in the residential amenity and pollution policies of the

		lines), and having acceptable street lighting quality standards (warm white etc). Mental health issues (promoting feel-good factors) should have a bearing on policy as physical health issues do (air quality).	Local Plan. Promotion of well-being is also important and feeds into policies relating to amenity and internal space standards of new dwellings.
Dr Antony Cowling	Question 37	Renewable energy, air quality, mental health.	Renewable energy and air quality are addressed by policies in the plan. Promotion of well-being is also important and feeds into policies relating to amenity and internal space standards of new dwellings.
James Lloyd	Question 37	I would like to see an adaptation and resilience plan mapping environment agency data against local climate modelling. I would also like this to influence a green infrastructure plan actively looking to the interconnectivity of green and blue spaces into the surrounding countryside. This could also correspond with access and recreation planning.	There is no separate adaptation and resilience plan included within the Local Plan. The production of additional strategies such as this would be dependent on available resources.
Elaine Murray	Question 37	Reference to Education provision policy and Transport policy	Policies for transport and community uses including education are included.
Network Rail	Question 37	<p>Councils are advised that level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways. Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.</p> <p>As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services.</p> <p>In this regard, we would request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings is specifically addressed through planning policy as there have been instances whereby Network Rail has not been consulted as statutory undertaker</p>	Noted. However, there are no level crossings within Reading Borough. The nearest footpath crossings are just outside the Borough boundary, and not in a location where development is expected to lead to any significant increase in use. The nearest road level crossing, at Ufton Nervet, is over 6 km from the Borough boundary.

		<p>and a proposal has impacted on a level crossing. We request that a policy is provided confirming that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council have a statutory responsibility to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:</li> <li>• Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and</li> <li>• The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.</li> </ul>	
Brian Oatway	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>Given the great increase in aging population over the next 20 years it is essential that their safety be considered when out and about.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The middle aged only take a few days to recover from bad bruising, the elderly several weeks.</li> <li>• The middle aged only take a few weeks to recover from broken bones, the elderly several months.</li> <li>• Intimidation can mostly be shrugged off by the middle aged, it can mean that the elderly do not leave the safety of their house.</li> <li>• Daily exercise is vital, be it a 20 minute walk to the shops or more.</li> </ul> <p>Currently experience shows that all the adverse risks to the elderly are increasing particularly as it is now so intimidating to walk on pavements and footpaths due to cyclists going too fast and passing too close. Hopefully, we will be given protected areas on pavements and footpaths where we can walk in safety.</p>	The Local Plan seeks general improvements to walking and cycling routes, for the benefit of all members of the population.
Mr Robert O'Neill	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>Two other sites should be left earmarked for education - namely Caversham Primary School, Hemdean Road Caversham. and Hemdean House School, Hemdean Road, Caversham. Reading. I feel that we are running into a future big problem with finding adequate space for education in the area to the North of the Thames and a potential loss</p>	A general policy on loss of community uses, including education, is included within the plan, because this issue applies to education facilities across the Borough. This is a preferable approach to site-by-site protection.

		of both or either of these sites to in-fill housing or other would compound the problems for the future.	
Eleanor Pitts	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>We need to protect health of citizens, reduce carbon emissions and pollution, look at ways of using the power of the LA to generate improvements for wildlife, and nature. Encourage sustainable local food production (not animal husbandry). Follow in the footsteps of towns that generate their own power communally. Encourage use of public transport by making it affordable, clean and efficient - subsidise it by making it more expensive to drive cars in Reading. (Try riding a bike in Reading and see how unsafe it feels and then try to improve the situation.)</p> <p>Be aware of the potential impacts of climate change and build in safeguards in planning and building regs. Encourage local clean green jobs and make a name for yourselves in doing this. Educate the population with honest information that they can trust.</p>	The Climate Change Strategy feeds into the Local Plan, and the plan seeks to provide development that helps to accord with those aims. A range of policies seeking high standards of new development are included. However, many of the items mentioned here are more appropriate for an overall sustainability strategy than the Local Plan, as they will not be controllable through planning powers.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>Flooding, drainage, reduction in areas for infiltration are all relevant to Reading. We have had flooding due to poorly maintained surface water drainage; flooding due to lack of capacity in surface water drainage and flooding due to increased water levels, over flow of the river systems</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all new developments should have a sustainable urban drainage scheme</li> <li>with higher intense rainfall, larger capacity gutters, downpipes, soakaways. More than one soakaway per side of dwelling</li> <li>permeable hard standing for vehicles incorporated in construction design to reduce the amount of additional, poor quality construction after sale</li> <li>suggest a change in national or local laws to insist that persons applying for building regs pay a fee to enable clearance of roadside drains after construction is completed</li> <li>maximise use of water reduction techniques inside new homes</li> <li>increased permeability of cycleways/pedestrian routes either planting on both sides to shed water into the ground or permeable pathways</li> </ol>	There are a variety of measures within the Local Plan relating to water including requirements for SuDS in major schemes plus encouragement for SuDS in minor schemes, and guidance on how SuDS should be achieved; policy on flood risk and adaptation to climate change; and water reduction measures in new development.
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	<b>Question 37</b>	<p>More greenery for cooling, air quality improvement and wildlife corridors/food/shelter.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increase urban tree provision</li> </ol>	There are a variety of policies within the Local Plan that seek improved green infrastructure within the urban area, relating to adaptation to

		<p>b. vertical planting on large high rise</p> <p>c. breaks in very high rise buildings to give high level planting areas (half way up the buildings)</p> <p>d. roof gardens (accessible to residents)</p> <p>e. hedges and trees in commercial developments forming corridors through the concrete and shady divisions in car parks</p> <p>f. tree planting/better planting of roundabouts</p> <p>g. wildlife corridors required linking waterway corridors and rail corridors to urban green spaces</p> <p>h. homes for wildlife. incorporation of nest boxes, flat spaces for black redstarts, holes in fences for hedgehogs, communal holes for sparrows</p>	<p>climate change, tree planting, landscaping, biodiversity and the green network, and measures than can be implemented on town centre sites including tall buildings.</p>
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 37	<p>Traffic management systems:</p> <p>a. consider turning off traffic lights after a particular time</p> <p>b. more intelligent traffic management system</p>	<p>Traffic management systems are not a matter for the Local Plan to control.</p>
Reading Urban Wildlife Group	Question 37	<p>Lighting:</p> <p>a. policies for use of LEDs and test areas prior to introduction throughout the town</p> <p>b. consider turning off lights at night in certain areas</p>	<p>This is a significant level of detail, beyond what it is appropriate for the Local Plan to provide. General policy avoids light pollution and light effects on residential amenity.</p>
Tanja Rebel	Question 37	<p>Suggested Lighting Policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The installation of new lights will be preceded by robust Environmental and Health Impact Assessments.</li> <li>2. New lights will be installed gradually, by conducting transparent Public Consultations. These will take the form of 'trials' to ensure that theoretical design calculations deliver a fully satisfactory solution which is considered acceptable by the public in terms of overall light levels, uniformity, lack of nuisance and pollution as well as appropriate colour temperature.</li> <li>3. Luminaires will not send any light directly at or above the horizontal.</li> <li>4. Lighting levels for road lighting will be designed to avoid detrimental glare.</li> <li>5. Lights will be dimmed or shut off when the area is not in use.</li> <li>6. The main aim will be for a decrease of the total installed flux.</li> <li>7. Short wavelength blue light will be strongly limited by ensuring that the CCT (Correlated Colour Temperature) of new lights is a maximum 3000K (preferably 2700K) i.e. warm-white to prevent harmful effects on human and wildlife circadian rhythms, road safety and sky glow.</li> </ol>	

		8. Warm-white lights (max 3000K) will be the preferred choice for the above reasons as well as their positive aesthetic impact, This for the benefit of general well-being and tourist attraction potential.	
Evelyn Williams	Question 37	Provision of allotments and protection of all Reading Borough Council's allotments sites, by adoption as statutory allotments.	The importance of allotments is specifically referenced within policy EN8.
Sport England	Question 37	Sport England along with Public Health England have recently launched our revised guidance 'Active Design'. It may therefore be useful to provide a cross-reference (and perhaps a hyperlink) to <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a> . Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone's life pattern. As such, Sport England would expect to see the principles on Active Design embedded in any subsequent Local Plan policy.	Reference to the Active Design criteria is included in the supporting text to the design policy.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	Other comments	We have tried to make comments which have taken into account the existing framework of planning policies used by Reading Borough Council. What we have discovered is a confusing web of documents, often overlapping in their purpose. This has made the process unwieldy and time-consuming for us and we feel that it inevitably makes meaningful consultation quite difficult for Reading residents. We hope that during the process of preparing the Local Plan the opportunity will be taken to provide a more accessible set of supporting policy documents which can be more easily accessed from the Council website.	Noted. The purpose of the Local Plan is to bring several documents under one roof and make cross-referencing more straightforward.
Brian Cottee	Other comments	What is the population density of a) Reading, b) Wokingham, c) West Berkshire d) Swindon, e) Basingstoke, e) Slough?	This information is available on the Office of National Statistics website, and has been provided separately.
Brian Cottee	Other comments	A number of years ago Reading B.C. committed itself to create a 'Green City'. Does this commitment still exist? If it does, why is it not mentioned in the document?	Whilst this specific aspiration is no longer referred to, the vision refers to the need to ensure the green elements of Reading remain.
Brian Cottee	Other comments	Why is there not a planning commitment to increase the area of green space /public open space? During the period 1971-2011 the population of Reading has grown by 50% whilst open space/public open space has declined in area	The policies within the plan seek to achieve new areas of public open space on sites of 50 or more dwellings. Over recent years, major new developments have delivered new areas of public open space, for instance at Kennet Island and Battle Hospital.
Brian Cottee	Other comments	How many people travel each weekday morning to reading via Reading station ? With the investment in the local railway system what increases	Estimates of station useage are set out on the ORR website:

		are anticipated in the period to 2036?	<a href="http://orr.gov.uk/statistics/published-stats/station-usage-estimates">http://orr.gov.uk/statistics/published-stats/station-usage-estimates</a>
Brian Cottee	Other comments	Why is there no identification and safeguarding, of sites for primary and secondary schools which might be needed in future. In the recent past and currently there has been a serious problem in finding such sites.	Provision for schools in general terms is covered by the policy on community facilities. Specific infrastructure investments are shown in the summary Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
James Lloyd	Other comments	As well as recreation, quality green and blue infrastructure will also be essential to deal with climate change, help reduce air pollution and give nature a more interconnected set of habitats. A green and blue infrastructure plan should accompany the local area plan to guide appropriate development.	The infrastructure delivery plan, accompanying the Local Plan, looks at green infrastructure provision to support growth. In terms of more detailed work, with limited resources, the focus must currently be on the Local Plan itself.
Mrs E R Smeeth	Other comments	Although I read the local paper the fact that there was a consultation document about the future of Reading has not come to my notice until now. The on line form is too complicated for me and as some-one who considers Reading to be over populated already I am obviously not suited to commenting on most of the proposals.	The consultation was extensively covered in the local press. With resource constraints, it is not possible to individually inform all residents of the consultation, so there must be reliance on the press and online methods. The online form was designed to be as simple as possible, and it was made clear on that form that it was an option for those who wanted to use it, and that a simple letter or e-mail would be perfectly acceptable.
Caversham GLOBE	Other comments Biodiversity	The current mapping layer for CS36 on the Adopted Local Plan is out of date in some areas and needs updating to correctly show the current boundaries of designated Local Wildlife Sites. Of particular concern is that the boundaries of Hemdean Bottom LWS are incorrectly mapped on the current CS36 layer. The map layer for CS36 wrongly shows only the wooded western part of Hemdean Bottom; the map needs updating to include the whole of Bugs Bottom within the LWS designation. The open area is LWS designated for its calcareous chalk grass meadow - a rare habitat in Reading & Berkshire as a whole and priority habitat nationally. The meadows are managed as conservation grassland under the Higher Level Stewardship scheme.	The current boundaries are shown on the new Proposals Map.
Natural England	Other comments Biodiversity	The Plan area is within the vicinity of the following designated nature conservation sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> <li>• Bramshill SSSI (part of TBH SPA)</li> <li>• Hazeley Heath SSSI (part of TBH SPA)</li> </ul>	A Screening level Appropriate Assessment has been carried out of the effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites, which includes many of the sites on this list, and this has not identified a need for a full Appropriate Assessment to be

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sulham &amp; Tidmarsh Woods &amp; Meadows SSSI</li> <li>• Hartslock SSSI</li> <li>• Temple Island Meadows SSSI</li> <li>• Lodge Wood &amp; Sandford Mill SSSI</li> <li>• Stanford End Mill &amp; River Loddon SSSI</li> <li>• Aldermaston Gravel Pits SSSI</li> </ul> <p>The Plan or associated docs should include a full assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the Plan on the features of special interest within the SSSIs listed above, and should identify such mitigation measures as may be required in order to avoid, minimise or reduce any adverse significant effects.</p>	<p>completed.</p> <p>Where an SSSI is not an internationally-designated site, and the site is not particularly close to the Borough boundary, it is not considered that it is proportionate to specifically assess all effects, unless there are specific reasons for doing so.</p>
Natural England	Other comments Biodiversity	The Plan will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. The Plan should include an assessment of the likely impacts on the wildlife and geodiversity interests of such sites. The Plan should include proposals for net biodiversity enhancement, or mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures.	Where development is proposed, consideration of the impact upon wildlife or geological sites, protected species or important habitats has formed part of the assessment, and has informed the policy.
Natural England	Other comments Biodiversity	<p>The Plan should assess the impact on protected species. The area likely to be affected by the proposal should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year for relevant species and the survey results, the Plans and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the Plan.</p> <p>In order to provide this information there may be a requirement for a survey at a particular time of year. Surveys should always be carried out in optimal survey time periods and to current guidance by suitably qualified and where necessary, licensed, consultants.</p>	
Natural England	Other comments Biodiversity	<p>The Plan should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance' within the England Biodiversity List, published under the requirements of S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a general duty on all public authorities, including local planning authorities, to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Natural England advises that survey, the Plan and mitigation proposals</p>	



		for Habitats and Species of Principal Importance should be included in the Plan. Consideration should also be given to those species and habitats included in the relevant Local BAP.	
Natural England	Other comments Biodiversity	Natural England does not hold local information on local sites, local landscape character and local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species. We recommend that you seek further information from the appropriate bodies.	Noted.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	Other comments District and Local Centres	<p>We wish to see policies included in the new Local Plan which are much more proactive regarding District Centres. We would like to see a framework within the Local Plan which recognises, protects and seeks to enhance the physical environment of District Centres as well supporting their economic, social, and spiritual and leisure functions for local residents. In Caversham we are particularly anxious that there should be recognition of the significance of the built form of the centre - taking into account all the elements that contribute to the character and ambiance of the area. This would include looking at streetscapes, types and styles of buildings, building materials used, relative heights of the buildings and the spaces between them, the relationships between buildings and open space, and location and amenity value of trees and shrubs.</p> <p>A plan for the centre of Caversham would be of great help in assessing any future proposals for development. This would sit well alongside the work that CADRA and Caversham Traders Association have already prepared in the 'Sharing Our Streets' initiative. It could optimize opportunities to implement much needed improvements. Enhancement of the shopping offer, especially food and services, would reduce the need to travel elsewhere by private car and, therefore, would be environmentally sustainable. A cohesive plan should include a strategy for longer term relocation of inappropriate land uses within the centre (eg petrol station).</p> <p>It could also look at: parking, which is an increasingly complex issue locally, especially as no provision is made for car parking spaces in higher density housing developments near the centre of Caversham; the design of shopfronts; signage as it relates to traditional building and character; and the prioritisation of motor traffic over other road users..</p>	The Draft Local Plan must balance the need to promote key elements of the strategy, such as the role of district centres, against the need to avoid getting into very significant levels of detail on specific centres. Whilst the draft policy highlights the need for environmental enhancements, looking in more depth at specific centres would more appropriately be a matter for Supplementary Planning Documents. Production of such documents would be a matter that would need to be considered in terms of available resources.

		The involvement of community groups in assisting the Council to build frameworks for safeguarding and developing vibrant District Centres would be an approach which we would commend to the Council.	
Environment Agency	Other comments Flood risk	The climate change allowances were updated on 19 February 2016. The climate change allowances will need to be incorporated into the SFRA as part of the evidence base for your local plan.	Noted. The SFRA builds in climate change allowances, in liaison with the Environment Agency.
Environment Agency	Other comments Flood risk	We were consulted on the Level 1 SFRA in March 2015, however, since that time our climate change guidance has been updated. We are aware that you are in the process updating the SFRA but we are not sure how near to completion it is. The Level 1 SFRA will need to include the new climate change guidance as will the Level 2 SFRA.	Noted. The Environment Agency's comments have been sought and taken into account in producing the SFRA.
Natural England	Other comments Landscape	As the Plan area is adjacent to both the North Wessex Downs and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding natural Beauty (AONB), consideration in the Plan and associated documents should be given to the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape and in particular the effect upon its purpose for designation within the environmental the Plan, as well as the content of the relevant management plans for the AONB.	The policy and commentary on the nearby AONBs has been fleshed out within the Draft Local Plan. Where a proposed site may have an impact on the AONB, this has been taken into account in the assessment.
Natural England	Other comments Landscape	<p>Details of local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the Plan area as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The Plan should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the Plan, such as changes in topography.</p> <p>The Plan should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the Plan on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. We encourage the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013.</p> <p>In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, Natural England encourages all new development to consider the character and</p>	Noted. The Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document have policies on Major Landscape Features, based on appropriate local evidence. Given competing demands for scarce resources, and the almost entirely urban nature of the Borough, a full Landscape Character Assessment was not felt to be necessary.

		distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of proposed developments reflecting local design characteristics and, wherever possible, using local materials.	
Natural England	Other comments Landscape	You should consider whether there is land in the area affected by the Plan which qualifies for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest.	This is not within the remit of the Local Plan.
Natural England	Other comments Access	Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.	Improved access to open spaces, including areas of countryside on the fringe of Reading, are covered within the plan. It is covered in general terms in policy EN9, and SR5 identifies some specific opportunities.
Natural England	Other comments Access	The Plan should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, Rights of Way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the Plan. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the Thames Path National Trail. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.	The consideration of impacts on these matters has been considered in assessing site allocations.
Natural England	Other comments Soil and agriculture	The Plan should consider, in light of the Government policy, the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 112 of the NPPF. We also recommend that soils should be considered under a more general heading of sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.	There is no BMV agricultural land within Reading. Given the urban nature of the Borough, it is felt that existing policy coverage is appropriate.
Caversham and District Residents' Association	Other comments Tall buildings	We recognise and support the role of tall buildings in helping to meet the housing targets of the borough. However we have considerable concern about the Vastern Road area. The existing buildings surrounding this area are not of great height. Any development should be stepped down in height toward the Caversham Road and Vastern Road edges of the area, and stepped up in height towards the rear of the site and abutting the railway. This would lessen the visual impact on the surrounding development.	The tall buildings strategy was developed taking into account a wide range of views, including from Caversham. The Station Area Framework, which will remain relevant, includes more detail on building heights, and seeks to reduce height away from the station towards Caversham Road and Vastern Road.

		<p>We are concerned that very considerable care is taken in assessing the potential impact of tall buildings on significant views. Any tall development in the Vastern Road area would inevitably impact on views to and from the River Thames and from Caversham.</p> <p>As part of the joint working on Enhancement of Conservation Areas, CADRA has helped to develop terms of reference for a study of views from Reading's waterways. This is an important area for Reading and should influence the decisions taken on tall buildings which can have a profound impact on long distance views. We would like to see this form part of the Local Plan framework.</p>	<p>In terms of a river views study, this was not taken forward. However, specific heritage views are covered by a policy. More panoramic views of central Reading are taken into account in the tall buildings policy.</p>
Scott Versace	Other comments Tree planting	<p>My partner and I have begun a project, entitled "Saptember", to have more trees planted across the UK. As we are resident in Reading we would like to start the project in our town and take the success further afield. Having guidance for where our project's members can plant new sapling trees would be of great help. We have recently contacted councillors who are investigating this for us already but any further assistance would be most beneficial.</p>	<p>Noted. General support for tree planting is included within the Local Plan. New tree planting initiatives are best dealt with by the Council's parks section.</p>
Environment Agency	Other comments Watercourses	<p>The Council should consider producing an advice note for developers on aspects that should be addressed when proposing developments adjacent to rivers. Please see the River Wye Advice Note produced by Wycombe District Council.</p>	<p>Noted, although policy resources are currently focused on production of the Local Plan itself.</p>
Network Rail	Other comments Section 106/CIL	<p>DDPs should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Specifically, we request that a Policy is included within the document which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development. In order to fully assess the potential impacts, and the level of developer contribution required, it is essential that where a Transport Assessment is submitted in support of a planning application that this quantifies in detail the likely impact on the rail network.</p> <p>To ensure that developer contributions can deliver appropriate improvements to the rail network we would recommend that Developer</p>	<p>Transport infrastructure is identified as a major infrastructure provision priority for developments in policy CC9, and it is not considered that a separate policy is required.</p> <p>The plan includes reference to assessments of transport impacts covering impacts on the rail network where relevant. Policy TR1 also includes strong requirements in terms of sustainable transport measures including public transport.</p> <p>Changes to the CIL Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list are not being consulted upon at this time.</p>

		<p>Contributions should include provisions for rail and should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments on the railway infrastructure should be exempt from CIL or that its development should at least be classified as payments in-kind.</li> <li>• We would encourage the railways to be included on the Regulation 123 list</li> <li>• A clear definition of buildings should be in the charging schedule. Railway stations are open-ended gateways to railway infrastructure and should not be treated as buildings. Likewise lineside infrastructure used to operate the railway should be classed as railway infrastructure and not treated as buildings.</li> <li>• We would like confirmation that its developments over 100sqm undertaken using our Permitted Development Rights will not be CIL chargeable.</li> <li>• Imposing a charge on one infrastructure project to pay for another in an inefficient way of securing funding</li> <li>• A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriate.</li> <li>• A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculated.</li> <li>• A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail infrastructure improvements. In order to be reasonable these improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail’s remit.</li> </ul>	
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Other comments Air quality</p>	<p>Air quality in the UK has improved over recent decades but air pollution remains a significant issue; for example over 97% of sensitive habitat area in England is predicted to exceed the critical loads for ecosystem protection from atmospheric nitrogen deposition. A priority action in the England Biodiversity Strategy is to reduce air pollution impacts on biodiversity. The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of developments which may give rise to pollution, either</p>	<p>Noted. A policy on air quality is included, and Natural England’s comments on the policy are welcomed.</p>

		<p>directly or from traffic generation, and hence planning decisions can have a significant impact on the quality of air, water and land. The assessment should take account of the risks of air pollution and how these can be managed or reduced.</p>	
Natural England	Other comments Ancient woodland	<p>The S41 list includes six priority woodland habitats, which will often be ancient woodland, with all ancient semi-natural woodland in the South East falling into one or more of the six types.</p> <p>Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource of great importance for its wildlife, its history and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes. Local authorities have a vital role in ensuring its conservation, in particular through the planning system. The Plan should have regard to the requirements under the NPPF (Para. 118)2.</p>	<p>Noted. The importance of retaining existing woodlands is recognised in policy EN14. Defined Ancient Woodland is shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
Environment Agency	Other comments Contamination	<p>The strategic objectives of the Local Plan should have regard to the need to protect groundwater from potential impacts of development, and how the specific issues in Reading BC can be addressed through the planning system.</p> <p>The local plan should make clear that where sites may have contamination, e.g. because of a historic use, that at least a Preliminary Risk Assessment, including walkover survey, is submitted with the application. Advice within the supporting text to such a policy should suggest pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency and local planning authority on establishing how much information is required.</p> <p>Protecting groundwater quality relies on three-dimensional conceptual modelling and the risk assessment of historic contamination potentially disturbed during enabling works that could impact on an underlying aquifer and assessing the potential for piling to create vertical pathways for contamination to migrate into underlying aquifers. Also the potential impact of the new development on the underlying aquifers needs to be risk assessed.</p>	<p>Policy EN16 on pollution and water resources covers groundwater. The supporting text to the policy refers to the need for a preliminary risk assessment and for early pre-application discussions.</p>
Network Rail	Other comments Planning applications	<p>We would appreciate the Council providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

		make. In this regard Network Rail would draw the council's attention to the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (16).	
Environment Agency	Other comments Water	<p>You will need to provide evidence that the growth proposed in Reading will be acceptable in terms of water quality impacts to the receiving watercourse. No assessment has been made on the environmental capacity. Water framework directive (WFD) impacts as a result of the increase in flow and loads (direct result of the growth only) from the sewage treatment works (STW) will need to be assessed.</p> <p>The Environment Agency is currently preparing some guidance about Water Cycle Studies (WCS) for local planning authorities, and we will forward this guidance to you once it is finalised. We intend that this guidance will set out questions for local planning authorities to consider regarding water resources, water quality and flood risk. If LPAs can answer them all with confidence, then they do not need to undertake an assessment.</p> <p>However, we would like to see the evidence. If you cannot answer the questions then you are likely to need to undertake an assessment to find out. There are different stages to a WCS and it might be that you only need to undertake a scoping study.</p> <p>Ideally any WCS assessment which you undertake would provide suitable evidence for the entire growth proposed within the council's plan area. From a water quality point of view, the housing numbers will add up to potentially quite an impact if all being served by the same STW.</p>	The Council is considering how best to assemble evidence related to the water effects of development. Water Cycle Studies are mentioned in the representation, but are not a requirement of national policy.
Evelyn Williams	Other comments	Reading should not seek to achieve city status but be happy with what it is. Perhaps it would be helpful to hold a referendum?	The Draft Local Plan does not make any comment on potential city status.
Evelyn Williams	Other comments	Many of the homes built or resold in Reading are not available for Reading residents to live in because they are sold for investment only or cash buyers only. Does legislation allow Reading Borough Council to control the actions of developers or estate agents so that these restrictions are controlled?	This is clearly a matter of some concern. However, the ability of the Council to control tenure and sales through the planning system are extremely limited.
Evelyn Williams	Other	There have been some initiatives and projects recently looking at	Noted. The Sustainability Appraisal incorporates

	comments	<p>Reading's future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading 2050;</li> <li>• Where's Reading Heading?</li> </ul> <p>Are the ideas generated from these initiatives and projects to have any influence?</p>	<p>the requirement to undertake a Screening level Appropriate Assessment of the policies and proposals, which ensures compliance with the requirements. Development is not likely to lead to significant effects.</p>
Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>The Plan should thoroughly assess the potential for the proposal to affect designated sites - designated Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, listed or proposed Ramsar sites, and any site identified as being necessary to compensate for adverse impacts on classified, potential or possible SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites.</p> <p>Under Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 an Appropriate Assessment needs to be undertaken in respect of any plan or project which is (a) likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) and (b) not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site.</p> <p>Should a likely significant effect be identified or be uncertain, the local planning authority may need to prepare an Appropriate Assessment, in addition to consideration of impacts through the Local Plan process.</p>	
Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>A full consideration of the implications of the whole Plan should be included. The Plan should include an assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included, (subject to available information), including those in neighbouring administrative areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. existing completed projects;</li> <li>b. approved but uncompleted projects;</li> <li>c. ongoing activities;</li> <li>d. plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and</li> <li>e. plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, ie projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the Plan and for which sufficient</li> </ol>	



		information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects.	
Reading Climate Change Partnership	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>The proposed schemes and sites are varied in their potential climate change impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many are brown field re-developments, which are both positive and negative with regard to mitigation, and neutral for adaptation.</li> <li>• The ambition for 699 houses per year is notably negative (mitigation) and significantly negative (adaptation).</li> <li>• Of the rest, there are some positive schemes but the majority are viewed as negative for either mitigation, adaptation or both.</li> </ul> <p>The latter point is not surprising given that most of these schemes will increase the footprint of the town. This is where we really need to understand the impacts holistically. And we need to compare them with the capacity of the existing town infrastructure, housing and businesses. All of these are likely to face pressure from the expected impacts of climate change, which is where we really need to see an adaptation plan for the town.</p>	Noted. A climate change adaptation plan does not fall within the remit of the Local Plan to provide, although elements of necessary adaptation (e.g. tree planting, SuDS, linking of wildlife habitats) are included.
Mr Chris Webster	Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 2 A12	<p>Regarding the positive and negative scores for the View Island Development in the Sustainability appraisal, only two clear positive aspects are found, namely 11 and 17. I disagree with both of these estimates.</p> <p>11: View Island is a wildlife reserve, a peaceful place that anyone who values such attributes can, and does, already visit. Construction of a building on the site will reduce its appeal to such people, and not contribute to their well-being.</p> <p>17: What physical and recreational activities are meant by this? If by culture and leisure is meant learning about wildlife, people are free to do this without the construction of a building that will displace some of that wildlife.</p> <p>Indeed, it is not clear why points 11 and 17 score positive anyway considering what is written in the Sustainability Appraisal itself: " the positive impact would be a greater understanding and appreciation of biodiversity, but bringing more people into an area of</p>	These points are noted, but a use which brings people into a natural area where they can benefit from informal recreation may well have some positive impacts. Nevertheless, this proposal is not carried forward into the Draft Local Plan.

		biodiversity significance could have impacts on the wildlife of View Island itself as well as on access to leisure and education ".	
Margaret and Michael Pocock	Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 2 A19	<p>It seems that there are more negatives than positives.</p> <p>To comment on specific sustainability objectives:-</p> <p>1 Any of the proposals will intensify climate changes.</p> <p>E.O. 2 and 3 Mostly negative</p> <p>E.O. 4,5,6 and 7 between very negative and partly negative.</p> <p>E.O. 9, 10 and 11 should not be ignored.</p> <p>E.O. 12 this will definitely not promote community cohesion.</p> <p>E.O. 14 will increase car and lorry movements and increase congestion.</p> <p>E.O. 15 Anyone using Emmer Green doctors will tell you of waiting in excess of 1 and often up to 3 weeks for appointments.</p> <p>We would suggest that the remaining items will not be largely neutral and mostly negative.</p>	<p>The points re objectives 1-7 and 15 are already picked up within the assessment. No objectives are ignored, but have been considered to have a neutral or uncertain impact. It is unclear why a negative impact on community cohesion should be recorded. The point re 14 is noted.</p> <p>Ultimately, the purpose of SA is to highlight effects rather than a mathematical exercise about how many positives vs negatives there are.</p>