

Reading Borough Local Plan

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS

January 2016



www.reading.gov.uk



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

1.0: Non-Technical Summary	2
2.0: Introduction	3
3.0: Stage A: Setting the Context and Objectives, Establishing the Baseline and Deciding on the Scope	6
4.0: Stage B: Developing and Refining Alternatives and Assessing Effects	8
5.0: Consultation	10
Appendix 1: Testing the Core Objectives Against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework	11
Appendix 2: Sustainability Appraisal of the Options	13
Appendix 3: Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Options, Screening Level	174
Appendix 5: Equality Impact Assessment of the Options, Screening Level	222

1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.0.1 This document is a Sustainability Appraisal of the options set out in the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation. It takes each option for each policy area, or site, in turn, and examines it against a range of environmental, social and economic objectives, which have been defined in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.
- 1.0.2 The object of the exercise is to highlight what the likely effects of each option will be. This allows options to be compared to each other, and, where they are proposed to be taken forward into policy, identifies mitigation measures that need to be taken to make sure that adverse effects are lessened or eliminated entirely.
- 1.0.3 At this stage, as there are a range of very different options for sites and policies, it is not possible to generalise about what the results show. When we have reached a more advanced stage in the process, with draft policies in place, it will be possible to come to a picture of what the overall effects of the plan as a whole are, but it is too early for that at this stage.
- 1.0.4 When a draft Local Plan is produced, it will be accompanied by the next stage of the Sustainability Appraisal, which will again be subject to consultation.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Requirement for Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.1.1 Planning authorities are required to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Local Development Documents in accordance with the requirements of a European Directive (2001/42/EC). This was enshrined in national law by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which introduced a requirement to carry out Sustainability Appraisal for all local development documents, now generally called local plans. Sustainability Appraisal fully incorporates the European SEA requirements, but expands it to also take account of social and economic matters. Thus, the requirements of the SEA Directive also apply to the wider remit of Sustainability Appraisal.
- 2.1.2 The Sustainability Appraisal process is intended to be an integral part of preparing an LDD, rather than an adjunct to it. It helps planning authorities to fulfil the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in preparing their plans, and thus contribute to sound plan making. Sustainability Appraisal should inform the evaluation of options, and should provide a key means to demonstrate the appropriateness of a plan given reasonable alternatives.
- 2.1.3 Therefore, Sustainability Appraisal is more than a simple checking exercise. It is a key part of the process of evaluating plans and proposals as they emerge.

2.2 Stages of a Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.2.1 Sustainability Appraisal is a multi-stage process, most of which is undertaken in separate appraisals of individual plans. The national guidance on sustainability appraisal¹ sets out the process in a number of stages, as follows:

STAGE A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope

- A1 - Identify other relevant policies, plans, programmes, and sustainability objectives.
- A2 - Collect baseline information
- A3 - Identify sustainability issues and problems
- A4 - Develop the sustainability appraisal framework
- A5 - Consult the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal report

STAGE B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects

- B1 - Test the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework
- B2 - Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives
- B3 - Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives
- B4 - Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
- B5 - Propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

STAGE C: Prepare the Sustainability Appraisal Report

STAGE D: Seek representations on the sustainability appraisal report from consultation bodies and the public

¹ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal/>

STAGE E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

E1 - Prepare and publish post-adoption statement

E2 - Monitor significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

E3 - Respond to adverse effects

- 2.2.2 Tasks A1 to A5 were carried out in 2014 in developing the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. They do not therefore need to be repeated in this report, although in carrying out the assessments in Stage B we will need to consider whether there is more up-to-date information on plans or programmes, baseline data or sustainability issues that need to be taken into account for specific assessments. These will be highlighted within the assessments where they are relevant.

2.3 What does this report contain?

- 2.3.1 This Sustainability Appraisal assesses the options set out in the Local Plan Issues and Options (January 2016). These options work at a range of levels, from options for dealing with a broad strategic matter such as how to accommodate Reading's housing need, to options for different development on specific sites.

- 2.3.2 This report covers stage B of the above list. Stage A is dealt with in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Stages C and D relate to the full Sustainability Appraisal Report of the publication plan, which comes at a later stage, whilst Stage E cannot be undertaken before the Local Plan is adopted. It does not represent the final version of those stages, which will be undertaken when a full draft plan is produced, but is an initial undertaking of those stages for the options set out.

- 2.3.3 The Appraisal generally consists of assessing the content of the plan against the 20 sustainability objectives that were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2014). This assessment involves considering what effect the plan, policy or option will have on that objective, in the short, medium or long term, and in conjunction with other plans and policies.

- 2.3.4 This Appraisal first assesses the draft objectives of the Local Plan against the 20 sustainability objectives that were set in (stage B1 of the sustainability appraisal process). This is undertaken in Appendix 1.

- 2.3.5 The Appraisal then moves onto assessing each of the options for consultation set out in the Issues and Options document against the 20 sustainability objectives, in order of how they appear in the document (stages B3 and B4 of the sustainability appraisal process). This is undertaken mainly in Appendix 2, but with discrete elements undertaken in more detail in Appendices 3 and 4.

2.4 Policy Context

- 2.4.1 The Council currently has a number of adopted documents with 'local plan' status, specifically the Core Strategy (adopted 2008, amended 2015), Reading Central Area Action Plan (adopted 2009) and Sites and Detailed Policies Document (adopted 2012, amended 2015), together with the associated Proposals Map. There are also a number of Supplementary Planning Documents in place that provide more detail to the policies in the three documents.

- 2.4.2 The proposal, as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS, November 2014), is to replace the three documents listed above with a comprehensive Local Plan. The LDS sets out the timescales for this process, with adoption currently anticipated during 2017 or 2018. The first stage is the publication of an Issues and Options report for consultation, which is a discussion paper considering what the key issues will be and what the options will be for dealing with those issues. This is the current stage. The process will then move on to production of a draft report during 2016, and this Sustainability Appraisal will be one of the key considerations in developing that draft.

2.5 Limitations

- 2.5.1 Sustainability Appraisal is an extremely valuable exercise in terms of balancing various effects against each other, and continues to be of great use in drawing up plans and policies. However, it does not represent the whole of the analysis needed. Even where one option scores most positively in terms of sustainability, it may not be appropriate for other reasons that are not highlighted here.
- 2.5.2 One particular factor which SA can overlook is the likelihood of implementation. Some of these options may have much less certainty of delivery than others, and this needs to be taken into account in drawing up a plan which is supposed to be realistic and achievable. These considerations will be presented as part of the background evidence for the draft plan.
- 2.5.3 Care also needs to be taken not to treat the SA as a quantitative exercise. It is not simply a matter of how many ticks are in the appraisal. On some sites, one positive effect may outweigh several negative effects, and vice versa. Again, the background evidence to support the draft plan will explain why such decisions have been made.

2.6 Who carried out the Sustainability Appraisal?

- 2.6.1 The production of the SA is the responsibility of the local planning authority. There is no requirement that the report be prepared by an independent body to that responsible for the plan itself, which is the subject of the appraisal. Indeed, the core philosophy behind the system of sustainability appraisal is that the process informs the production of the plan, and therefore, too great an independence is not desirable.
- 2.6.2 This Sustainability Appraisal was drafted mainly by the officers responsible for the production of the local plan. This is appropriate at this stage, as the consideration of environmental, social and economic outcomes is the central element to deciding on the policy approach and the suitability of each site. As a result, the Sustainability Appraisal will significantly influence the content of the Local Plan.

3.0 STAGE A: SETTING THE CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES, ESTABLISHING THE BASELINE AND DECIDING ON THE SCOPE

3.0.1 Stage A of the Sustainability Appraisal process consists of the following:

STAGE A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope

A1 - Identify other relevant policies, plans, programmes, and sustainability objectives.

A2 - Collect baseline information

A3 - Identify sustainability issues and problems

A4 - Develop the sustainability appraisal framework

A5 - Consult the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal report

3.0.2 These stages were all covered in the latest version of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, which was published in September 2014. The document listed the relevant plans, programmes and strategies with which there might be combined effects (section 2). It set out relevant baseline information, with a number of facts and figures, which were as up-to-date as possible at the time of publication (section 3). It identifies the most significant sustainability issues and problems in terms of environment, economy and society (section 4). Finally, it develops a Sustainability Appraisal Framework (section 5) to form the basis for carrying out sustainability appraisal. Consultation was carried out on the main elements of the Scoping Report beginning in November 2013.

3.0.3 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework is the main output of the Scoping Report, and it is the basis for sustainability appraisal of plans and policies in Reading. Appendix 3 of the Scoping Report contains a detailed SA Framework.

3.0.4 One of the main roles of the SA Framework is to set out the sustainability objectives against which the effects of the plans or proposals will be assessed. The 2014 SA Framework contains 20 environmental, social and economic objectives, which are set out below. The Framework also lists sub-questions for each objective to allow the effects to be considered, and contains baseline indicators and an overall aim for each objective.

Table 2: Sustainability Objectives (2014)	
Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives)	
1	To limit the impact of climate change through minimising CO2 emissions and other greenhouse gases.
2	Adapt to inevitable climate change in terms of preparedness for extreme weather events, including avoiding and managing the risk of flooding, heat wave, drought and storm damage.
3	Ensure appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources.
4	Minimise the consumption of, and reduce damage to, undeveloped land.
5	Minimise the generation of waste and promote more sustainable approaches to waste management.
6	Minimise air, water, soil/ ground and noise pollution, and improve existing areas of contaminated land and poor air and water quality.
7	Value, protect and enhance the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology, and other contributors to natural diversity, including establishing/enhancing ecological networks, including watercourses and surrounding corridors.
8	Avoid contributing towards a likely significant effect, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, that could lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of internationally-

	designated wildlife sites.
9	Create, enhance and maintain attractive and clean environments including protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing landscape and townscape character.
10	Value, protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment and the heritage assets therein and the contribution that they make to society and the environment.
Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society (Social & Economic Objectives)	
11	Protect, promote and improve human health, safety and well-being including through healthy lifestyles.
12	Promote strong and vibrant communities through reduction in crime and the fear of crime and enhanced community cohesion.
13	Ensure high quality housing of a type and cost appropriate to the needs of the area.
14	Reduce the need for travel and transport particularly by car or lorry and facilitate sustainable travel choices.
15	Ensure good physical access for all to essential services and facilities, including healthcare.
16	Avoid significant negative effects on groups or individuals with regard to race, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation.
17	Value, protect and enhance opportunities for all to engage in culture, leisure, and physical and recreational activity, particularly in areas of open space and waterspace.
18	Facilitate sustainable economic growth and regeneration that provides employment opportunities for all and supports a successful, competitive, and balanced local economy that meets the needs of the area.
19	Reduce deprivation and inequality within and between communities.
20	Maximise access for all to the necessary education, skills and knowledge to play a full role in society and support the sustainable growth of the local economy.

3.0.5 It is not considered that there is any reason to make any amendments to the Sustainability Appraisal Framework for the purposes of undertaking this appraisal. The Framework was produced very recently, in 2014, and is therefore reasonably up-to-date. The Local Plan is also concerned with strategic issues, and does not have a limited scope that might necessitate amending the Framework. Whilst there may be plans and documents to take into account that were published more recently than the Framework, or new information that has become available, these will be highlighted in the individual appraisals where relevant.

4.0 STAGE B: DEVELOPING AND REFINING ALTERNATIVES AND ASSESSING EFFECTS

- 4.0.1 Stage B of the Sustainability Appraisal process consists of the following steps:

STAGE B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects

B1 - Test the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework

B2 - Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives

B3 - Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives

B4 - Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

B5 - Propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

- 4.0.2 These steps are dealt with in the following sections.

4.1 B1 - Test the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework

- 4.1.1 The Issues and Options report includes a draft set of objectives for the Local Plan. These are not final, and are subject to the results of consultation. However, it is appropriate at this stage to consider how they relate to the sustainability appraisal framework. In particular this might help to highlight tensions between different objectives.

4.2 B2 - Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives

- 4.2.1 The options for the Local Plan are those set out in the Issues and Options document itself, which provides commentary on how the options have been derived

4.3 B3 - Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives

- 4.3.1 This step takes in the most significant element of the sustainability appraisal process, of assessing the likely effects of the options for the Local Plan that have been identified. Each option set out in the Issues and Options is assessed in turn against each of the 20 sustainability objectives.
- 4.3.2 The full evaluation of the likely effects is set out in Appendix 2. At later stages of the plan, when a strategy is proposed, we will also include a summary table of the likely significant effects. However, at this stage this is not appropriate, because we are discussing a range of options which will have potentially conflicting and contradictory effects, meaning that a summary table is not particularly helpful.
- 4.3.3 As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, the SA process now also covers the need for Screening level Habitat Regulations Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment. These are dealt with by objectives 8 and 16 respectively, but the analysis that has gone into those objectives is set out in detail in Appendix 3 (Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment) and Appendix 4 (Screening Equality Impact Assessment). These assessments do identify a number of options where a full Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Impact Assessment would need to be carried out were the option to be taken forward to a draft plan. However, it may well be that the option will be discarded before then, so there is no full assessment carried out at this stage.

- 4.4 B4 - Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects**
 - 4.4.1 The assessment should consider whether there are measures that can be taken to mitigate the adverse effects against individual objectives, or to accentuate the positive effects. At this stage of the plan, when a range of options are being discussed, this takes the form of very general commentary on possible measures. However, at a later stage when a draft plan is being appraised, the references can be much more specific, and relate to possible changes to policies elsewhere in the document, or other specific measures that can be taken.
- 4.5 B5 - Propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan**
 - 4.5.1 At this point, we are only considering options for what should be included in the Local Plan, and which direction it should take. When a full draft Local Plan is drawn up, one part of the plan will be proposals for monitoring the effects of the policies, and this will also mean considering how the significant effects can be monitored within that monitoring framework. This will therefore be covered in a Sustainability Appraisal of the draft plan, and it is too early to propose monitoring measures at this stage.

5.0 CONSULTATION

- 5.0.1 This Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options has been published for public consultation, alongside the Issues and Options document itself. This is a significant consultation exercise, including all three of the statutory bodies², along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.
- 5.0.2 Your representations on this Sustainability Appraisal are welcomed. Please send any comments by 5:00pm on **Monday 15th February 2016** to:

LDF@reading.gov.uk

Planning Policy Team
Planning Section
Reading Borough Council
Civic Offices
Bridge Street
Reading
RG1 2LU

² Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

APPENDIX 1: TESTING THE CORE OBJECTIVES AGAINST THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

The seven core objectives consulted upon in the Issues and Options report are revised versions of the objectives set out in the Core Strategy (adopted 2008). They have been appraised against the 20 sustainability objectives in the matrix below. It is important to bear in mind that a negative score in the below table highlights areas where the plan should consider what it needs to do to mitigate that potential effect - it does not mean that the plan objective itself is intrinsically unsustainable.

It should be noted that there will always be considerable uncertainty about the effects of the plan objectives. In general, the more specific the measure that is being appraised, the more clear the effects will be. The plan objectives being appraised are very high-level, and could have a wide variety of effects. The matrix below would therefore need to be supplemented by appraising the specific measures proposed.

	Strengthen the role of Reading, including central Reading, as the hub for the Thames Valley, providing an accessible focus for the development of employment, housing, services and facilities, meeting the needs of residents, workers, visitors, those who study in Reading Borough, and the wider area;	Improve the quality of life for those living, working, studying in and visiting the Borough, creating inclusive, sustainable communities with good access to decent and affordable housing, employment, open space and waterspace, transport, education, services and facilities (such as sustainable water supplies and wastewater treatment, healthcare services, sport and recreation, etc.) to meet identified needs;	Ensure new development is accessible and sustainable, in accordance with the sustainability appraisal objectives;	Maintain and enhance the historic, built and natural environment of the Borough through investment and high quality design;	Improve and develop excellent transport systems to improve accessibility within Reading and for the wider area by sustainable modes of transport;	Offer outstanding cultural opportunities, which are based on multiculturalism, local heritage and high quality, modern arts and leisure facilities;	Ensure that Reading is a multi-cultural city where significant social inclusion exists and where the needs of all its citizens are met by high quality, cost effective services and outstanding levels of community involvement.
1	?X	?✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0
2	X	0	✓✓	✓	0	0	0
3	?X	?✓	✓✓	?✓	✓	0	0

4	?✓	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0
5	?✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0
6	?X	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0
7	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0
8	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
9	?✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	?✓	0
10	?X	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	0
11	✓	✓✓	✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓
12	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	?✓	✓✓
13	✓✓	✓✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓
14	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
15	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
16	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓✓
17	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
18	✓✓	✓✓	✓	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓
19	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓	?✓	✓✓
20	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓

The potential negative effects that have been identified largely relate to the aim of strengthening Reading as a hub for the Thames Valley, and the effect significant levels of development could have on some of the environmental sustainability objectives. For example, a focus on central Reading, where there are areas at risk of flooding, would be seen as a negative effect. However, these effects are far from clear cut, as development focused on an accessible hub such as Reading may be less likely to have effects such as contributing to CO2 emissions or using undeveloped land than it might in another location. Nevertheless, these issues would need to be addressed by policies in the plan.

APPENDIX 2: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS

The following symbols are used in the appraisal to denote effects.

✓✓	Very positive impact on the sustainability objective (significant positive effect)
✓	Positive impact on the sustainability objective
?✓	Tendency to a positive impact on the sustainability objective
O	Neutral impact on the sustainability objective
?X	Tendency to a negative impact on the sustainability objective
X	Negative impact on the sustainability objective
XX	Very negative impact on the sustainability objective (significant negative effect)
✓X	Both positive and negative impacts on the sustainability objective
?	The impact of an issue cannot be predicted at this stage

In general, the options assessed in the following tables are specific to each site or policy. However, in all cases, a “do nothing/no policy” option, a “business as usual” option and the draft policy option are appraised. The symbols below are used to indicate which options fulfil these requirements.

* “Do nothing/no policy” option
▼ “Business as usual” option

Effects against objective 8 are assessed in more detail in Appendix 3, because this fulfils the requirements to carry out the Screening stage of a Habitat Regulations Assessment. Section 7 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report 2014 explains this in more detail, but for each option considered, the assessment in Appendix 3 results in the score against objective 8 in this section.

Likewise, objective 16 fulfils the requirements to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment (screening level, or Stage 1), and therefore this objective is assessed in more detail in Appendix 4, with the results of that assessment leading to the objective 16 score in this section. This is explained in Section 8 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report 2014.

Q3: HOW MUCH HOUSING?

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
3.1	Provide 699 homes each year	X	XX	X	?X	X	XX	X	X	X	X	?	?	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓	?X	✓✓	?	X
3.2	Provide around 600 home each year	X	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	X	?X	?X	?	?	XX	✓	X	X	?	X	?	X
3.3	Provide around 630 homes each year	X	X	X	?✓	X	X	?X	X	?X	?X	?	?	XX	✓	X	X	?	X	?	X
3.4	Provide significantly more than 700 homes each year	X	XX	X	XX	X	XX	XX	X	XX	XX	?	?	✓✓	✓✓	X	✓	X	✓✓	?	X

Neither a 'do nothing' nor 'business as usual' approach are assessed at this stage. A 'do nothing' approach would not be possible, as setting housing requirements is one of the main jobs of a local plan, and it would not be found sound without it. A 'business as usual' approach is also not possible, as existing targets are not based on any up-to-date assessment of either needs or capacity.

COMMENTS:

3.1: Provide 699 homes each year:

Providing the level of housing that would meet economic development needs would have a **significant positive effect on economic growth(18)** and **would ensure high quality housing for all who need it (13)**. It would also **significantly reduce the need to travel, by ensuring that there is enough housing to match local jobs (14)**. Provision of a significant number of new homes would have a number of potential negative effects on environmental measures through the development process (1, 2, 3, 5, 6), and a high level of housing would make it inevitable that **sites at risk of flooding (2) and sites with contamination or air quality issues (6) will be needed for development**. Undeveloped land would be more likely to be needed (4). There would also be more likely to be an effect on biodiversity (7), townscape (9) and the historic environment (10) than with the lower levels of housing. It would also lead to the need for additional healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. Although an effect would be anticipated from this fundamental issue on virtually all of the objectives, some of the effects are very uncertain (11, 12, 17, 19), because so much would depend on the form and location of the housing.

3.2: Provide around 600 homes each year:

In general, the lower numbers of housing proposed would be likely to have less strong environmental effects than Q3.1, although it still represents an increase in provision over current levels, and therefore impacts on matters such as education and healthcare infrastructure would take place. At the same time, this option would fail to provide the required housing, **having a significant negative effect on ensuring housing to meet needs (13)** and also having a negative effect on economic growth.

3.3: Provide around 630 homes each year:

The effects, when assessed at a broad strategic level, would be virtually identical to Option Q3.2, although the extent of those effects would differ on the

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
ground.																					
<u>3.4: Provide significantly more than 700 homes each year:</u> Many effects would be similar to the option of providing 699 homes per year, but there would be some notable differences. Providing this level of housing would make it almost inevitable that a significant amount of undeveloped land would be required (4) , and that sites with biodiversity significance would be needed (7) , and higher densities would be needed, having a significant negative effect on the townscape (9) and historic environment (10) .																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> Potential impacts have been identified on Hartslock Wood SAC and Thames Basin Heaths SPA in terms of increasing visits to the site from all of the options. Impacts on Thames Basin Heaths have also been identified through increased traffic leading to noise and disturbance and air quality issues at parts of the site from options Q3.1 and Q3.4. The same two options also have potential impacts on Kennet and Lambourn Floodplains SAC and River Lambourn SAC if it necessitates development in the flood plain affecting water flows. All of these impacts will depend on the specific distribution of housing.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> Not providing sufficient levels of housing would be likely to have a negative effect due to age, through failing to meet the housing needs of the ageing population.																					
MITIGATION: A large number of the effects identified above are negative, but many of these can be mitigated through the right combination of policies in the plan. The environmental performance of houses can be mitigated through sustainable design measures, although the Council’s ability to apply these has been reduced by the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Effects on flood risk and biodiversity may be capable of mitigation on site, although further site specific work would be needed. Effects on townscape and the historic environment can be addressed by design measures, but the ability to address the issue reduces as the proposed level of housing increases. Provision of new infrastructure, e.g. education and healthcare, can mitigate negative impacts.																					
As this is the core issue for the plan to address, appraising the options and identifying mitigation is very complicated, and will affect the way that the whole plan is drafted. In a sense, much of the local plan will need to be devoted to mitigating the impacts of the level of development identified.																					

Q10: EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING BALANCE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
10.1 *▼	Do not limit employment development	XX	X	X	X	X	XX	X	X	X	X	0	0	XX	XX	0	X	0	✓X	X	0
10.2	No limit but development to mitigate impacts	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?	0
10.3	Limit employment based on housing in Borough	✓X	X	X	X	X	✓X	X	0	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓X	?	0
10.4	Limit employment based on housing in HMA	✓X	X	X	X	X	✓X	X	0	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓X	?	0

COMMENTS:

10.1: Do not limit employment development:

For this option, as well as all the others, there is likely to be a negative effect on the environmental objectives from additional development (1-7, 9, 10), although there is no difference between the options shown, as not limiting employment development will not necessarily lead to a greater amount than if a limit was placed. There would be a **significant negative effect on access to housing (13)**, as this approach risks leading to greater pressure on the housing market, squeezing out those most in need, which in turn has an effect on inequality (16, 19). The other **significant negative effect would be on the need to travel (14) and on the environmental objectives associated with increased car use (1, 6)**, as unlimited employment development unsupported by housing would lead to greater levels of commuting, much of it by car. In terms of economic growth (18), this approach would be flexible to allow unlimited employment development, but on the flipside the balance of the economy could be affected, so the effects are mixed.

10.2: No limit on employment development but development should mitigate its effects on housing:

As set out above, many of the environmental effects of additional development would be negative. However, this option would involve mitigating impacts on housing, so some of the associated effects would be neutral. It would be more likely than 10.1 to lead to balanced economic growth (18). The effect on inequality (19) is complicated, and could have a wide variety of different effects.

10.3: Limit employment development to be in line with the level of housing to be provided in Reading:

Although the same environmental objectives would be negative as the other options, there would be a more positive effect on housing (13), and the balance of employment and housing would **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)** with associated environmental effects (1, 6). Impacts on economic growth (18) could be both positive and negative, as a limit may constrain new employment development, but at the same time a greater balance in the economy would be promoted.

10.4: Limit employment development to be in line with the level of housing to be provided in the Housing Market Area:

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>Although the geographic coverage would be slightly different from 10.4, the differences are not significant enough to lead to different scoring.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> Unlimited employment development may draw in car-based travel on some of the major routes to Reading, which could particularly affect Chilterns Beechwoods SAC, Hartslock Wood SAC and Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The other options are not considered likely to have significant effects.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> Unlimited employment development would be likely to lead to pressures on the housing market, which could particularly affect the younger age groups that have been identified as having significant affordability issues in the SHMA. The other options are not considered likely to have significant effects.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Mitigation of the environmental effects would need to be through sustainable design and construction policies, and, unlike for housing, the policies relating to commercial development remain capable of providing this mitigation. Since option 10.1 essentially rules mitigation out of the policy, some of the negative effects are unlikely to be capable of mitigation.</p>																					

Q22: RICHFIELD AVENUE & CARDIFF ROAD INDUSTRIAL AREA

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
22.1 *	Retain as an employment area	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22.2	More mixed commercial area	X	X	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?X	0	X	0	X	✓	0	0	✓	✓X	?X	0
22.3	Development for other uses such as residential	X	XX	X	✓	X	XX	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	X	✓	?X	X	✓	XX	?X	?X

COMMENTS:

22.1: Retain as an employment area:

As this would largely continue the existing situation, the effects would largely be neutral, although continued employment use of the land (with a great deal of hardstanding) could affect climate change mitigation (2). It could also continue existing tensions between adjacent employment and residential uses, affecting well-being (11).

22.2: More mixed commercial area:

A development option includes the usual potential negative environmental effects associated with development (1, 3, 5), with also potential impacts on the valuable Thames meadows landscape feature (9). Taking existing uses into account, some of these negatives have the potential to be positives if new development is to be an improvement, but this must be highlighted as an issue for mitigation at this stage. In terms of adaptation to climate change (2), the land is at risk of flooding, which means a negative effect on risk of flooding for any option involving higher risk uses. The development options would mean use of brownfield land (4), and would mean reducing the need to travel by locating in an accessible area within walking distance of the station (14). Development options that bring residents or visitors into an area enhance access to the Thames-side recreation and leisure functions (17).

22.3: Development for other uses such as residential:

Many of the effects would be the same as for other types of development under option 22.2, but the introduction of residential could mean some major issues, for instance a significant negative effect on the risk from flooding (2) and significant exposure to areas of potential contamination (6), both of which lead to a significant negative impact on health (11). There would also be a significant negative effect on economic growth through reduction of existing employment land (18), much of which is used by some of the key industrial and distribution uses that provide balance to the local economy.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential negative impact due to age and disability has been identified for option 22.3 (16, see Appendix 4), as those with limited mobility are more at risk from flooding issues.

MITIGATION: No mitigation measures have been identified.

Q28: ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
28.1 *	No requirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	XX	0	0	X	0	0	0	0
28.2 ▼	100% accessible and adaptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
28.3	>50% accessible and adaptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
28.4	<50% accessible and adaptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

28.1: No requirement:

Not addressing this issue would have a **significant negative effect on meeting housing needs (13)**, and could also potentially negatively affect health (11). A negative impact due to age and disability (16) has been identified through the equality impact assessment screening.

28.2: 100% accessible and adaptable:

This approach would certainly have a **significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13)**, as well as assisting health and well-being and meeting the needs of identified groups in the equality impact process (16).

28.3: Over 50% accessible and adaptable:

This approach would be likely to help to meet housing needs (13), well-being (11) and fulfil equality duties (16), but the effects are less certain, as the level is less likely to meet needs in full.

28.4: Less than 50% accessible and adaptable:

The effects of this option would be less likely to be positive than the approach of over 50%.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential adverse effect due to age and disability has been identified (16, see Appendix 4).

MITIGATION: No mitigation measures have been identified.

Q29: WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
29.1 *▼	No requirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	XX	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0
29.2	>7% wheelchair accessible and adaptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0
29.3	<7% wheelchair accessible and adaptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>29.1: No requirement:</u> Not addressing this issue would have a significant negative effect on meeting housing needs (13), and could also potentially negatively affect health (11). A significant negative impact due to age and disability (16) has been identified through the equality impact assessment screening.</p> <p><u>29.2: Over 7% wheelchair accessible and adaptable:</u> This approach would make a significant contribution to meeting housing needs (13) and on providing for disabled people (16), and would also positively impact on well-being (11).</p> <p><u>29.3: Less than 7% wheelchair accessible and adaptable:</u> The effects of this option would generally be negative as it would be less likely to meet needs.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect due to disability has been identified (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: No mitigation measures have been identified.</p>																					

Q30: WATER EFFICIENCY

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
30.1 *▼	No requirements above building regulations	0	XX	XX	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.2	Proportion of dwellings meet optional standard	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.3	All dwellings meet optional standard	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NB: The ‘business as usual’ approach is not possible in this case, as it would mean adopting a standard other than the option Building Regulations standard, which is specifically forbidden in national policy.

COMMENTS:

30.1: No requirements above building regulations:
There would be **significant negative effects** in terms of potential increased water use (3) and adaptation to climate change by putting more pressure on water resources at a time when there may be potential droughts (2). Reducing access to water can also have an effect on health and well-being (11), and greater water abstraction has a potential negative effect on biodiversity (7).

30.2: Proportion of dwellings meet optional standard:
There would be positive effects on efficient use of water (3) and availability of water in the event of an extreme weather event (2). Ensuring continuity of water supply could also have a positive effect on health and well-being (11), and there could be positive effects on biodiversity by less use of water.

30.3: All dwellings meet optional standard:
The positive effects would be against the same objectives as the previous option, but requiring compliance for all new dwellings will mean a **significant positive effect on water use (3) and adaptation to climate change (2)**.

Habitat Regulations issues
There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: There are no substantial mitigation measures for the significant negative effects that are within the remit of the local plan to control.

Q31: SPACE STANDARDS

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
31.1 *▼	No space standards	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	X	?✓	0	?X	0	0	X	0
31.2	Proportion of dwellings meet space standards	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0
31.3	All dwellings meet space standard	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0

COMMENTS:

31.1: No space standards:

Not having a space standard could lead to a large number of dwellings being provided with inadequate internal space. This does not result in housing that meets the needs of the local area (13) and could mean a **significant negative effect on the well-being of the occupants** (11). It may also result in dense development that does not reflect the character of a particular area (9), and accentuates the divisions between those with access to quality housing and those without (19). However, it does allow for higher densities, which makes more efficient use of land (4) and can reduce the need to travel (14).

31.2: Proportion of dwellings meet space standards:

There are potential positive effects from this option in terms of well-being (11), access to good quality housing (13), the character of areas (9) and inequality (19), as well as potential negative effects from decreasing densities in terms of use of undeveloped land (4) and the need to travel (14). However, with only a proportion of dwellings needing to meet standards, the benefits or costs of this option are fairly faint.

31.3: All dwellings meet space standards:

This approach will result in a **significant positive effect on well-being (11) and on providing quality housing (13)**. There will also be positive effects in terms of inequality (19) and potentially the character of local areas (9). This approach however may result in somewhat lower densities, and therefore less efficient use of undeveloped land (4), with less dense urban areas also meaning that the need to travel may be increased (14).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3).

Equality issues

There may be a slight negative (for option 31.1) or positive (for option 31.2 or 31.3) effect on people with certain disabilities as a result of this.

MITIGATION: There are no substantial mitigation measures for the significant negative effects that are within the remit of the local plan to control. In terms of the negative effect on people with disabilities from option 31.1, this could be mitigated in another part of the plan by adopting standards for accessible and adaptable dwellings.

A1: BRUNEL ARCADE, STATION ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A1a	Retail, operational facilities, office, residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓✓	0	X
A1b	Mixed use scheme on an extended site including Apex Plaza including residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓✓	0	X
A1c	Do not allocate *▼	✓X	0	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	XX	0	0	0	X	0	0
A1d	Retail and related uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0
A1e	Office use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
A1f	Residential use	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

A1a: Retail, operational facilities, office, residential

This option would involve a **significantly efficient mixed use** of one of the most accessible previously-developed sites in the country (4, 14). Redevelopment of this key site would also be have a **significant positive effect on the local economy** (18), both directly through development for beneficial use and indirectly through improving the first impression of Reading for visitors. It would also make a **significant contribution to the provision of new housing** (13). Whilst there would be environmental costs associated with development (1, 3, 5, 6), there may well be improved performance of new buildings in the long term. A positive effect on the townscape from a new development is likely (9), but there is a need to identify a potential impact on the adjacent listed buildings and structures as an effect that will require mitigation (10). In terms of health, the occupants of any residential would be able to make many of their journeys on foot, therefore promoting healthy lifestyles, but at the same time they would be located in an Air Quality Management Area with potential noise effects (11). There would be good access to many services (15), but at the same time an impact on strained town centre health and education services (15, 20).

A1b: Mixed use scheme on an extended site including Apex Plaza including residential

The appraisal of this option is generally the same as for the previous option, but it would involve removing Apex Plaza, thus resulting in a **significant positive effect on the townscape** (9).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>A1c: Do not allocate</u> The effects on environmental options (1, 3, 5, 6) would be positive in the short term of there being no development taking place, but in the long term there is likely to be an environmental cost. The current use does not currently make a particularly positive contribution to the townscape (9). Not developing arguably Reading’s most accessible brownfield site will have a significant negative effect on undeveloped land and the need to travel (4, 14), and will also fail to provide housing (13) and send out the wrong economic message (18).</p> <p><u>A1d: Retail and related uses</u> This option would have similar effects to the other development options, including a significant positive effect on the need to travel (14) and the local economy (18), although it is likely to be a less efficient use of undeveloped land (4). It will fail to provide housing (13), but will have less effects on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).</p> <p><u>A1e: Office use</u> The appraisal is similar to the retail option, but would not provide essential local services (17).</p> <p><u>A1f: Residential use</u> The appraisal of this option is almost identical to the mixed use option, but without an employment generating uses the impact on economic growth (18) would be less positive.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: One of the main possible impacts needing mitigation is on the nearby heritage assets, and any policy should specify this as something to consider. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

A2: 27-28 MARKET PLACE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A2a	Residential/ commercial/ retail/ leisure	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	✓	?✓	0	?X
A2b	Do not allocate *▼	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0
A2c	Offices with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0
A2d	Residential with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
A2e	Leisure with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

Since all options involve retention of the building rather than new development, there tend to be positive effects on many of the environmental objectives (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). Those options that involve reuse and refurbishment of this listed building have positive effects on the townscape (9) and heritage assets (10), whereas not allocating the site could lead to continued vacancy and harm to these objectives. Bringing residential into an area of comparatively poor air quality (11) is a potential negative effect, as is putting strain on town centre education (20) and healthcare (15) infrastructure. Otherwise, many of the options will tend to have positive effects on access to services through further facilities available in the town centre.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION:

Mitigation of the effects of new town centre residential on infrastructure would need to be considered through the plan, as would effects of air quality issues on residents.

A3: 29-31 MARKET PLACE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A3a	Residential/ commercial/ retail/ leisure	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	✓	?✓	0	?X
A3b	Do not allocate *▼	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0
A3c	Offices with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0
A3d	Residential with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
A3e	Leisure with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

Since all options involve retention of the building rather than new development, there tend to be positive effects on many of the environmental objectives (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). Those options that involve reuse and refurbishment of this listed building have positive effects on the townscape (9) and heritage assets (10), whereas not allocating the site could lead to continued vacancy and harm to these objectives. Bringing residential into an area of comparatively poor air quality (11) is a potential negative effect, as is putting strain on town centre education (20) and healthcare (15) infrastructure. Otherwise, many of the options will tend to have positive effects on access to services through further facilities available in the town centre.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION:

Mitigation of the effects of new town centre residential on infrastructure would need to be considered through the plan, as would effects of air quality issues on residents.

A4: 32 MARKET PLACE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A4a	Residential/ commercial/ retail/ leisure	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	✓	?✓	0	?X
A4b	Do not allocate *▼	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0
A4c	Offices with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0
A4d	Residential with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
A4e	Leisure with ground floor retail	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

Since all options involve retention of the building rather than new development, there tend to be positive effects on many of the environmental objectives (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). Those options that involve reuse and refurbishment of this listed building have positive effects on the townscape (9) and heritage assets (10), whereas not allocating the site could lead to continued vacancy and harm to these objectives. Bringing residential into an area of comparatively poor air quality (11) is a potential negative effect, as is putting strain on town centre education (20) and healthcare (15) infrastructure. Otherwise, many of the options will tend to have positive effects on access to services through further facilities available in the town centre.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION:

Mitigation of the effects of new town centre residential on infrastructure would need to be considered through the plan, as would effects of air quality issues on residents.

A5: 37-43 BLAGRAVE STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A5a	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓	✓	?X	0	0	✓X	0	X
A5b	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0
A5c	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	0	0	?X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
A5d	Retail development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	0	0	?X	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
A5e	Leisure development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	0	?X	✓	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

A5a: Residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design (9), and although the current property does not actively contribute to the conservation area, it is also not an obvious detraction - however, this must be identified as an effect in need of potential mitigation (10). The site would provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), and would be in a location where it may be exposed to poor air quality (11). In terms of economic growth, development itself may have positive effects, but it would result in the loss of employment-generating floorspace (18).

A5b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

A5c: Office development

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (11, 15, 20). The effects on the economy would be more positive through retaining an employment generating use (18), but housing would not be provided (13).

A5d: Retail development

The appraisal is largely the same as for office, with the additional positive benefit of provision of services in an accessible location (15).

A5e: Leisure development

Again, the appraisal is largely the same as for other development options, but access to leisure would be enhanced by additional provision in an accessible location.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings will need to be managed in any policy. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

A6: BRISTOL AND WEST ARCADE, 173 FRIAR STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A6a	Residential/ commercial/ retail/ leisure	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	✓X	✓X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	✓	✓	0	X
A6b	Do not allocate *▼	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0
A6c	Residential with ground floor retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	X	0	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
A6d	Office with ground floor retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	X	0	0	?X	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
A6e	Leisure with ground floor retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	✓X	?✓	0	?X	✓	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

A6a: Residential/commercial/retail/leisure development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design (9). The current property does make a generally positive contribution to the conservation area, so any development would need to be carefully designed (10). The site would provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), and would be in a location where it may be exposed to poor air quality (11). However, any leisure provision could have a positive effect on healthy lifestyles (17, 11). In terms of economic growth, development itself may have positive effects, and would retain employment generating uses (18).

A6b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

A6c: Residential with ground floor retail

The appraisal of this option is almost identical to the mixed use option A6a, but the positive effects of incorporating a leisure use (11, 17), would not be felt.

A6d: Office with ground floor retail

This option would have many of the same effects as other development options, but would lack the advantages and disadvantages of bringing residents into this location (11, 13, 15, 20).

A6e: Leisure with ground floor retail

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
This option would be similar to the office option, but would result in additional leisure provision (17), which could have a positive impact on health (11).																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings will need to be managed in any policy. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.																					

A7: PRIMARK, 32-42 WEST STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A7a	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	X	0	✓✓	✓X	XX	X	?✓	XX	?X	X
A7b	Do not allocate *▼	✓X	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0
A7c	Development for ground floor retail uses and offices above	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	X	✓	✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

A7a: Residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The current building makes a reasonable contribution to the street (9) and redevelopment risks having adverse effects on the historic environment, including a nearby Grade I listed church (10). Whilst there would be a **significant positive effect on provision of housing (13)**, bringing some benefits including reducing the need to travel given its central location, there would be pressure placed on stretched town centre education (20) and healthcare resources (15). There would in fact be a **significant negative effect on access to services (15)**, not only through pressure on healthcare, but through loss of a major retail facility in a key retail location, leading to a gap in retail provision along the street. There would also be a **significant negative effect on economic growth through loss of a major employment-generating property (18)**, which provides jobs across a wide range of skill levels (19).

A7b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13), but it would mean the retention of an important employment-generating service (15, 18, 19).

A7c: Development for ground floor retail uses and offices above

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (11, 15, 20). The effects on the economy would be more positive through reproviding an employment generating use (18) and an important retail service (15), but housing would not be provided (13).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

An adverse effect on older people has been identified of option A7a involving the loss of retail (16, see Appendix 4). This option would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.

MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings will need to be managed in any policy.

The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

A8: LAND AT RICHFIELD AVENUE AND TESSA ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A8a	Mix including retail/ trade counter/ employment/ residential	X	XX	X	✓	X	XX	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	✓X	✓	?X	0	✓	✓X	?X	?X
A8b	Do not allocate *▼	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A8c	Development for employment	X	X	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	0
A8d	Development for residential	X	XX	X	✓	X	XX	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	✓X	✓	?X	0	✓	XX	?X	?X
A8e	Development for retail and leisure	X	X	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?X	0	?✓	0	0	✓X	0	X	✓	X	0	0

COMMENTS:

A8a: Mix including retail/trade counter/employment/residential

Many of the options for development share similar effects, which include the usual potential negative environmental effects associated with development (1, 3, 5), with also potential impacts on the valuable Thames meadows landscape feature (9). Taking existing uses into account, some of these negatives have the potential to be positives if new development is to be an improvement, but this must be highlighted as an issue for mitigation at this stage. In terms of adaptation to climate change (2), the land is at risk of flooding, which means a **significant negative effect on risk of flooding** for any option involving higher risk uses, particularly residential. Options involving residential also potentially have a **significant negative effect in terms of exposure to potentially contaminated land** (6, 11), as well as affecting well-being by introducing potential conflicts between residents and noisy industrial uses. Given these effects, whilst a reasonable amount of housing could be provided, it is unlikely to be high quality unless there is a more comprehensive approach to the area (13). The development options would mean use of brownfield land (4), and would mean reducing the need to travel by locating in an accessible area within walking distance of the station (14). Development options that bring residents or visitors into an area enhance access to the Thames-side recreation and leisure functions (17). Residential development could also place a strain on education and healthcare facilities (15, 20). A mix of employment and residential could result in a loss of employment (18), but might retain a certain amount of jobs and create different employment opportunities.

A8b: Do not allocate

The scores for this option would be largely neutral, although the vacant premises could become a focus for crime and anti-social behaviour (12).

A8c: Development for employment

Many of the same effects as for a development for a mix of uses would be seen, but some would be less significant if residents were not brought into the area. However, there would be a **significant positive effect on economic growth from renewal for employment** (18), with knock-on effects on deprivation (19).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>A8d: Development for residential</u> Development for residential only would have many of the same effects seen for A8a, but the wholesale loss of employment land for housing would mean that impacts on economic growth would be significantly negative (18).</p> <p><u>A8e: Development for retail and leisure</u> Many of the effects would be the same as for other development options, but could have a negative effect on the need to travel by car given its out of centre location.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect on older people has been identified from out of centre retail and leisure development, and on older and disabled people in a residential development from the increased risk to flooding (16, see Appendix 4). These options would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Effects on environmental objectives could be mitigated by high standards of design and construction. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL. More work would need to be done to examine whether risk of flooding could be mitigated, although it should be noted that there may be the scope for improvement given that the area is virtually all currently hardstanding. Effects on health could be mitigated through remediation of contaminated land, although effects from noise of nearby uses would be more difficult to address. The economic effects of loss of employment to residential would not be possible to mitigate unless it could be demonstrated that the employment was surplus to requirements.</p>																					

A9: FORMER COX & WYMAN SITE, CARDIFF ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A9a	Redevelopment for residential use	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
A9b *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A9c	Employment uses	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?X	?✓	X	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
A9d	Retail and leisure uses	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	?✓	X	XX	X	X	✓	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:

A9a: Redevelopment for residential use

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The site is surrounded by Flood Zone 2, but is not in it itself, so there may be a marginal effect on adaptation to climate change (2). Redevelopment of the site would be likely to make a positive contribution to the townscape. It would have a **significant positive effect through use of a large previously developed site (4), in an accessible town centre fringe location (14), which could provide a significant amount of housing (13)**. Development would bring residents into an area with potentially low air quality and contamination issues (11), but at the same time would remove a noisy use from near existing residents and eliminate any effects on their well-being. Redevelopment of a vacant site could prevent it becoming a target for anti-social behaviour (12). Residential could put pressure on town centre health (15) and education (20) infrastructure, and would result in the loss of a site previously used for employment purposes (18).

A9b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13), and the vacant building would continue to detract from the character of the area (9) and provide a potential focus for crime and anti-social behaviour (12).

A9c: Development for employment uses

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (11, 15, 20). There would be a significant positive effect on the economy through reprovision of employment generating uses (18), but this would potentially result in some negative effects on the health and well-being of neighbouring residents (11). An employment development would be less likely to make a positive contribution to the townscape than a residential use (9).

A9d: Development for retail and leisure uses

Many of the effects would be the same as for other development options. However, the main concern would be that this would essentially be an out of centre location for retail and leisure development, which would impact on town centres and therefore have a **significant negative effect on the need to travel (14)**, and also a negative effect on access to services (15). Whilst it would provide employment, it could potentially detract from the town centre economy (18).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect on older people has been identified from out of centre retail and leisure development (16, see Appendix 4). This option would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. A flood risk assessment would be required, which would look in more detail at whether there are flooding implications and recommend any mitigation measures. The impacts of any retail and leisure options on the town centre could potentially be mitigated by restricting the type of use that can be provided.</p>																					

A10: LAND AT READING WEST STATION

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A10a	Residential—187 dwellings	✓X	?X	X	✓✓	X	X	X	0	X	XX	?X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?X
A10b	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A10c	Less dense residential [25-47 dwellings]	✓X	?X	X	✓	X	X	X	0	X	XX	?X	?✓	✓	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

A10a: Residential—187 dwellings

The Tilehurst Road railway bridge, which would need to be significantly altered and obscured on one side to facilitate development, is listed, and any development would have a **significant negative effect on the historic environment** (10), as well as negatively affecting the overall townscape (9). There could be negative effects on many of the environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6) as for any development, and in this case the railway is additionally a wildlife corridor that would be broken by development (7). Development of a podium over the railway could cause some drainage issues (2) that would need to be addressed. New homes could place pressure on existing services such as healthcare (15) and education (20). A new access onto the Tilehurst Road (a classified road which narrows over the bridge) at this point could well cause issues for highway safety (11), although the effects of providing natural surveillance over a pedestrian route to Reading West station that previously had none could be positive for crime and the fear of crime (13). Effects on provision of high quality housing (13) could be both positive and negative, as more homes would be provided but they would be unlikely to match the needs for larger homes outside the town centre, which would be less of an issue for the less dense option. The location next to Reading West Station would mean a **significant positive effect on the need to travel** by modes other than the car (14). A novel solution such as building over the railway would have a **significant positive effect on the need for greenfield land** (4), with a similar albeit less significant effect for the smaller scale development.

A10b: Do not allocate

There is a potential negative effect on crime or the fear of crime by leaving a relatively isolated pedestrian route to the station (12).

A10c: Less dense residential [25-47 dwellings]

The effects would largely be the same as for A14a, although the efficiency of land use would be less intense (4). The development is also more likely to deliver the type of housing that Reading needs (13).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Effects on environmental objectives could be mitigated by high standards of design and construction. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL. Continuation of a green link through the site could mitigate the interruption of a

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
wildlife corridor to some extent. However, the effect on the historic environment is not considered likely to be capable of mitigation.																					

A11: CAVERSHAM WEIR

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A11a	Weir with hydropower generation	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓
A11b	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>A11a: Weir with hydropower generation</u></p> <p>The option of a weir with hydropower generation would have significant positive effects on CO2 emissions through providing a source of renewable energy (1), on availability of energy (3) and on adaptation to climate change through providing a source of energy that is less susceptible to interruptions to supply (2). However, there are potential negative effects on biodiversity, as the Thames is a wildlife corridor (8), and townscape (9), as a result of the operational equipment that may be required.</p>																					
<p><u>A11b: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>The weir would not be changed, and there would be no sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
MITIGATION: The effects of any equipment or housing on biodiversity and townscape would need to be mitigated in any allocation.																					

A12: VIEW ISLAND

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A12a	Conservation and ecology exemplar area	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	?X	✓X	0	?X	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	?✓
A12b	Do not allocate for development *▼	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>A12a: Conservation and ecology exemplar area</u></p> <p>It is assumed that the option of a conservation and ecology exemplar area might include a small amount of development, such as an education centre, which would have small environmental impacts such as on resource use and waste generation (1, 3, 5, 6), as well as on the landscape character of the island (9). Impact on biodiversity could be both positive and negative (7) - in a wider sense, the positive impact would be a greater understanding and appreciation of biodiversity, but bringing more people into an area of biodiversity significance could have impacts on the wildlife of View Island itself as well as on access to leisure and education (11, 17, 20).</p>																					
<p><u>A12b: Do not allocate for development</u></p> <p>This option would preserve an undeveloped site (4) and maintain the biodiversity significance (7).</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: Environmental effects could be mitigated through high standards of sustainability in design and construction, and by making sure that any development is small scale and relates well to the character of the Island. The potential effects on biodiversity would need to be investigated in depth at the time a proposal is made, but mitigation measures could include some form of management plan.</p>																					

A13: READING UNIVERSITY BOAT CLUB, PROMENADE ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A13a	Residential development	✓X	XX	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?✓	?✓	✓	✓	✓X	X	✓X	0	0	?X
A13b *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
A13c	Higher density residential	✓X	XX	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?✓	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓X	X	✓X	0	0	?X
A13d	Leisure uses associated with meadows	✓X	?X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A13a: Residential development

As for all development options there are potential environmental costs in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6), but these may be offset by future improved performance. A **significant negative effect on flood risk has been identified (2)** due to the location in the flood plain. The development would make good use of a previously developed site (4). The location adjacent to a major landscape feature means that development risks a negative impact (9). The development would provide housing (13) in an area with good access to services and facilities (14, 15) and areas of informal recreation (17), and residential use adjacent to the meadows could enhance natural surveillance (12). Development will have an impact on health and education infrastructure (15, 20). It would also result in the loss of a leisure facility (17).

A13b: Do not allocate

Not allocating the site for development would mean no environmental costs through construction, although the performance of the existing building is not likely to be optimal. A previously developed site would be left undeveloped (4) and an opportunity to provide housing would be lost (12). A leisure facility would be retained, although it is not clear that there is a future for the current use (17, 11).

A13c: Higher density residential development

The effects would largely be the same as for the other residential option, although it is considered **the effect on housing provision (13) would be significant**.

A13d: Leisure development

Although some of the effects would be the same as for other development options, there would be a **significant positive effect on access to leisure (17)**, which knock-on effects on human health.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential adverse effect on older and disabled people in a residential development from the increased risk to flooding (16, see Appendix 4) has been

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
identified. This option would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.																					
MITIGATION: Impacts of development on CO2, energy, waste and pollution could be mitigated by sustainable design and construction measures. Impacts in terms of loss of leisure could be mitigated by re-provision elsewhere, or use of any existing facilities. Impacts on education and health infrastructure could be mitigated by adequate contribution to new infrastructure provision.																					

A14: ALLOTMENTS AND ADJACENT LAND, KENTWOOD HILL

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A14a	Develop 1.04 ha on Kentwood Hill for housing— approx. 45 dwellings	X	X	X	✓X	X	X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X
A14b	Development of the whole area for housing (200-250 dwellings)	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	0	X	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓/X	✓X	0	XX	0	0	X
A14c	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A14d	Identify previously developed part only [11-17 dwellings]	X	0	X	✓	X	X	?X	0	✓X	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X
A14e	Identify land fronting Kentwood Hill for housing - approx. 60-90 dwellings	X	X	X	XX	X	X	X	0	X	0	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X
A14f	Identify whole area bar recreation ground for housing	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	0	X	0	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	X	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

A14a: Develop 1.04 ha on Kentwood Hill for housing - approx. 45 dwellings

As for all development options there are potential environmental costs in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6). There would be a direct loss of undeveloped land, although there would also be use of part of the site which is previously developed (4). An area adjacent to the site has recognised wildlife value which could be affected by any scheme (7), and the green frontage to Kentwood Hill adds to the landscape of the area (9) and provides shading and permeable ground for water absorption (2). Development will bring new housing (13) into an area where services can be accessed on foot (14, 15), although there will be pressure placed on some services such as healthcare (15) and education (20).

A14b: Development of the whole area for housing (200-250 dwellings)

This would involve development of the whole site, including allotments in use and a recreation ground for housing. Therefore, whilst there would be a

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	significant positive effect on housing provision (13) and a large number of new residents in a location accessible on foot to a district centre (14, 15), there would be a number of negative effects, some of which would be very strong, in addition to the effects of development already set out in relation to A14a. This would mean developing a significant area of greenfield land (4), including an area with significance for wildlife (7) and a number of trees (2). Through loss of allotments, there would be a reduction in supply of food (3). The area has an important landscape function that would be lost (9). Loss of an area of recreation ground will have a significant negative effect on access to leisure (17) and, combined with the loss of allotments, on healthy lifestyles (11), and means that people will have to travel further afield for recreation.																				
	<u>A14c: Do not allocate</u> Not allocating the site will have largely neutral effects, other than on provision of housing (13), although it will lose the opportunity to turn the builders yard into a development that makes a positive contribution to the area (9).																				
	<u>A14d: Identify previously developed part only (11-17 dwellings)</u> This would mean developing only the builders yard on Kentwood Hill for a small housing development. Therefore, the effects of development on environmental objectives in option A14a are largely replicated here, with the exception of those related to a loss of greenfield land (4, 2). Many of the other effects are similar, but more limited in scale due to the small size of the site. In terms of the effects on the character of the area (9), removing the builders yard for a development would have a tidying up effect, but the Inspector for the SDPD noted that this would be a piecemeal approach which would not address the wider issues of the area.																				
	<u>A14e: Identify land fronting Kentwood Hill for housing (60-90 dwellings)</u> The effects of this option would largely be as for A14a, although as the development would be on a greater scale, the effects could be felt more strongly.																				
	<u>A14f: Identify whole area bar recreation ground for housing</u> This would be similar to option A14b, although retention of the recreation ground would mean that effects on loss of leisure (17) and health (11) would be less significant, albeit still negative.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																				
	MITIGATION: Depending on the extent of the loss of green space, there may be scope to mitigate impacts through on-site provision and/or off-site improvements, but this is likely to be more difficult to achieve the greater the loss of undeveloped land. Loss of a recreation ground is unlikely to be capable of acceptable mitigation. In terms of wildlife, some of the smaller scale developments could address this with an appropriate buffer or management measures, but wholesale loss is again likely to be incapable of complete mitigation. Effects on the landscape from a smaller scheme can be potentially mitigated through quality landscaping. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Effects on climate change mitigation could be mitigated by ensuring the development includes trees and gardens with permeable surfaces, and green infrastructure could also be beneficial in terms of wildlife.																				

A15: 7 LIPPINCOTE COURT

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A15a	Residential development [4-6 dwellings]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	?X	0	0	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
A15b	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A15c	Development for community use	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	?X	0	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

A15a: Residential development [4-6 dwellings]

Many of the effects of this option on the environmental objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) are considered to be negative when considered against not developing and undeveloped site. Of particular relevance is the fact that the site has many trees, which provide shade (2) and habitats (7) and which benefit the wider landscape (9). However, developing next to a public car park which otherwise has little natural surveillance could be of benefit to crime (12), and developing close to a station will have positive effects on the need to travel (14).

A15b: Do not allocate

There would be positive effects in terms of preserving a greenfield site (4) and any biodiversity interest on it (7), and the contribution it makes to the overall townscape would be maintained (9). However, the site does not provide any natural surveillance (14).

A15c: Development for community use

The effects would largely be the same as for A15a, although the site would not provide housing (13). However, a community use could help provide essential services (15), which could include education (20).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Some of the negative effects of development, for instance on waste or pollution, could be mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. However, other effects, such as the loss of trees are unlikely to be capable of mitigation at all.

A16: READING LINK RETAIL PARK, ROSE KILN LANE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A16a	Wide range of retail use	XX	XX	X	✓	?X	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	XX	X	X	✓	?✓	✓X	0
A16b	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A16c	Employment or quasi-retail use	X	XX	X	✓	?X	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	✓	✓✓	0
A16d	Leisure use	XX	XX	X	✓	?X	X	X	0	X	0	✓	0	0	XX	X	X	✓	?✓	✓X	0

COMMENTS:

For the retail and leisure options in particular, the appraisal discerns **significant negative effects on the need to travel (14) and CO2 emissions (1)** due to the location of main town centre uses in a location that is likely to result in increased car journeys. There would also be **significant negative effects on water flows (2)** from all development options due to the site's location in Flood Zone 2. All development will have potential negative effects on various environmental objectives (3, 5, 6), but there are particular sensitivities on this site due to the significance of neighbouring land for wildlife (8) and landscape (9). There would be positive effects in terms of bringing visitors to a location that is highly accessible to open space (17), and providing job opportunities in South Reading (18, 19). The **effect on deprivation could be significantly positive** from the employment option, but for other options these effects may be counterbalanced by negative effects if the type of development affects existing centres.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential adverse effect on older people has been identified from out of centre retail and leisure development (16, see Appendix 4). These options would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.

MITIGATION: Any development in Flood Zone 2 may require mitigation, as would effects on biodiversity and landscape character. Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability.

A17: 103 DEE ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A17a	Housing (50 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
A17b	Retained fire service/ community uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓✓	?✓	X	✓	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0
A17c	Do not allocate *▼	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A17d	Less dense residential [31-49 dwellings]	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
A17e	Retail development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	X	XX	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

A17a: Housing (50 dwellings)

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design, but would be likely to be an improvement (9). The site would provide a **significant amount of housing on an accessible brownfield site** (4, 13, 14), but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20). The effect on health and safety would depend on whether the loss of the fire station meant no difference in service, but a negative effect has been assumed at this stage (11). The effect on the character of the local area would depend largely on design (9).

A17b: Retained fire service/community uses

It is assumed that this option would involve development for these uses. Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (15, 20). The effects on deprivation in this area with known deprivation issues would be more positive through retaining an employment generating use (19), but housing would not be provided (13). A new fire station could have a **significant positive effect on health and safety** (11), and a community use could assist towards community cohesion (12) and help to provide essential services (15).

A17c: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13).

A17d: Less dense residential (31-49 dwellings)

Since the number of dwellings to be provided is not massively different from option A17a, the effects highlighted remain the same.

A17e: Retail development

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (11, 15, 20). The effects on deprivation in this area with known deprivation issues would be more positive through retaining an employment generating use (19), but housing would not be provided (13). A significant retail development could compete with town centres, and is likely to ultimately **significantly increase the need to**

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
travel by car (14), and reduce access to services in town centres (15).																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Any negative impacts associated with the loss of the fire station could only be adequately mitigated if that facility is no longer needed.</p>																					

A18: ALEXANDER HOUSE, KINGS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A18a	Residential development - around 57 dwellings	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	X	0	✓✓	✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
A18b *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A18c	Development for offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	X	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
A18d	Lower density residential (20-40 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	X	0	✓	✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X

COMMENTS:

A18a: Residential development (around 57 dwellings)

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design, but would be likely to be an improvement (9). The site would provide a **significant amount of housing on an accessible brownfield site** (4, 13, 14), but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), and would be in a location where residents may be exposed to poor air quality and noise (11). A loss of an employment generating use could have negative effects on economic growth (18).

A18b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13).

A18c: Office development

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (11, 15, 20). The effects on the economy would be more positive through retaining an employment generating use (18), but housing would not be provided (13). Although reasonably accessible, the site is still not in an optimum location for offices in terms of accessibility by means other than the car (14).

A18d: Lower density residential development (20-40 dwellings)

The appraisal is largely the same as for the other residential option, but a less efficient use of land would result in less significant effects on previously developed land (4) and housing provision (13).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

A19: PART OF READING GOLF COURSE, KIDMORE END ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A19a	Residential and golf clubhouse [100 / 85-134 dwellings]	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?X
A19b	Do not allocate *▼	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A19c	New clubhouse only	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
A19d	Leisure with new clubhouse	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	0	✓	0	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

A19a: Residential and golf clubhouse (100 / 85-134 dwellings)

There would be the same short term environmental costs and potential long term benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). This option would result in the **loss of a significant amount of undeveloped land (4)**. This could have some marginal effects in terms of wildlife (7) and climate change adaptation (as a result of potential loss of trees and permeable ground) (2). **A significant amount of residential would be provided (13)**, which would be relatively close to local services therefore reducing the need to travel (14). The effect on the local character would depend entirely on design (9). There would be added pressure on education (20) and healthcare (15) services. This development could secure the future of the golf club, thus having a positive effect on access to leisure (17).

A19b: Do not allocate

Most of the effects would be neutral, although a potential housing site would not be used.

A19c: New golf clubhouse only

Some of the effects of other development options would also apply here, although those effects are likely to be less extensive. This development could secure the future of the golf club, thus having a positive effect on access to leisure (17).

A19d: Leisure development with new golf clubhouse

Many of the same effects as for the residential option would be felt, but this option would make a **significant contribution to access to leisure (17)**, with knock-on effects in terms of health (11), as well as provide employment opportunities.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure,

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Effects on climate change mitigation could be mitigated by ensuring the development includes trees and gardens with permeable surfaces, and green infrastructure could also be beneficial in terms of wildlife.</p>																					

A20: REAR OF 200-214 HENLEY ROAD, 12-24 ALL HALLOWS ROAD & 4, 7 & 8 COPSE AVENUE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A20a	Residential development (30-35 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
A20b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A20c	Northern part only	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
A20d	Southern part only	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A20a: Residential development (30-35 dwellings)

As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of C02 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). In addition, development could sever a green link, which means a potential effect on wildlife (7), and would use undeveloped land (4). The northern part of the site has potential contamination issues, whilst the southern part is partially within an Air Quality Management Area, both of which could potentially affect health (11). There are also concerns that a scheme could adversely affect the character of the local area (9). There would be a **significant positive effect on housing provision (13)**, and more intense development would reduce the need to travel (14).

A20b: Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (14).

A20c: Development of the northern part only

Most of the effects of this option would be identical to the overall residential option, albeit that they would be limited to a smaller area. However, the effect on housing provision would be less positive.

A20d: Development of the southern part only

Most of the effects of this option would be identical to the overall residential option, albeit that they would be limited to a smaller area. However, the effect on housing provision would be less positive.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Mitigation of many of the environmental effects could be through sustainable design and construction measures, albeit with the Code for Sustainable Homes having been removed, there are less tools in place to achieve this. A scheme could be designed to ensure that the green link is not

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
broken. Remediation of any contaminated land is likely to be achievable, and the scheme could be designed to mitigate any air quality issues. Good design could potentially address any concerns about the effects on local character.																					

A21: REAR OF 13-14A HAWTHORNE ROAD & 282-292 HENLEY ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A21a	Residential development (10 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
A21b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>A21a: Residential development (10 dwellings)</u></p> <p>As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of C02 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). In addition, development would use undeveloped land (4). The site is partially within an Air Quality Management Area, both of which could potentially affect health (11). There are also concerns that a scheme could adversely affect the character of the local area (9). There would be a positive effect on housing provision (13), and more intense development would reduce the need to travel (14).</p>																					
<p><u>A21b: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (14).</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: Mitigation of many of the environmental effects could be through sustainable design and construction measures, albeit with the Code for Sustainable Homes having been removed, there are less tools in place to achieve this. A scheme could be designed to ensure that the green link is not broken. Remediation of any contaminated land is likely to be achievable, and the scheme could be designed to mitigate any air quality issues. Good design could potentially address any concerns about the effects on local character.</p>																					

A22: REAR OF 8-26 REDLANDS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A22a	Residential development (around 20 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	X	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
A22b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A22a: Residential development (around 20 dwellings)

As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of C02 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). In addition, development could sever a green link, which means a potential effect on wildlife (7), and would use undeveloped land (4). The site is partially within an Air Quality Management Area, which could potentially affect health (11). The site is within a conservation area and adjacent to listed buildings (10), and, whilst development could potentially have a positive effect, this needs to be highlighted as a potential issue at this stage. There are also concerns that a scheme could adversely affect the character of the local area (9). There would be a positive effect on housing provision (13), and more intense development would reduce the need to travel (14).

A21b: Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (14).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Mitigation of many of the environmental effects could be through sustainable design and construction measures, albeit with the Code for Sustainable Homes having been removed, there are less tools in place to achieve this. A scheme could be designed to ensure that the green link is not broken. Remediation of any contaminated land is likely to be achievable, and the scheme could be designed to mitigate any air quality issues. Good design could potentially address any concerns about the effects on local character and the conservation area.

A23: LAND ADJACENT TO 40 REDLANDS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A23a	Housing—23-24 dwellings	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	X	?X	0	0	?X
A23b	Do not allocate *	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A11c	Less dense residential [15-22 dwellings] ▼	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	X	?X	0	0	?X
A23d	Development for community use	X	0	X	?✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A23a: Housing - 23-24 dwellings

As for any development, there will be negative effects in terms of some environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6), although previous work on allocations did not identify any biodiversity significance (7). New residential development could increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Loss of a community facility could impact on access to recreational activities (17). New housing development would help to meet needs (13), reduce greenfield land use (4), reduce the need to travel (14) and potentially reduce crime through reusing a vacant site (12). The effect on townscape (9) and the adjacent conservation area (10) would be uncertain, and would depend on the design, but may require mitigation.

A23b: Do not allocate

Generally, the effects would be neutral, but there would be negative effects in terms of an underuse of previously developed land (4), and potential issues in terms of townscape, the historic environment and crime of a site being left vacant (9, 10, 12).

A23c: Less dense residential [15-22 dwellings]

This option is sufficiently similar to A23a that the scores are the same.

A23d: Development for community use

Many of the effects would be the same as or similar to the residential options (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14). However, a development for community use would likely have a positive effect on access to recreational activities (17) and, depending on the use, healthcare (15).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential adverse effects due to religion has been identified if the existing use is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).

MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on the conservation area or townscape more generally could be mitigated by good design.

A24: LAND AT SEARLES FARM

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A24a	71.2 ha - Open space associated with major residential development on nearby land	?✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓X	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
A24b	58.4 ha - Residential development (1,500 homes)	X	XX	X	XX	X	X	XX	X	XX	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓	XX	X	✓X	0	✓	XX
A24c *▼	Do not allocate	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
A24d	Residential development of whole area with other uses	X	XX	X	XX	X	X	XX	X	XX	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	XX	X	✓X	?✓	✓	XX
A24e	Commercial development	X	XX	X	XX	X	X	XX	X	XX	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	✓✓	✓✓	0
A24f	Leisure development	X	XX	X	XX	X	X	XX	X	XX	?X	X	0	0	X	0	0	✓X	✓	✓	0
A24g	Small scale & water compatible leisure	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

A24a: Open space associated with major residential development on nearby land (71.2 ha)

It is important to note that the appraisal has not taken account of the residential development itself, which if it happened would likely be primarily in an adjoining authority. Therefore this option deals with the open space element only. This therefore has a **significant positive effect on the preservation of undeveloped land (4), on access to leisure and recreation (17) and therefore on healthy lifestyles (11)**. It preserves a landscape which has been identified in policy as having major local significance (9). There is also a positive effect on climate change mitigation through preservation of a functional floodplain (2). Whilst some elements of the biodiversity of the area will be preserved through open space use, other elements may be sensitive to increased visitor numbers through a more formalised open space function (7).

A24b: Residential development (1,500 homes on 58.4 ha)

The main positive effect of this option would be a significant positive effect on provision of housing (13). Development as an urban extension would also potentially help to reduce the need to travel (14) and address inequality of access to housing (19). For the occupants, there would be good access to areas for recreation (17). However, there would be a number of strong negative impacts. The option would mean a **significant loss of undeveloped land**

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	(4), a very significant effect on water flows through development of the functional floodplain (2), and a wholesale loss of an area of strong landscape (9) and biodiversity (7) significance. The area also has potential archaeological significance (10). The development would generate significant demands on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. It would also result in the loss of an area popular for informal recreation (17, 10). In addition, there would be the usual negative environmental effects associated with any development (1, 3, 5, 6).																				
	<u>A24c: Do not allocate</u> Whilst positive effects would be recorded against most of the same objectives as the open space option (1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 17), these would not be as strong as for that option, as not identifying the site would offer no guarantees about its future.																				
	<u>A24d: Residential development of whole area with other uses</u> The effects would largely be the same as for option A24b, with the main difference being that supporting non-residential uses would potentially generate some local economic activity (18).																				
	<u>A24e: Commercial development</u> Most of the very severe negative effects associated with the residential options would also arise in relation to commercial development, although it would not place a strain on the healthcare and education infrastructure. There would be significant positive effects on economic growth through a major commercial development (18) and a large number of jobs would be created that are accessible to some of Reading’s most deprived areas (19).																				
	<u>A24f: Leisure development</u> Similar effects to the commercial option have been identified. However, there would be a negative effect on the need to travel, as major leisure could have an impact on town centre facilities (14). For this reason, the objective of enhancing access to leisure (17) is not wholly positive.																				
	<u>A24g: Small scale water compatible leisure</u> Although many of the same objectives are identified with a potential negative effect, a much smaller scale development will also mean that those effects are much smaller scale. This type of development could significantly enhance the recreation function of the meadows (17) leading to healthier lifestyles (11).																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> Options involving significant levels of development could potentially have significant effects on Kennet and Lambourn Floodplains SAC and River Lambourn SAC due to effects on water flows. Major development could draw more traffic past the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, leading to effects in terms of noise and disturbance and air quality. Major residential could also potentially affect Hartslock Wood SAC due to increased visitor numbers (8, see Appendix 3). Options involving open space or low-key leisure development would not be likely to have any significant effects.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect on older and disabled people in a residential development from the increased risk to flooding (16, see Appendix 4) has been identified. These options would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.																				
	MITIGATION: Whilst the effects on matters such as CO2, waste and energy use could be mitigated through sustainable design and construction measures, many of the other effects associated with development will simply not be capable of mitigation due to the scale of the effect.																				

A25: THE ARTHUR CLARK HOME, DOVEDALE CLOSE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A25a	Development for extra care housing	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓	0	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0
A25b *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A25c	Development for community uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?✓	0	X	0	✓	X	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A25a: Development for extra care housing

There would be the same short term environmental costs and potential long term benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). There would be a **significant positive effect in terms of providing housing to meet the identified needs for housing for elderly people (13)**, and this has a positive effect on health (11) and access to facilities (15), as well as addressing potential inequality issues (19). This would be a use of a previously developed site (4). The effects on the character of the local area would be dependent on the design (9).

A25b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13).

A25c: Development for community uses

Many of the effects would be the same as for the extra-care option above, but it would not provide housing (13). Depending on the specific uses provided, there may be a potential improvement in access to healthcare services (15).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A potential adverse effects due to age has been identified if the use of the site as provision for older people is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).

MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on loss of services to elderly people may be mitigated to some degree if residential accommodation is geared towards elderly people.

A26: REAR OF 1 & 3 WOODCOTE ROAD & 21 ST PETER'S HILL

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A26a	Residential development (10-15 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
A26b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

A26a: Residential development (10-15 dwellings)

As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of C02 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). In addition, development would use undeveloped land (4). The site is partially within an Air Quality Management Area, both of which could potentially affect health (11). There are also concerns that a scheme could adversely affect the character of the local area (9). There would be a positive effect on housing provision (13), and more intense development would reduce the need to travel (14).

A26b: Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (14).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Mitigation of many of the environmental effects could be through sustainable design and construction measures, albeit with the Code for Sustainable Homes having been removed, there are less tools in place to achieve this. A scheme could be designed to ensure that the green link is not broken. Remediation of any contaminated land is likely to be achievable, and the scheme could be designed to mitigate any air quality issues. Good design could potentially address any concerns about the effects on local character.

A27: LAND AT CONWY CLOSE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A27a	Residential development (likely affordable)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	✓	?X
A27b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A27c	Community uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	0	X	?✓	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓

COMMENTS:

A27a: Residential development (likely to be affordable housing)

There would be the same short term environmental costs and potential long term benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). There would be a **significant positive effect on use of undeveloped land (4) and on the provision of housing to meet identified needs (13)**, and provision of affordable housing would also help to address inequality (19). Residential development can place some strain on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is partly in the Air Quality Management Area, and residents may therefore be exposed to poorer air quality (11). The effect on the character of the area will be dependent on the design (9).

A27b: Do not allocate

Leaving the site undeveloped would represent a poor use of previously developed land (4) and a wasted opportunity to provide housing (13).

A27c: Development for community uses, potentially associated with school

Many of the effects would be the same as for the residential development option, albeit that housing would not be provided (13), and the efficiency of the use of a previously developed site would be likely to be less than for a residential development (4). Depending on the community use to be provided, there may be a positive effect in terms of access to healthcare and essential services (15) and education (20).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: The effects of poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

A28: 16-18 BENNET ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A28a	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?✓	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0
A28b *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A28c	Other commercial uses	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?✓	0	0	0	✓	?✓	0
A28d	Residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	XX	0	X	?✓	0	X	0	XX	0	?X

COMMENTS:

A28a: Employment development (B1/B2/B8)

There would be the same short term environmental costs and potential long term benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The site is partly in Flood Zone 2, so development could affect flood risk and therefore adaptation to climate change (2). Development would represent a positive use of a previously developed site (4). A new employment development in this location would have a **significant positive effect on the economy (18)**, and would also have a benefit to addressing inequality, given the proximity to some of the largest concentrations of unemployment and low skills (19).

A28b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although that building's performance may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used (4). A vacant site could become a focus for crime and anti-social behaviour (12).

A28c: Other commercial uses

Development for other commercial uses outside the B use classes would be likely to have very similar effects as the employment development option, assuming that those uses were for the types of uses often found on employment areas rather than something like major retail uses. However, we might expect the effect on economic growth (18) to be less significant.

A28d: Residential development

Whilst some of the effects of development in terms of environmental objectives would be similar to other options, there would be some very different effects felt elsewhere. The site is partly in the flood plain, and surrounded by industrial activities that generate noise and disturbance, and has potential contamination issues, and this would have a **significant negative effect on any residents of a development (11)**. Loss of the employment function of the land would also have a **significant negative effect on economic growth (18)**. Whilst housing would be provided, the constraints of the site would mean that it was not capable of being the high quality housing to meet needs.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect on older and disabled people in a residential development from the increased risk to flooding (16, see Appendix 4) has been identified. This option would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. As only part of the site is within Flood Zone 2, it seems likely that design can effectively mitigate any impact. However, it seems likely that the noise and disturbance of the surrounding area on any proposed residential development of the site would be incapable of mitigation.</p>																					

A29: LAND BOUNDED BY ISLAND ROAD, LONGWATER AVENUE, A33 AND THE SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A29a	Mixed commercial uses, excluding residential	X	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
A29b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
A29c	Retail development	XX	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	X	✓	0	0	0	0	XX	?X	X	0	XX	X	0
A29d	Leisure development	XX	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	X	✓	0	✓	0	0	XX	?X	X	✓✓	?X	?X	0
A29e	Residential development [270-506 dwellings]	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	✓	0	XX	0	✓X	X	X	0	?✓	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

A29a: Mixed commercial uses, excluding residential

As for any development, there will be negative effects in terms of some environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6). It is not known whether there is any biodiversity significance of the site, and this would need to be investigated further (7). The site is in flood zone 2 (2). Development of essentially a vacant site is likely to have a positive effect on the townscape of the area (9) and will represent good use of a previously developed site (4). It will make a significant contribution to the local economy (18) and help reduce deprivation by presenting significant job opportunities close to Reading's largest area of deprivation (19).

A29b: Do not allocate

Generally, the effects would be neutral, but there would be negative effects in terms of an underuse of previously developed land (4), poor quality townscape resulting from a vacant site (9) and the impression a vacant site makes on the main entrance to the town (18).

A29c: Retail development

Some of the effects would be the same as for A12a (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7), but there are a wide range of potential negative impacts. There would be a significant negative impact on the need to travel by car (14) which would mean a significant negative impact on CO2 emissions (1). The development could result in a significant negative effect on town centres (18), which would have implications for those without access to a car (19), and in turn reduces access to essential services (15).

A29d: Leisure development

Many of the effects are the same as A12a for retail, albeit that some (e.g. the effect on town centres, 18) are less certain because it would largely depend on the type of leisure development. If a leisure development were of a type that complemented, rather than competed with, the town centre this would mean a significant positive effect on access to leisure (17), which could also mean positive impacts for health (11).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>A29e: Residential development</u></p> <p>Whilst this option would have significant positive effects on the use of undeveloped land by using a brownfield site to meet the most pressing needs (4), there would be a number of negative effects. In particular a significant negative effect in terms of exposing residents to potential air quality and contamination issues, as well as flood risk, has been identified (6, 11). The housing would also be located in an area that does not have easy links to education and essential services (15, 20). Whilst the numbers of dwellings that could be accommodated would be high, the quality is unlikely to be acceptable given the isolated location between the dual carriageway and the sewage treatment works (13).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>Three of the options could result in significant effects on Thames Basin Heaths SPA (8, see Appendix 3). Options for very major out of centre retail or leisure development could result in increased road traffic past the SPA, whilst a large residential development, in combination with other such developments in South Reading, could lead to increased recreational use of the SPA and therefore habitat loss or degradation. These options would therefore require a full Habitat Regulations Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>A potential adverse effect on older people has been identified from out of centre retail and leisure development. Options involving residential would also have an adverse effect due to age and disability due to the risk of flooding (16, see Appendix 4). These options would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on access to services for residential could be mitigated by including facilities on site. Not all of the effects identified are capable of mitigation, particularly for options involving retail and residential.</p>																					

A30: LAND NORTH OF ISLAND ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A30a	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0
A30b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A30c	Leisure development	X	0	X	✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	?✓	0	?X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓	?✓	0
A30d	Residential development (60-100 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	X	0	✓✓	?X	XX	0	0	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

A30a: Employment development (B1/B2/B8)

As with any development, there will be negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6) that will require some mitigation. This site is also adjacent to the Kennet, which has significance for wildlife (7), and there could be potential effects, particularly if the use results in noise and disturbance. The Kennet Meadows are a major landscape feature, and development could potentially have a negative impact on the landscape character (9). **Development would make a good use of a sizeable previously developed site that has lain unused (4), and would have a significant positive effect on economic growth by providing new employment floorspace (18),** within reach of some of Reading's most deprived areas (19). The site is not easily accessible by means other than cars or lorries (14).

A30b: Do not allocate

As the site has been unused for many years, most of the effects of this option would be neutral, but it would represent an underuse of a previously developed site (4).

A30c: Leisure development

Many of the effects would be shared with A30a, particularly in terms of the environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6, 7). However, there would be a **significant positive effect on the provision of leisure (17),** and this could also result in more use of the Kennet area for informal recreation, thus promoting healthy lifestyles (11).

A30d: Residential development (60-100 dwellings)

Many of the same effects are seen again as for other development options. There is a potential negative effect on the health and well-being of future residents (11), because the site is surrounded by areas in Flood Zone 2, has uses around it that generate noise, disturbance and, potentially, smell effects, and in the event that there is historic contamination. There would be a significant positive effect on the provision of housing (13), but a significant negative effect on access to services (15), as these dwellings would be remote from any centres or facilities, and indeed from other residential properties. There would additionally be more pressure on education and healthcare services (15, 20).

Habitat Regulations issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on access to services for residential could be mitigated by including facilities on site. Not all of the effects identified are capable of mitigation, particularly for options involving residential.</p>																					

A31: LAND SOUTH OF ISLAND ROAD AT SMALLMEAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A31a	Employment development (B1c/B2/B8)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	0	X	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
A31b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A31c	Residential development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	X	0	XX	0	✓✓	?X	XX	0	0	0	0	X
A31d	Leisure development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	X	0	✓X	0	0	?X	0	X	✓✓ /X	✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

A31a: Employment development (B1c/B2/B8)

As with any development, there will be negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6) that will require some mitigation. The site is partly within flood zone 2, so a potential negative effect on adaptation to climate change could be felt (2). As the site is former landfill, the **effects on pollution could be significant because development could risk disturbing landfill gases (6)**. Although the site is a former landfill, there may be some wildlife significance that would need to be investigated (7). Although the site has no particular landscape significance of its own, as it is raised land it is prominent from the nearby important Kennet Meadows landscape feature, and any development could have potential effects on the landscape character (9). Development would **make a good use of a very significant previously developed site (4)**. A large employment development with a focus on logistics would have a **significant positive effect on economic growth**, and helps to bring balance to the economy, through a different sector from the knowledge based sectors for which Reading is known (18). In addition, this will have a **significant positive effect on deprivation** through provision of significant numbers of jobs, many low-skilled, close to Reading's most deprived areas (19). However, there is a potential effect on health and well-being of future residents of the adjacent Green Park Village development (for over 700 homes) if noisy industrial and distribution activities take place on adjacent land (11).

A31b: Do not allocate

As there would be no change, and the site has been grassed over, all effects are considered to be neutral.

A31c: Residential development

Some of the same effects would be shared with the employment development option (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9). A development on this scale would have a significant positive effect on housing provision. Conversely, there would be a **significant negative effect on health and well-being of future residents (11)**, through contamination associated with the landfill and the effects of flooding. There would also be **significant negative effects on access to services**, as this site would be isolated from existing facilities and centres (15). Residential development on this scale would also place pressure on education infrastructure (20).

A31d: Leisure development

Many of the effects would be similar to the employment development option, although those related to economic growth (18) and deprivation (19) are less pronounced. There would be a **significant positive effect on access to leisure (17)**, although the effects of this could be reversed if the leisure was of a type that might have an impact on the town centre. This might also assist in encouraging healthy lifestyles (11).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> Potential significant effects on Thames Basin Heaths SPA have been identified. A residential development could result in more visits to the site, leading to potential habitat degradation, whilst a major leisure development could result in more traffic past the site, leading to noise and disturbance and air quality impacts (8, see Appendix 3).</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effect on older and disabled people in a residential development from the increased risk to flooding (16, see Appendix 4) has been identified. This option would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on access to services for residential could be mitigated by including facilities on site. Effects on adjacent residential at Green Park from an employment development could potentially be mitigated by inclusion of a landscaped buffer at the south of the site. In terms of flood risk, this would need further investigation to ensure that development can be developed safely without contributing to flooding elsewhere. Any development would have to have stringent measures in place for dealing with contamination and land instability, and this will likely be one of the first issues to address if the site is identified.</p>																					

A32: LAND AT THE MADEJSKI STADIUM

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A32a	Mixed use devt with residential, hotel, convention centre etc	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	?	0	XX	?✓	✓✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓✓	?✓	X
A32b *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A32c	Less dense mixed use development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	?	0	XX	0	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	?✓	X
A32d	Retail and leisure development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	?	0	?✓	?✓	X	XX	?✓	X	✓✓ /X	✓X	0	0
A32e	Employment development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	X	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0

COMMENTS:

A32a: Mixed use development comprising residential (around 630 units), hotel, convention centre etc

As with any development, there will be negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6) that will require some mitigation. The site is partly within flood zone 2, so a potential negative effect on adaptation to climate change could be felt (2). As the site is former landfill, the effects on pollution could be significant because development could risk disturbing landfill gases (6). There could be some effects on the adjacent waterways, which are wildlife corridors (7). The effect on the character of the local area would depend on design (9). Development would make a good use of a very significant previously developed site (4), and provide a very significant amount of housing (13) in a relatively accessible location (14). There would be a significant negative effect on health and well-being of future residents (11), through contamination associated with the landfill and the effects of flooding. There would also be significant negative effects on access to services, as this site would be isolated from existing facilities and centres (15). Residential development on this scale would also place pressure on education infrastructure (20). Residents would have good access to leisure facilities nearby, however (17). The provision of a convention centre, something Reading currently lacks, would have a significant positive effect on economic growth (18), with knock-on effects for deprivation (19). A development centred around the stadium could draw on that to enhance community cohesion (12).

A32b: Do not allocate

Leaving the site undeveloped would represent a poor use of previously developed land (4) and a wasted opportunity to provide housing (13).

A32c: Less dense mixed use development

In general, the same effects would be seen as for the denser mixed-use development, but the effects would be more muted on some instances.

A32d: Retail and leisure development

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>Many of the environmental effects would be the same as for other development options. It could represent a significant provision of leisure (17), which can also help to promote healthy lifestyles (11). However, major retail and leisure on this scale could also have a significant detrimental effect on existing centres, thus increasing the need to travel to out of town facilities by car (14), and affecting the town centre economy and the retail and leisure uses that are located there (17, 18).</p>																					
<p><u>A32e: Employment development</u></p> <p>This shares many of the effects with other development options, but an employment development, as a generally more noisy use, could have a greater effect on wildlife (7). An employment development in this location could have a significant positive effect on economic growth (18), and consequently have positive implications for deprivation (19).</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>Three of the options could result in significant effects on Thames Basin Heaths SPA (8, see Appendix 3). Options for very major out of centre retail or leisure development could result in increased road traffic past the SPA, whilst a large residential development, in combination with other such developments in South Reading, could lead to increased recreational use of the SPA and therefore habitat loss or degradation. These options would therefore require a full Habitat Regulations Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>A potential adverse effect on older people has been identified from out of centre retail and leisure development. Options involving residential would also have an adverse effect due to age and disability due to the risk of flooding and contamination (16, see Appendix 4). These options would therefore require a full Equality Impact Assessment if taken forward to a draft plan.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on access to services for residential could be mitigated by including facilities on site. In terms of flood risk, this would need further investigation to ensure that development can be developed safely without contributing to flooding elsewhere. Contamination will need to be remediated, particularly if residential is to be included in any development. Negative effects on existing town centres can be mitigated to some degree by specifying the types of uses and/or goods that would be involved.</p>																					

B1: FRIAR STREET AND STATION ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B1a ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
B1b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0
B1c	More limited identification of individual sites	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

B1a: Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design (9). The site incorporates, and is close to, a number of listed buildings, and there is therefore a potential impact on this historic environment that should be identified for mitigation (10). The site would provide a **significant amount of housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14)**, but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), and would be in a location where it may be exposed to poor air quality (11). The allocation includes leisure and town centre uses, so could have a **significant positive effect on access to leisure (17)**, although its effect on services would be offset by the impact on healthcare (15). In terms of economic growth, development itself may have positive effects (18).

B1b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

B1c: More limited identification of individual sites

This option is unlikely to make a significant difference to the outcome from continuing the current allocation, and any differences it makes are likely to be matters of detail. Therefore, the assessment is identical to B1a.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings, as well as the potential for archaeological finds, will need to be managed in any policy. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

B2: FRIARS WALK AND GREYFRIARS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B2a ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
B2b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0
B2c	Greater emphasis on residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓X	0	X

COMMENTS:

B2a: Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape depends largely on design (9). The site incorporates, and is close to, a number of listed buildings, and there is therefore a potential impact on this historic environment that should be identified for mitigation (10). The site would provide a **significant amount of housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14)**, but that housing would place a potential strain on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), and would be in a location where it may be exposed to poor air quality (11). The allocation includes leisure and town centre uses, so could have a **significant positive effect on access to leisure (17)**, although its effect on services would be offset by the impact on healthcare (15). In terms of economic growth, development itself may have positive effects (18).

B2b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining a building, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

B2c: Greater emphasis on residential

The appraisal of this option is largely the same as for B2a, but including a greater emphasis on residential at the expense of other employment generating uses in this highly accessible location could also have a negative impact on economic growth (18) and, by failing to make the most of such an accessible site, on the need to travel (14).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings, as well as the potential for archaeological finds, will need to be managed in any policy. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

B3: STATION HILL

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B3a ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	✓X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
B3b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	XX	X	X	0	0	0	XX	0	0
B3c	Allocation more reflective of current permission	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	✓X	?X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B3a: Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this vital site at a high density with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4), on provision of both housing (13) and leisure (17), and on economic growth (18)**. The development is in as accessible a location by public transport as exists in Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The current situation is that the site is in the process of demolition. Therefore, development of a vacant and cleared site will have a significant positive impact on the townscape (9), and will bring natural surveillance to the new station south square and interchange (12). The impact on the nearby listed buildings could be either positive or negative, depending on the quality of the design (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, although it would also provide new services and facilities (15). The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, meaning there is a potentially negative effect on health (11).

B3b: Do not allocate

In appraising this option, the current demolition of the site must be borne in mind. Such an accessible and prominent site sitting vacant would have a **significant negative effect on the preservation of undeveloped land (4), on the townscape (9) and nearby historic environment (10), and on the overall economic growth prospects through the perception of Reading that would result (18)**. It would also fail to provide housing (13).

B3c: Allocation more reflective of current permission

The main way that the current permission differs from the allocation, insofar as it affects the appraisal, is that there is much greater focus on offices than residential. This means that the contribution to housing supply would be less significant (13), but at the same time the impact on health and education infrastructure (15, 20) and health (11) would be lessened.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings, as well as the potential for archaeological finds, will need to be managed in any policy, but would be effectively mitigated by a high-quality design. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

B4: NORTH OF THE STATION

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B4a ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
B4b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B4c	Less emphasis on retail & leisure	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X
B4d	Locate uses in accordance with flood risk	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X	0	✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B4a: Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this vital site at a high density with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4), on provision of both housing (13) and leisure (17), and on economic growth (18)**. The development is in as accessible a location by public transport as exists in Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The site makes no positive contribution to the townscape in its current state, so development is likely to have a positive effect (9). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, although it would also provide new services and facilities (15). The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain.

B4b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

B4c: Less emphasis on retail and leisure

The RCAAP identified this as a major extension to the town centre, and although there is interest in some retail and leisure provision on site, the level of development envisaged in the RCAAP seems unlikely to be delivered. Therefore, whilst many of the effects are the same as for the current mixed use allocation, there would be likely to be less positive effects in terms of provision of leisure (17) and services (15) and contribution to the economy (18).

B4d: Locate uses in accordance with flood risk

This would see the layout of the site essentially being dictated by flood risk, with more vulnerable uses such as residential being kept out of the areas of highest flood risk. Ultimately, this would be likely to result in less residential being delivered on the site. Therefore, whilst many of the effects would be the same as the current allocation, along with a more positive score for adaptation to climate change (2) and health (11), it would make less of a contribution to housing provision (13).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.																					
In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.																					

B5: RIVERSIDE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B5a ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓/XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓	✓X	0	X
B5b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B5c	Mainly commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
B5d	Mainly leisure development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B5a: Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. There would be positive effects on access to leisure, through both new facilities and through introducing residents close to an area of recreation (17). The allocation would result in some loss of employment floorspace, but could include some employment generating uses of its own (18). The site is adjacent to the Thames, meaning that it could make a strong contribution to the landscape (9). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, although it would also provide new services and facilities (15). The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation, albeit that new leisure facilities could promote the use of the riverside and enhance healthy lifestyles. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain.

B5b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14), and the use would continue to detract from the landscape (9).

B5c: Mainly commercial development

This option would have similar effects to the other development options, including a **significant positive effect on the need to travel (14) and undeveloped land (4)**. It will fail to provide housing (13), but will have less effect on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).

B5d: Mainly leisure development

There would be similar effects to the commercial option above, but the provision of leisure uses in an accessible location would **significantly enhance access to leisure (17), and, in conjunction with the potential of the riverside areas, significantly enhance health through access to recreation areas (11)**, as well as providing important services.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.</p>																					

B6: NAPIER ROAD JUNCTION

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B6a ▼	Continue current allocation for landmark building	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	✓/ XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X
B6b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B6c	Residential with more than one tall building	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	XX	XX	✓/ XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X
B6d	Office development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
B6e	Retail/leisure development	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B6a: Continue current allocation for landmark building

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. There would be positive effects on access to leisure, through introducing residents close to an area of recreation (17, 11). The site is close to Kings Meadow, part of a major landscape feature, meaning that it could make a strong contribution to the landscape (9). There is a potential effect on the listed Kings Meadow Baths (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, as well as in a potentially noisy location, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain.

B6b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

B6c: Residential with more than one tall building

Many of the sustainability effects would be the same as for the current allocation, but the notable difference is in terms of the visual effect that the development would have. In particular, there is a **very significant adverse impact on the townscape and the important landscape feature (9)** as well as a potentially strong effect on the listed Kings Meadow Baths (10).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>B6d: Office development</u> This option would have similar effects to the other development options, including a significant positive effect on the need to travel (14) and undeveloped land (4) . It will fail to provide housing (13), but will have less effect on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).																					
<u>B6e: Leisure development</u> There would be similar effects to the commercial option above, but the provision of leisure uses in an accessible location would significantly enhance access to leisure (17) , and, in conjunction with the potential of the riverside areas, significantly enhance health through access to recreation areas (11) , as well as providing important services.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.																					
In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.																					

B7: NAPIER COURT, NAPIER ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B7a ▼	Residential development (200-250 dwellings)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	XX	✓	✓✓	✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	X
B7b *	Do not allocate	✓	?X	✓	?✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B7c	Mixed use office and residential	X	X	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	XX	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	X
B7d	Office development	X	X	X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	0	X	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
B7e	Leisure development	X	X	X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	0	X	✓	?✓	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B7a: Residential development (200-250 dwellings)

As with any development taking place, there would be CO2 emissions (1), use of energy (3) and generation of waste (5). The policy states that the increase in building coverage over the existing buildings would be unlikely to be significant, but a negative effect requiring mitigation should be recorded (2). Residential development in this area would, in overall terms, reduce the need to travel by car (14, 6), but would create more car journeys in the specific locality, part of the Air Quality Management Area, affecting pollution (6). There may also be an effect on the listed Kings Meadow Pool building (10) which would need to be mitigated. Due to its intensive nature, this option would have **significant positive effects on the provision of housing (13) and the use of brownfield land (4)**. It would also bring natural surveillance into an area where there is little activity later in the evening (12), and could promote recreational use of the meadows (17). Whilst there would be some health benefits of locating housing next to open space, overall there is considered to be a **significant negative effect on health (11)**, as residents would be located in a noisy environment, an AQMA and an area at risk of flooding. There are also few local health facilities, and local education capacity is also limited (15, 20).

B7b: Do not allocate

This approach would have some environmental benefits as it will retain buildings that could have some limited commercial future, in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5). The current site is primarily in Flood Zone 2, and is covered in hard surfacing and buildings, meaning that there is a potential negative impact on adaptation to climate change (2), where flooding will increase. Not developing this site will mean a loss of an opportunity to provide housing (12).

B7c: Mixed office and residential

This option would be a combination of the residential and office options, and the effects are therefore combined in this appraisal. This would include a **significant positive effect on use of previously developed land (4)** and a **significant negative effect on health (11)**,

B7d: Office development

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>Many of the effects would be the same as any other development, such as residential (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 14). The development would be an efficient use of land (4), but these effects would not be significant as there is less need for offices than housing, and offices would not necessarily need to be provided elsewhere in the Borough if not on this site. There could be a positive effect on economic growth of an accessible office development, but a significant amount of more accessible office space is already planned around the station (18). The health benefits would potentially be positive as the development would encourage walking or cycling (11).</p> <p>B7e: Leisure development: A leisure development would have many of the same effects as office development for a number of objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13 and 14). There would be a significant positive effect on access to leisure (17), which would be particularly beneficial given its location close to the meadows and river. Leisure development would also provide jobs and add to the diversity of the central area (18).</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any development would need to consider and, potentially, mitigate the effects that the development would have on the AQMA and floodwater flow, and a residential development would also need to mitigate the effects of noise, air quality and flooding on the health and well-being of its residents. The effects on the local character of the area, recognising that this is a transitional site between the tranquil Thames area and the high-density centre, and on the historic environment, would need to be mitigated. Effects of additional residential units on schools and healthcare would also need to be mitigated.</p>																					

B8: CATTLE MARKET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B8a ▼	Retail and residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	XX	?✓	✓✓	✓X	X	0	0	✓	0	X
B8b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B8c	Residential without major retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	XX	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	✓	0	X
B8d	Commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B8a: Retail and residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site for retail and residential would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore reduce the need to travel (14), although an edge of centre retail development could attract trips by car. The development would be likely to make an improvement to the local townscape (9), as well as developing an area that might otherwise become a focus for anti-social behaviour (12). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, as well as in a potentially noisy location, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain.

B8b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14).

B8c: Residential without any major retail provision

The appraisal of this option is largely the same as for the existing allocation, except that, without retail provision, there is likely to be a **significant positive effect on the need to travel by car (14)**.

B8d: Commercial development

This option would have similar effects to the other development options, including a **significant positive effect on the need to travel (14) and undeveloped land (4)**. It will fail to provide housing (13), but will have less effect on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. The effects of edge of centre retail development on the need to travel could be mitigated by restricting the type of goods that can be sold.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.</p>																					

B9: GREAT KNOLLYS STREET AND WELDALE STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B9a ▼	Primarily residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	XX	0	X
B9b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B9c	Mix uses according to flood risk	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	X	0	✓	✓✓	X	0	0	XX	0	X
B9d	Mixed use with commercial emphasis	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓	✓X	?X	0	0	✓X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B9a: Primarily residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site for mainly residential would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The development would be likely to make an improvement to the local townscape (9), but there are listed buildings close by so impact on the historic environment is a potential negative effect (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain. There are a number of small business units on the site, so a **loss of those units is potentially a significant negative effect on the local economy (18)**.

B9b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13).

B9c: Mix uses according to flood risk

This would see the layout of the site essentially being dictated by flood risk, with more vulnerable uses such as residential being kept out of the areas of highest flood risk. Ultimately, this would be likely to result in less residential being delivered on the site. Therefore, whilst many of the effects would be the same as the current allocation, along with a more positive score for adaptation to climate change (2) and health (11), it would make less of a contribution to housing provision (13).

B9d: Mixed use with commercial emphasis

Many of the effects would be the same as for any development option. However, the development for commercial, whilst resulting in the loss of some small business units, would at least bring more employment generating uses on to the site (18). However, as something of a fringe office location, commercial development here might also increase the amount of journeys by car (14).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Loss of small business units could be mitigated by specifying the need to retain or replace them on site.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.</p>																					

B10: CHATHAM STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B10a ▼	Mixed use extension to the centre	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	0	0	X
B10b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B10c	Decking over IDR	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

B10a: Mixed use extension to the centre

Most of the Chatham Street development has now been completed or is nearing completion. The only remaining element is the original proposal to deck over the IDR and roundabout, which was present in the original proposals but is now not being pursued. That is therefore what is appraised here. There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site for mainly residential would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**, and leisure could also be one of the elements of the mix (17). The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The development would be likely to make a **significant improvement to the local townscape (9)** by overcoming the disconnect between the town centre and areas to the west. More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, meaning a potential effect on health (11) that would require mitigation, although decking at this point could improve air quality for existing residents at a very localised level.

B10b: Do not allocate

The area would essentially be left exactly as it is. As the site does not risk becoming vacant in a real sense, there are not considered to be anything other than neutral impacts.

B10c: Include an aspirational proposal for decking over the IDR

The outcomes on the ground of this option would be the same as for the existing allocation, so no different effects have been recorded.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION:

The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

B11: BROAD STREET MALL

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B11a ▼	Mixed use development with retail & leisure on ground floor	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
B11b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B11c	Retain mall & development on top	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
B11d	Mixed use with greater office emphasis	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	X	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B11a: Mixed use development with retail and leisure on the ground floor

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site for mainly residential would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The development would be likely to make an improvement to the local townscape, from which the Mall currently detracts (9), but there are listed buildings and a conservation area close by so impact on the historic environment is a potential negative effect (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, meaning that there is a potential negative impact on health (11) that would require mitigation. A mixed use development would provide employment (18) and also new services and facilities (15).

B11b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13). The existing building would continue to affect the local townscape (9) and historic environment (10).

B11c: Retain mall with development on top

This would involve retaining the existing structure, so whilst many of the effects would be the same as for a comprehensive redevelopment option, the continuing negative effects on townscape would not be alleviated (9).

B11d: Mixed use with greater office emphasis

Many of the effects would be the same as for any development option. However, the development for commercial would bring more employment generating uses on to the site (18), resulting in a significant positive effect.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings, as well as the potential for archaeological finds, will need to be managed in any policy, but would be effectively mitigated by a high-quality design. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

B12: HOSIER STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B12a ▼	Mixed use development around civic core	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	?✓	X
B12b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	XX	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
B12c	Mixed use with residential focus	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	0	0	X
B12d	Retail-led mixed use	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B12a: Mixed use development around civic core

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this site for mainly residential would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13) as well as leisure (17)**, and there would also be an improvement in access to essential services (15). A new civic hub promotes community cohesion (12). The development is in an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development will therefore **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The development would be likely to make an improvement to the local townscape, as the current position is that the Civic Offices are under demolition (9), but there are listed buildings and a conservation area close by so impact on the historic environment is a potential negative effect (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, meaning that there is a potential negative impact on health (11) that would require mitigation. A mixed use development would provide employment (18) and also new services and facilities (15).

B12b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13). The condition of the current site is a **significant detraction from the quality of the area (9)**, and it may discourage theatre use at some times of day (17)

B12c: Mixed use with residential focus

This would have many of the same effects as the existing allocation, albeit without the positive implications for leisure (17) and community cohesion (12) without the focus on those uses.

B12d: Retail-led mixed use

Many of the effects would be the same as for any development option, but without the positive and negative effects of residential development (e.g. 11, 15, 20). However, the development for retail would bring more employment generating uses on to the site (18).

Habitat Regulations issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings, as well as the potential for archaeological finds, will need to be managed in any policy, but would be effectively mitigated by a high-quality design. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.																					

B13: READING PRISON

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B13a ▼	Retain building, use as residential, hotel, office	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X
B13b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓	✓	0	0	?X	XX	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
B13c	Convert building and significant surrounding development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓X	✓X	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

B13a: Continue current allocation to retain building for use as residential, hotel or office

In terms of pollution (6) and waste (5), retaining an existing building has positive environmental effects, but in terms of C02 (1) and energy (3), the effects are more mixed as the energy efficiency of the building is unlikely to be particularly good. The development makes use of a previously developed site (4), and retaining the listed building will have a **significant positive impact on the historic environment (10)**, as well as benefiting the local townscape (9). The conversion would potentially provide housing (13) in an accessible location (14), and would also open up a building that is a key part of Reading's heritage and identity (12). In doing so, it will have a positive effect on the local economy, and potentially provide some leisure uses (17). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, meaning that there is a potential negative impact on health (11) that would require mitigation.

B13b: Do not allocate

Doing nothing with such a historic site will result in a significant negative impact on the heritage asset (10), and will have a detrimental effect on the local townscape (9), economic growth (18), housing provision (13) and the need to travel (14). The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term.

B13c: Convert building and significant surrounding development

This option would have many of the same effects as B13a, as it would involve retention of the building, but a significant amount of development on surrounding land will have a number of additional effects, not least a potential detrimental effect on the setting of the listed building and on the very important archaeological remains in the area (10), and therefore local character (9). However, the greater amount of development that could be accommodated would now mean that the **positive effects on undeveloped land (4), housing provision (13) and the need to travel (14) would now be significant.**

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The biggest impact requiring mitigation is the potential archaeological impact, and the effects on the listed building. The former will require a significant amount of work to determine the extent and significance of the remains, and this may dictate where additional development can take place. The latter will require retention of the main parts of the building and a sensitive development around it (where this can be accommodated). The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Many of these issues are picked up in the Prison Framework, and compliance with that SPD would ensure that much of the mitigation is carried out.</p>																					

B14: FORBURY RETAIL PARK

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B14a ▼	Residential development with potential retained & expanded retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
B14b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B14c	Residential without additional retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
B14d	Mixed use located according to flood risk	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

B14a: Residential development with potential retained and expanded retail

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this vital site at a high density with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. Major development in this accessible location will **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The site makes no positive contribution to the townscape in its current state, so development is likely to have a positive effect (9). It is close to some listed buildings, including the prison, and within an area of archaeological potential, so development could have an effect on those assets that requires mitigation (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, although it would also provide new services and facilities (15). The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain.

B14b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14), and the area would continue to detract from local character (9).

B14c: Residential without additional retail development

Many of the effects would be the same as option B14a, although it would result in a reduction in employment on site (18). The positive effects in terms of CO2 (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6) as well as the need to travel (14) would be enhanced by removing uses which are currently essential car-orientated.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B14d: Mix of uses located according to flood risk</u> This would see the layout of the site essentially being dictated by flood risk, with more vulnerable uses such as residential being kept out of the areas of highest flood risk. Ultimately, this would be likely to result in less residential being delivered on the site. Therefore, whilst many of the effects would be the same as the current allocation, along with a more positive score for adaptation to climate change (2) and health (11), it would make less of a contribution to housing provision (13).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.</p>																					

B15: KENAVON DRIVE AND FORBURY BUSINESS PARK

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B15a ▼	Mainly residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	✓/XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	?X	0	X
B15b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B15c	Commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B15a: Mainly residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this vital site in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. Major development in this accessible location will **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The site makes no positive contribution to the townscape in its current state, so development is likely to have a positive effect (9). It is close to a listed building, including the prison, and within an area of archaeological potential, so development could have an effect on those assets that requires mitigation (10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation, although the site would have good access to Kings Meadow for informal recreation (11, 17). There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain. There would be a loss of employment floorspace (18).

B15b: Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual buildings to be retained may not be optimal in the long term. An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14), and the area would continue to detract from local character (9).

B15c: Commercial development

Some of the effects would be similar to residential, but a commercial development in this fringe location might be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car. The effects associated with new residents (11, 15, 17, 20) would be absent from this option.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: The effects of poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.																					

B16: GAS HOLDER, KENAVON DRIVE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B16a ▼	Residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓	0	✓/XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	?✓	0	X
B16b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B16c	Commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓	0	✓	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B16a: Residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of this vital site at a high density in line with the allocation would have a **significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and on provision of housing (13)**. Major development in this accessible location will **significantly reduce the need to travel (14)**. The site detracts from the local area in its current state, so development is likely to have a positive effect (9). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and the flood plain, and has potential contamination issues, as well as being close to other potential hazard sites, meaning there is a **potentially significant negative effect on health of any residents (11)** that would require mitigation, although the site would have good access the Thameside areas for informal recreation (11, 17). In addition, development of the site will remove a potential hazard form nearby residents. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the flood plain. The site is a prominent one on entry to Reading on the train, and a beneficial development might therefore have positive economic effects (18).

B16b: Do not allocate

This option would fail to make use of a previously developed potential residential site (4, 13), and would retain a site that detracts from the local character of the area (9), and which once vacant could become a target for anti-social behaviour (12).

B16c: Commercial development

Some of the effects would be similar to residential, but a commercial development in this fringe location might be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car. The effects associated with new residents (11, 15, 17, 20) would be absent from this option.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: The effects of poor air quality on the residents can also be mitigated through design. Any contamination should be subject to remediation. Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on infrastructure, particularly health and education could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
In terms of flood risk, the allocation in the RCAAP was accompanied by a site specific SFRA, which demonstrated that it could be developed safely. A new allocation could therefore mitigate flood risk issues by taking account of the recommendations of that assessment, and of any updates to flooding information since.																					

B17: 108-116 OXFORD ROAD, 10 EATON PLACE & 115-125 CHATHAM STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B17a ▼	Residential development with associated community use (100-150 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓ ?X	?✓	?✓ X	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓ ?X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	✓	✓	0	?X
B17b *	Do not allocate	0	0	?	?X	?X	0	0	0	X	✓	?	?X	X	✓	0	0	?✓	?	0	?
B17c	Higher density residential development (200 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	?✓ ?X	✓	?✓ X	?X	0	0	?X	?	✓ ?X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	✓	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B17a: Residential development with associated community use (100-150 dwellings)

This results in a large volume of housing (13) being provided within close proximity of shops and services, healthcare provision (15), public transport nodes (14) and educational establishments (20). Development would be easily accessible to leisure and culture uses, and may result in the provision of opportunities to engage in leisure and culture through the provision of community and other leisure uses on the site (17). This should also encourage community interaction, contributing to the establishment of strong and cohesive communities (12). However, it is likely that additional residential development may place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity (15 and 20), particularly if it results in the loss of existing healthcare. There could be an issue with ground contamination, based on a previous use of the site. An investigation is needed to confirm if there is any risk associated with this potential contamination. The site is also in the Air Quality Management Area (6). The relationship between development and the adjacent listed buildings and Conservation Area will also need to be addressed, to ensure that the local historic environment is protected and where appropriate, enhanced (10). There is a strong potential to achieve diversity in built form in this prominent location, and new development would be expected to create buildings and spaces that function effectively, whilst contributing to character (9). A comprehensive development of this nature has the ability to utilise natural resources efficiently in its design and construction, achieve some degree of energy efficiency in its operations (1, 3), and incorporate sustainable approaches to waste management (5). This proposal promotes redevelopment of a site that is currently in active use, and contains a lower development intensity to what is being proposed, and thus, there are likely to be negative implications on both the efficient use of resources (3) and on the need for waste minimisation (5).

B17b: Do not allocate

This fails to deliver new housing, which may result in the consumption of undeveloped land elsewhere (4). Whilst the site is currently accessible to public transport, town centre uses, services, employment and leisure, a lack of residential development here represents a lost opportunity, in terms of capitalising on the proximity and availability of these services. A decision not to redevelop this parcel also misses opportunities to improve the character of the area and achieve distinctive and high quality design (9). It also fails to capitalise on opportunities to foster strong, safe and cohesive communities (12), and potentially, make contributions to the local economy over and above what the site is currently making (18). If ground contamination is

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
identified on the site, development may necessitate its remediation. However, development may also result in contamination being destabilised, which would suggest that leaving the site as is may be a better outcome.																					
<u>B17c: Higher density residential development (200 dwellings or more)</u> This delivers significant amounts of new housing, and thus has positive implications for Objective 13. Higher densities in this area will mean that occupants receive maximum exposure to town centre uses, including a concentration of public transport services and opportunities to access uses by foot. However, densities of up to six storeys are significantly higher than surrounding uses (particularly on the western side of the IDR), and thus, even if development is well designed, there is likely to be some impact on local character (including overshadowing). The area is particularly sensitive due to its presence of listed buildings and the Russell Street/ Castle Street Conservation Area and therefore, there is a potential for even more adverse effects. There are inefficiencies likely to be associated with redevelopment, in terms of CO2, the use of resources and amount of waste generated (1,3 and 5).																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age and disability has been identified if the doctors surgery is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).																					
MITIGATION: It will be important to ensure that development achieves high quality design that respects the historic environment, in accordance with relevant design and heritage policies. An investigation should be carried out in conjunction with any development proposal for the site, to determine whether any contamination exists (and the extent of this, if identified). Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the Centre, which are at or close to capacity. In terms of waste and the use of resources, impacts could be mitigated by using some of the demolition materials on-site.																					

B18: 143-145 OXFORD ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B18a ▼	Residential development with some retention of small-scale leisure function. (10-20 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	X	?X	0	0	?✓	?	?X ?✓	?✓	✓	✓✓	?X	X	✓	✓	0	?X
B18b *	Do not allocate	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	X	✓✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
B18c	Higher density residential development (approx. 30 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	?	?X	?	✓✓	?X	?X	X	0	?	0	?X

COMMENTS:

Residential development with some small scale leisure (10-20 dwellings)

Incorporating an element of residential development on this site is appropriate, given the site's relatively high level of accessibility to Reading Station, bus services and other town centre services and facilities (14). The site would result in the provision of some housing and a small-scale leisure use, which would be of benefit to prospective residents and existing residents of the area (17). Residents of the proposed scheme would also benefit from nearby leisure facilities, most of which are accessible by foot, as well as healthcare and education, though additional residential development in the Centre would add to the pressure on existing healthcare and education (15, 20). The site's proximity within easy walking distance of the Centre promotes healthy activity, leading to more active lifestyles (11). It also reduces vehicular reliance, helping to decrease emissions and noise pollution (6). Whilst the existing building may not positively contribute to the Russell Street/ Castle Hill Conservation Area (within which the site is located), new development would need to be sympathetic to traditional building character existing within this area (10). Residential development is likely to be subject to some level of noise pollution and poor air quality, based on the site's Oxford Road location (6). New development on the site has negative implications for minimising the generation of waste, given that the site contains an existing active use (5).

B18b: Do not allocate

The existing facility presents a significant benefit in terms of opportunities for leisure and recreation (17). It is also assumed that the facility attracts a range of people and encourages interactions between members of the local community (12). It is also assumed that the facility is making a contribution to the local economy.

B18c: Higher density residential (approximately 30 dwellings)

Whilst there are opportunities to make improvements to the appearance of existing development, caution needs to be taken to ensure that new development is consistent with traditional building character prevailing in the Conservation Area (10). Again, this option does not minimise the generation of waste (5). The site is suitably located for higher density residential development based on accessibility, however vehicular access to the

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>site would be difficult off Oxford Road (and may not be suitable from Russell Street). It would also add to the problem of existing healthcare and education shortages in the Centre (15 and 20). Economic impacts are difficult to predict, and would be dependent on the success of the existing pool hall.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to religion has been identified if the existing use is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: In recognising that residential development may place additional strain on primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, it will be necessary to provide appropriate facilities to meet future housing growth. Potential noise disturbance and effects of poor air quality will need to be mitigated through design. New development will need to be designed and constructed in accordance with historic environment policies, which ensures that the surrounding historic environment is preserved and enhanced. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site.</p>																					

B19: FORMER READING FAMILY CENTRE, NORTH STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B19a ▼	Residential development (25-40 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?	✓	✓	?✓	X	?✓	✓	0	X
B19b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	✓X	0	0	0	X	0	X
B19c	Continuation of education use	✓X	0	?	?X	0	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	✓
B19d	Higher density residential development (over 60 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	✓	0	?X	0	0	X	0	?X	?	✓✓	✓	?✓	X	✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

B19a: Residential development (25-40 dwellings)

The allocation seeks housing within reasonably close proximity of Reading Station and the transport interchange (13 and 14). Residential development of the scale envisaged also has the potential to make improvements to the visual quality of the area (9). Development in this location would place residences in reasonably close proximity of essential goods and services, healthcare and leisure, particularly if redevelopment of the West Side Major Opportunity Area proceeds as planned. However, additional residential development also places further pressure on existing healthcare and educational facilities in the Centre (15 and 20), whilst resulting in the loss of a temporary education use. It remains unclear as to whether this development will be able to easily integrate with the adjoining residential community, given its position on the edge of a residential area, and the presence of commercial uses nearby (12). This option would enable the site to make more economic contributions than a vacant site, if the temporary use were to cease (16). New development will not have an impact on waste generation, given that the site has no permanent structures (5).

B19b: Do not allocate

Allowing the site to remain in its current long-term state (i.e. cleared) means that an opportunity to contribute to the local economy is being lost. Thus there is a negative economic impact associated. There is also a lost opportunity for redevelopment (including for housing uses), in terms of the site's accessibility to public transport and other town centre uses (education, healthcare, leisure and culture, employment). A long term vacancy does not contribute to the local community, makes little visual contribution, and is possibly unsafe after dark.

B19c: Continuation of education use

This is predicted to have positive effects on strengthening the sense of community in this area, recognising (and hopefully building upon) social and cultural diversity (12). There is a loss of opportunity for housing development (13). An education use makes an economic contribution (18). Continuation of an education use in an accessible location contributes to enhancing access to education (20). Its appearance and level of resource efficiency will be dependent on design and construction.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B19d: Development for higher density residential (over 60 dwellings)</u> The appraisal would be largely similar to the existing allocation, except that it would represent a more significant contribution to housing supply (13), but would be likely to be out of character with the surrounding areas (9).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified if the education use of the facility is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: An investigation of the site's soil quality will need to be carried out, to determine whether any contamination exists. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the Centre, which are at or close to capacity. Effects on environmental objectives can be mitigated to some extent by compliance with sustainable design and construction policies.</p>																					

B20: 9-27 GREYFRIARS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B20a ▼	Residential and/or office development (up to 60 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	?	X	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓ ?X	✓	?	✓✓	✓X	0	✓	✓	0	?X
B20b *	Do not allocate	0	0	✓	?X	0	?	0	0	?	?✓	✓	0	X	✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0	✓
B20c	Higher density residential development (around 80 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	✓X	?✓	X	0	0	0	?✓	?X	✓ ?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓	?	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B20a: Residential and/or office development (up to 60 dwellings)

The proposed site again has excellent access to public transport and other services, with the potential to significantly reduce vehicular reliance (14). There are opportunities to achieve a sense of community and foster diversity, if the chosen use of the site is residential (particularly given the presence of other residential uses and potential future developments in the nearby area; 12). This would have a positive impact against Objective 13, yet a tendency for negative impacts on Objectives 15 and 20, due to additional demand being placed on existing healthcare and primary education facilities. Regardless of the development type, there is a potential to introduce buildings of a high visual standard, including diverse and distinctive forms, on this reasonably prominent site (situated on a slope and therefore, prominent from Station Hill and Greyfriars Road). Provided that the development was designed to accord with design policies, redevelopment should not impact on the integrity of the nearby terraced housing area (10). This alternative promotes the redevelopment of a site that is currently in active use for a similar intensity of development. As such, this could have negative implications on the need for waste minimisation (5), CO2 (1) and energy use (3).

B20b: Do not allocate

This alternative still represents reasonably efficient development in a highly accessible area, despite the fact that the site might actually be better suited to residential (and that its redevelopment for residential is predicted to bring about more positive sustainability effects). By leaving the site in its current use, it is assumed that it will continue to have a positive economic impact (18). The impact on nearby terraced housing and amenity will remain as is, though there may be a missed opportunity to upgrade and improve the appearance and environmental standards of the building. The building at present makes no contribution to housing provision (13).

B20c: Higher density residential development (around 80 dwellings or more)

This would have positive implications for housing provision, accessibility and proximity/ access to town centre uses (11, 13, 14, 17). Some pressure on existing services is however predicted (15 and 20). However, this option has the potential to generate negative impacts on amenity, based on the (current) prevailing building heights in the area (which are substantially lower than the proposed heights) and the adjoining terraced housing, which at present, positively contributes to the unique and historic character of Central Reading, and thus are very sensitive to surrounding development (10).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>There are negative implications for waste generation (5).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The site is in a zone of flood risk, and a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the Centre, which are at or close to capacity, which would require mitigation. In terms of waste, the impact could be mitigated through the use of some demolition materials on-site.</p>																					

B21: 2-8 THE FORBURY AND 19-22 MARKET PLACE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B21a ▼	Retail and related uses on ground floor with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 20 dwellings)	✓X	0	?X	?✓	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	?X
B21b	Retail/residential on ground floor and business above	✓X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	0
B21c *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
B21d	Higher density residential development (around 30 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	X✓	✓	X	✓X	0	0	X	XX	?X	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B21a: Retail and related uses with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 20 dwellings)

This alternative promotes the redevelopment of a site which is currently in active use for a similar intensity of development. As such, this could have negative implications on the need to use resources efficiently (3), on CO2 emissions (1) and on the need for waste minimisation (5). In terms of waste, the impact could be mitigated by the use of some demolition materials on-site. Since the intensity of use would be similar to the current situation, it is not anticipated that there will be any particular direct positive benefits from the promotion of a site so close to excellent public transport links (the station and bus routes through the Market Place) (14). The main positive benefits are expected to be felt as a result of the development enhancing the physical environment of the Market Place. The Market Place is a conservation area with several listed buildings, that has recently been enhanced, and the purpose of the policy is to enhance the contribution that this site makes. Development would not be permitted if it did not enhance the area. **As such, a significant positive impact on the local historic environment (10) can be expected, along with the creation of a space that is a popular, high-quality environment for many years to come, which means a significant positive effect against objective 9.** The development could also contribute, by enhancing open space, informal recreation (17). There is less certainty about the effects of introducing residential development to the site, since the policy does not insist on residential development. Therefore, there is no certainty in terms of positive effects of town-centre living (13), which might otherwise be directed towards greenfield sites (4), and introducing natural surveillance outside business hours into an important space (12), and no certainty in terms of potential negative effects of residential in an area where there is likely to be noise disturbance, which would require mitigation through design (4), or an impact on existing primary education facilities and health facilities, which are near capacity (20 & 15).

B21b: Retail/residential on ground floor and business above

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>The effects would be in many cases identical to the existing allocation. Therefore, the same negative effects or effects requiring mitigation in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) would exist, along with the same positive and significant positive effects in terms of the local and historic environment (9, 10). The site would be in similar use to the existing uses, and would include no housing, so most of the other effects would be neutral.</p>																					
<p><u>B21c: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>The site is currently in an active use, and the site would not be developed within the plan period. This could make a positive contribution towards the aims of minimising waste (5) and using energy as efficiently as possible (3), although, in the case of the latter, no information is available on the current energy performance of the building. However, the building as it stands actively detracts from the conservation area, nearby listed buildings and the open space which is currently undergoing improvement. This effect will become more and more apparent as time goes on. This will have a significant negative effect on the creation of a lasting public space (9), and on the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings (10). Elsewhere, the maintenance of the status quo would be likely to have neutral effects overall.</p>																					
<p><u>B21d: Higher density residential development (around 30 dwellings or more)</u></p> <p>Under this alternative, the site would be used more intensively, meaning more storeys, in order to bring more residential to the site. While the same negative effects in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) of developing an active site remain, there are also some positive effects in terms of resource use (3) and pollution (6) of more residential development, with little car parking, being located in close proximity to the station and facilities, and therefore the need to travel being reduced (14). However, in the case of pollution, we should also bear in mind that more residential development would be introduced to an area where air quality and noise pollution may be an issue, which would be an effect requiring mitigation (11). More residential development in the central area would also have positive implications in terms of providing more housing (13), bringing more natural surveillance into an area which currently has none outside of business hours, and therefore potentially reducing crime (12), and reducing the need to use undeveloped land to meet housing targets (4).</p> <p>However, the main negative implications of a higher density development would be on the character of the area, the very issue which the allocation exists to address. There would be a significant negative effect in that the development would be likely to overwhelm nearby listed buildings and the conservation area generally (10). This would compromise the creation of a lasting public space (9), which would also detract from the use of the area for informal recreation (17).</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be noise disturbance. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council’s policies on Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>																					

B22: 3-10 MARKET PLACE, ABBEY HALL AND ABBEY SQUARE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B22a ▼	Retail and related uses on ground floor with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 70 dwellings)	✓X	0	?X	?✓	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	?X
B22b	Retail/residential on ground floor and business above	✓X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	0
B22c *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
B22d	Higher density residential development (around 100 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	X✓	✓	X	✓X	0	0	X	XX	?X	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B22a: Retail and related uses with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 70 dwellings)

This alternative promotes the redevelopment of a site which is currently in active use for a similar intensity of development. As such, this could have negative implications on the need to use resources efficiently (3), on CO2 emissions (1) and on the need for waste minimisation (5). In terms of waste, the impact could be mitigated by the use of some demolition materials on-site. Since the intensity of use would be similar to the current situation, it is not anticipated that there will be any particular direct positive benefits from the promotion of a site so close to excellent public transport links (the station and bus routes through the Market Place) (14). The main positive benefits are expected to be felt as a result of the development enhancing the physical environment of the Market Place. The Market Place is a conservation area with several listed buildings, that has recently been enhanced, and the purpose of the policy is to enhance the contribution that this site makes. Development would not be permitted if it did not enhance the area. **As such, a significant positive impact on the local historic environment (10) can be expected, along with the creation of a space that is a popular, high-quality environment for many years to come, which means a significant positive effect against objective 9.** The development could also contribute, by enhancing open space, informal recreation (17). There is less certainty about the effects of introducing residential development to the site, since the policy does not insist on residential development. Therefore, there is no certainty in terms of positive effects of town-centre living (13), which might otherwise be directed towards greenfield sites (4), and introducing natural surveillance outside business hours into an important space (12), and no certainty in terms of potential negative effects of residential in an area where there is likely to be noise disturbance, which would require mitigation through design (4), or an impact on existing primary education facilities and health facilities, which are near capacity (20 & 15).

B22b: Retail/residential on ground floor and business above

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>The effects would be in many cases identical to the existing allocation. Therefore, the same negative effects or effects requiring mitigation in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) would exist, along with the same positive and significant positive effects in terms of the local and historic environment (9, 10). The site would be in similar use to the existing uses, and would include no housing, so most of the other effects would be neutral.</p> <p><u>B22c: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>The site is currently in an active use, and the site would not be developed within the plan period. This could make a positive contribution towards the aims of minimising waste (5) and using energy as efficiently as possible (3), although, in the case of the latter, no information is available on the current energy performance of the building. However, the building as it stands actively detracts from the conservation area, nearby listed buildings and the open space which is currently undergoing improvement. This effect will become more and more apparent as time goes on. This will have a significant negative effect on the creation of a lasting public space (9), and on the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings (10). Elsewhere, the maintenance of the status quo would be likely to have neutral effects overall.</p> <p><u>B22d: Higher density residential development (around 100 dwellings or more)</u></p> <p>Under this alternative, the site would be used more intensively, meaning more storeys, in order to bring more residential to the site. While the same negative effects in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) of developing an active site remain, there are also some positive effects in terms of resource use (3) and pollution (6) of more residential development, with little car parking, being located in close proximity to the station and facilities, and therefore the need to travel being reduced (14). However, in the case of pollution, we should also bear in mind that more residential development would be introduced to an area where air quality and noise pollution may be an issue, which would be an effect requiring mitigation (11). More residential development in the central area would also have positive implications in terms of providing more housing (13), bringing more natural surveillance into an area which currently has none outside of business hours, and therefore potentially reducing crime (12), and reducing the need to use undeveloped land to meet housing targets (4).</p> <p>However, the main negative implications of a higher density development would be on the character of the area, the very issue which the allocation exists to address. There would be a significant negative effect in that the development would be likely to overwhelm nearby listed buildings and the conservation area generally (10). This would compromise the creation of a lasting public space (9), which would also detract from the use of the area for informal recreation (17).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be noise disturbance. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>																					

B23: 37-43 MARKET PLACE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B23a ▼	Retail and related uses on ground floor with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 15 dwellings)	✓X	0	?X	?✓	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	?X
B23b	Retail/residential on ground floor and business above	✓X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓	0	0	0
B23c *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
B23d	Higher density residential development (around 20 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	X✓	✓	X	✓X	0	0	X	XX	?X	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B23a: Retail and related uses with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 70 dwellings)

This alternative promotes the redevelopment of a site which is currently in active use for a similar intensity of development. As such, this could have negative implications on the need to use resources efficiently (3), on CO2 emissions (1) and on the need for waste minimisation (5). In terms of waste, the impact could be mitigated by the use of some demolition materials on-site. Since the intensity of use would be similar to the current situation, it is not anticipated that there will be any particular direct positive benefits from the promotion of a site so close to excellent public transport links (the station and bus routes through the Market Place) (14). The main positive benefits are expected to be felt as a result of the development enhancing the physical environment of the Market Place. The Market Place is a conservation area with several listed buildings, that has recently been enhanced, and the purpose of the policy is to enhance the contribution that this site makes. Development would not be permitted if it did not enhance the area. **As such, a significant positive impact on the local historic environment (10) can be expected, along with the creation of a space that is a popular, high-quality environment for many years to come, which means a significant positive effect against objective 9.** The development could also contribute, by enhancing open space, informal recreation (17). There is less certainty about the effects of introducing residential development to the site, since the policy does not insist on residential development. Therefore, there is no certainty in terms of positive effects of town-centre living (13), which might otherwise be directed towards greenfield sites (4), and introducing natural surveillance outside business hours into an important space (12), and no certainty in terms of potential negative effects of residential in an area where there is likely to be noise disturbance, which would require mitigation through design (4), or an impact on existing primary education facilities and health facilities, which are near capacity (20 & 15).

B23b: Retail/residential on ground floor and business above

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>The effects would be in many cases identical to the existing allocation. Therefore, the same negative effects or effects requiring mitigation in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) would exist, along with the same positive and significant positive effects in terms of the local and historic environment (9, 10). The site would be in similar use to the existing uses, and would include no housing, so most of the other effects would be neutral.</p>																					
<p><u>B23c: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>The site is currently in an active use, and the site would not be developed within the plan period. This could make a positive contribution towards the aims of minimising waste (5) and using energy as efficiently as possible (3), although, in the case of the latter, no information is available on the current energy performance of the building. However, the building as it stands actively detracts from the conservation area, nearby listed buildings and the open space which is currently undergoing improvement. This effect will become more and more apparent as time goes on. This will have a significant negative effect on the creation of a lasting public space (9), and on the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings (10). Elsewhere, the maintenance of the status quo would be likely to have neutral effects overall.</p>																					
<p><u>B23d: Higher density residential development (around 100 dwellings or more)</u></p> <p>Under this alternative, the site would be used more intensively, meaning more storeys, in order to bring more residential to the site. While the same negative effects in terms of CO2 (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) of developing an active site remain, there are also some positive effects in terms of resource use (3) and pollution (6) of more residential development, with little car parking, being located in close proximity to the station and facilities, and therefore the need to travel being reduced (14). However, in the case of pollution, we should also bear in mind that more residential development would be introduced to an area where air quality and noise pollution may be an issue, which would be an effect requiring mitigation (11). More residential development in the central area would also have positive implications in terms of providing more housing (13), bringing more natural surveillance into an area which currently has none outside of business hours, and therefore potentially reducing crime (12), and reducing the need to use undeveloped land to meet housing targets (4).</p> <p>However, the main negative implications of a higher density development would be on the character of the area, the very issue which the allocation exists to address. There would be a significant negative effect in that the development would be likely to overwhelm nearby listed buildings and the conservation area generally (10). This would compromise the creation of a lasting public space (9), which would also detract from the use of the area for informal recreation (17).</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be noise disturbance. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council’s policies on Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>																					

B24: READING CENTRAL LIBRARY, ABBEY SQUARE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B24a ▼	Residential development with some potential for offices and other town centre uses on the ground floor	X✓	0	?X	?✓	0	X✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓ ?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	X	?✓	✓	0	?X
B24b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B24c	Development for offices	X✓	0	?X	?X	X	?	0	0	?✓	?X	0	?X	XX	✓✓	0	X	?✓	?✓	0	0
B24d	Higher density residential development (approximately 40 dwellings or more)	X✓	0	?X	?✓	X	?X	0	0	?	?X	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	X	?✓	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B24a: Residential development with town centre uses on ground floor, subject to replacement facility

The option has significant positive implications for the provision of housing (13). Establishing housing on a very central site such as this one enables residents to take advantage of the high levels of accessibility (by foot and public transport) to nearby retail, employment, leisure including the Holy Brook etc. (11, 14 and 17). It is noted however, that additional residential development in the Centre may place pressure on education and healthcare, albeit that the replacement of the library may actually improve and upgrade the educational opportunities associated with it. Therefore, whilst this development may not have a direct impact on existing facilities, it would add to the increasing demand. New residential development should provide opportunities for community interaction and thus improve the cohesiveness of the community, although the effect is not likely to be any more positive than the existing situation, given that the site presently contains a community facility. The option contains potential for high quality buildings to be established, which could include diverse design features or styles. It also enables relocation of the Central Library to a more appropriate location, providing opportunities to increase its functionality and improve the appearance of this new facility (9). Noise quality could be an issue in this part of the Centre, both from uses at ground level and other nearby uses, however the central location of the site would reduce vehicular reliance and associated vehicle-based emissions (6). Development will generate waste (3). New development will need to be designed such that it is sympathetic to the adjoining Market Place/ London Street Conservation Area, the adjoining Scheduled Ancient Monument and other nearby listed buildings (10).

B24b: Do not allocate

This option would have mainly neutral impacts, with the exception of not making maximum use of a previously developed site (4) and not providing

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
residential (12).																					
<p><u>B24c: Development for offices</u> This option does not result in the provision of housing, but this form of development is not out of character with the area, as the site is located within the defined Office Core. Policy RC4s still presents opportunities to achieve high quality and architecturally distinctive outcomes, and would make economic contributions, providing the offices were designed to meet specific needs. If the building was designed flexibly (i.e. it could be adapted for other uses), the development could be quite successful in catering for various uses over time. The development should be efficient in terms of energy usage, if constructed at the appropriate density and incorporating sustainable design features (and bearing in mind its accessibility to Reading Station and bus services). An office use is not particularly sensitive to noise disturbance impacts, which could otherwise be attenuated through design. This alternative promotes the redevelopment of a site that is currently in active use for a similar intensity of development. As such, this could have negative implications on the need to use resources efficiently (3), CO2 emissions (1) and on the need for waste minimisation (5).</p> <p><u>B24d: Higher density residential development (approximately 40 dwellings or more)</u> Developing the site for higher density residential has the potential to impact on the appearance of nearby listed buildings and the adjoining Conservation Area, albeit that this option presents opportunities to achieve high quality design, and the site is well located to accommodate increased densities. This option has significant positive implications for the provision of housing (13), and provides opportunities to strengthen the Centre's existing residential community and encourage social and cultural diversity (12). This should contribute to overall well-being. Residential development will be subject to some level of noise pollution, given the site's location (6). It is also likely to worsen the current situation with regard to the shortage of education within (and within close proximity of) the Central Area (20). There are negative implications predicted for minimising the generation of waste (5).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age and disability has been identified if the library use is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: Residential development may place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the Centre, which are at or close to capacity. Noise attenuation will need to be incorporated into design. New development will also need to be sympathetic to the adjoining features of the historic environment.</p>																					

B25: THE ANCHORAGE, BRIDGE STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B25a ▼	Development for water-compatible leisure and/or tourism uses.	X✓	X	X✓	✓	X	?✓	?	0	?	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	?
B25b	Business, tourism and housing	X✓	XX	X✓	?✓	X	X✓	?	0	?	0	?✓	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0	?
B25c *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	0	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B25d	Residential development (approximately 30 dwellings)	X✓	XX	X✓	✓	X	X✓	?	0	?	0	?✓ ?X	✓	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B25a: Development for water-compatible leisure & tourism

The Anchorage is a relatively modern office building. Therefore, the redevelopment of such a building would mean using resources that might not otherwise have been used (3), emitting CO2 (1) and creating more waste (5). The waste minimisation issue could be mitigated at application stage by a commitment to reuse some of the waste created. However, the widening of the range of leisure facilities, an area in which the centre of Reading is often found to be lacking, **will not only have a significant positive effect on the access to formal and informal leisure and recreation (17)**, but should also reduce the need to travel by widening the range of facilities in one place (14), with consequent beneficial effects for CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and air quality (6). Whilst the site reduces the need to consume undeveloped land by providing a rare brownfield waterside opportunity that might otherwise mean the use of green land (4), it also finds itself in the flood plain. Despite it being a water-compatible use, there is still a potentially negative effect on water flows and flood risk, that would require mitigation at the application stage. Another environmental issue to be highlighted is biodiversity (7) – it is known for instance, that sand martins nest in the banks of the Kennet, but whether this affects this site is unknown. Such issues would require investigation and mitigation at application stage. The development would expand the diversity of the economy and the range of available job opportunities (18). There would also be potential for such a facility to provide an educational role (20), but this is dependent on the type of facility. A waterside facility could promote access to the waterways and therefore healthier lifestyles (11), and could make a visually positive contribution to the centre – although this is entirely dependent on the design.

B25b: Development for business, tourism and leisure

Development of this site would have the same negative implications as the submission approach for CO2 emissions (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5), and the implications for biodiversity (7) may also be similar. Although the development would be different to that envisaged in the allocation, it might also be expected to reduce the need to travel, through a wider mix of uses (14), with potential benefits in terms of CO2 (1), energy use (3) and air pollution (6). However, the introduction of residential so close to the Inner Distribution Road, which is raised at this point, could mean that residents are exposed to poor air quality (6). In terms of flooding, this could mean **significant** negative effects as there would be people living in the flood zone (2). Despite this, residential on the site does have some positives: it widens the offer of housing, particularly in a desirable riverside location (13),

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	<p>and brings natural surveillance to the towpath, which would otherwise be a threatening place to be in the dark (12). A wider mix of uses does, however, dilute the leisure focus of the scheme, and although the effects on issues such as access to leisure and recreation (17) and the diversity of the economy (18) are still positive, they are not as positive as the effects of the proposed scheme.</p> <p><u>B25c: Do not allocate</u> The majority of the effects are expected to be neutral. There would be some positive implications in terms of CO2 emissions (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5) of not redeveloping a reasonably recent building. However, the office use of a site which is, by central standards, relatively distant from the station and accessible by car is out of step with the strategy of focusing office development around the areas accessible to the station, and therefore this option will continue to increase the need to travel with increases in office floorspace efficiency and car ownership/use (14), which will have knock-on impacts on CO2 (1), energy use (3) and air pollution (6). It should also be noted that the fact that an office building is the only building on this part of the southern bank of the Kennet may make a negative contribution to how safe this area feels after business hours (12).</p> <p><u>B25d: Residential development:</u> In the same way as all of the alternatives that propose redevelopment of this site, there are negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5), and the implications for biodiversity (7) are as yet unknown. There would be justified environmental concerns about the suitability of this site for a substantial amount of residential. Its position adjacent to the IDR makes it likely that new receptors would be introduced to an Air Quality Management Area (6). It would also place a solely residential development within the flood zone, and this would therefore significantly raise the risks of flooding (2). The location of the residential development, on the fringe of the shopping core, could represent the encroachment of the wholly residential areas into the central core, and this could place strain on education facilities (20) and health facilities (15). However, there would also be positive effects associated with residential development on this site, where it would lead to a loss of offices, largely around removing a use that increases the need to travel by car and introducing residents with good access to jobs and services (14), with added implications for CO2 (1), energy use (3) and air pollution (6), and for the promotion of healthier means of travel (11). This may be set against any negative economic effects of a loss of offices (18).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The site is in a zone of flood risk, and a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. Also at application stage, an investigation into the biodiversity merit of the site would highlight any issues or need for mitigation. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>																				

B26: THE ORACLE EXTENSION, BRIDGE STREET AND LETCOMBE STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B26a ▼	Development for retail, with use of site at Letcombe Street for public car park	X✓	X	X✓	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	X✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	?X	0	0	0
B26b *	Do not allocate	X✓	0	✓X	0	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0
B26c	Residential development (approximately 200 dwellings)	X✓	XX	X✓	?✓	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	?X	?✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B26a: Development for retail with use of site at Letcombe Street as car park

The provision of additional retail development in the central area will expand the range of facilities in the centre and prevent such development being driven out-of-town. In this way it has significant positive effects on the need to travel (14), although this will be dependent on the number of parking spaces in the new car park, and therefore some positive effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6). However, the fact that it would mean redevelopment of a site which was developed fairly recently does not represent efficient use of energy (3) or minimisation of waste (5). There would be a potential for a negative effect on the adjoining conservation area, which would require mitigation (10), although a sensitively designed proposal could actively enhance the setting of the area. The potential loss of some leisure-type facilities south of the Kennet for retail could mean some limited loss of access to leisure (17). The majority of the site is within Flood Zone 2, so it would bring more people into an area at risk of flooding (2). This would require mitigation. Finally, the development may change the type of crime associated with the area to retail crime from drinking-related crime (12), although the overall levels may not change.

B26b: Do not allocate

This alternative would mean leaving the site in its current state, and since it is an active use with a reasonable environmental quality and no particular evidence that this is likely to deteriorate, many of the effects would be likely to be neutral. The main negative effects would be caused by an opportunity to develop a central site, to meet some of the identified retail need, being lost. It would be likely that the need would therefore be met from less central sites, therefore having a significant negative effect on the need to travel (14), with consequent negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6). However, there would be positive effects on energy use (3) and minimising waste (5) of maintaining reasonably new buildings.

B26c: Residential development (approximately 200 dwellings)

This alternative would mean a redevelopment of the site for a mix of retail and residential. The fact of redevelopment, regardless of use, means that some of the effects are likely to be similar to the approach under the submission policy, in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), undeveloped land (4), waste minimisation (5), the historic environment (10) and loss of leisure (17). However, there are some major differences between a purely retail use and a retail and residential development, and this is reflected in the sustainability effects. Residential use would introduce new receptors into an Air Quality Management Area (6), and this would be a significant negative effect requiring mitigation. Residential development would also then be

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
introduced into Flood Zone 2, therefore resulting in a significant negative effect on the risk of flooding. The reduction of the need to travel for retail uses (14) may be less positive than for the submission approach, as a mix of facilities may mean less space for retail, but the overall effect will still be positive. There may be a negative effect on the capacity of primary education (20) and healthcare facilities (15). Other positive effects of introducing a retail element will include adding natural surveillance into an area, which may have the effect of reducing crime (12). Using the site for housing would also have a positive effect on housing provision.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: The site is in a zone of flood risk, and a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site at application stage. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council’s policies on Sustainable Design and Construction. In terms of the impact on the conservation area, this would need to be mitigated through careful design and strict application of the Borough-wide and centre-specific design policies in the plan. Any impacts on crime would need to be mitigated by careful management and security arrangements. The loss of leisure on the site is likely to be outweighed by an overall gain in leisure across the central area.																					

B27: 25-31 LONDON STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B27a ▼	Residential (15-30 dwellings)	X✓	XX	X✓	✓	X ?✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
B27b *	Do not allocate	0	0	✓X	?X	✓	X	0	0	X	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B27c	Higher density residential development (approximately 40 dwellings or more)	X✓	XX	X✓	✓	X ?✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	XX	?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
COMMENTS:																					
<u>B27a: Residential development (15-30 dwellings)</u> The results of the appraisal for the allocation of this site are somewhat mixed, although many of the negative effects can be mitigated. The site is in use, having been recently refurbished. Therefore, as with other proposals to redevelop sites in active use, there are negative implications for CO2 emissions (1), resource use (3) and waste minimisation (5). Other negative environmental effects include the fact that the site is located in a location where air quality is likely to be poor (6), with implications for health (11). This effect would require mitigation through design. The development for residential may stretch primary education capacity and healthcare, requiring mitigation (20 & 15). In addition, the site is located at the edge of Flood Zone 2, and therefore there is a significant negative effect that requires mitigation (2). The topography of the site, which slopes upwards, may make mitigation relatively simple here. However, the use of a brownfield site for housing reduces pressure on undeveloped land (4), and redeveloping offices for housing would reduce the need to travel by car to the centre (14), which has positive benefits for CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6). There is potential for some negative effects on the economy in losing offices to housing (18), although the significant positive benefits to the economy of additional housing (13) may outweigh this. The site is on a prominent corner, and currently makes no particular positive contribution to it, so there is potential for a building that improves the townscape of the area to be built (9). However, care must be taken to avoid the potentially negative effects on the conservation area in which it is located and the listed building it adjoins (10).																					
<u>B27b: Do not allocate</u> This would leave the building in reasonably active use, meaning conservation on resources (3) and minimisation of waste (5). Its location relatively distant from the station risks increasing the need to travel by car (14), with negative implications for energy use (3) and pollution (6). Once the site is out of use, it would represent a wasted opportunity to develop a brownfield site (4). It will also increasingly detract from the character of the town and the prominent corner site (9), and will also increasingly detract from the conservation area in which it is situated and the adjacent listed building (10).																					
<u>B27c: Higher density residential (approximately 40 dwellings or more)</u> This alternative would mean developing the site for a higher density of residential, going higher than its current five-storey height, potentially to around seven or eight storeys. Since the use would be the same as for the allocation, it is anticipated that the same effects will be felt, albeit that they may be more pronounced in places due to the higher intensity of development. In particular, a significantly greater amount of residential development may significantly decrease the need to travel by car (14). However, the major concern here is the effect that such a dominant building would have on the																					

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
conservation area, and particularly the adjacent listed building (10).																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be low air quality as well as noise disturbance. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. The RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. The impact on waste minimisation could also be mitigated through using demolition waste from the site. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction. In terms of flooding, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. Given the site's location on the edge of Flood Zone 2 and the potential for building up to match the topography of surrounding areas, this may be a reasonably simple matter. The impact on the conservation area and listed buildings would need to be mitigated through careful design and strict application of the Borough-wide and centre-specific design policies.</p>																					

B28: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SOUTHAMPTON STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B28a ▼	Residential development (10-25 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	?✓	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	?X
B28b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	?X	?	0	XX	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
B28c	Higher density residential development (approximately 35 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	0	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B28a: Residential development (10-25 dwellings)

This alternative is generally seen as having positive sustainability effects, as it would involve the use of a derelict site. The use of a derelict brownfield site will have significant positive effects on minimising use of undeveloped land (4), and will also have significant positive effects on the supply of housing (13). It is also on a very prominent corner, meaning that there is the opportunity to make a significant positive contribution on townscape (9). Although there are no specific identified historic features nearby, the impact on the generally historic area around London Street and Southampton Street may be positive (10). Developing one of the few remaining derelict sites in Reading will send out the right economic signals (18), and it will also prevent the anti-social behaviour for which derelict sites often become a focus (12). Using a site in the central area for housing means that people do not need to travel by car as much (14), meaning positive effects for CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6).

Only three areas were identified where there might be a negative effect or mitigation might be required. Firstly, the site is in an Air Quality Management Area, and residents would therefore be exposed to low air quality (6, 11). This could be mitigated through design. In addition, it is not known whether the site has any biodiversity value (7), which derelict brownfield land may sometimes have, but this could be identified and mitigated at the application stage. There may also be pressure placed on primary education and healthcare facilities (20, 11).

B28b: Do not allocate

This alternative would mean leaving a derelict site undeveloped, and there are no identified positive effects of such an approach. A significant negative effect of not developing vacant brownfield sites is that pressure increases on greenfield sites (4). In addition, the site is an eyesore on a highly visible corner, which has significant negative effects on townscape (9), and potential negative effects on the generally historic London Street/Southampton Street area (10). Derelict sites may be used for fly-tipping, which has potentially polluting impacts (6), or as a focus of anti-social behaviour, and therefore fear of crime (12). It also gives the impression of an area in decline, which is not true in Reading's case, and may therefore not encourage investment in the area (18).

B28c: Higher density residential development (approximately 35 dwellings)

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>Developing the site for higher density residential use would have many of the same effects as the existing allocation, but the effects would be more pronounced. For instance, while more people would be able to walk to employment or facilities, more people may be exposed to the low air quality. The main differences are in terms of the objectives that relate to the urban design elements. The height of such a development would be likely to be very dominant over the surrounding medium and low density uses, and this would undermine the character and distinctiveness of the area and the overall look and feel of the area (9).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be low air quality. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. At application stage, an investigation into the biodiversity merit of the site would highlight any issues or need for mitigation of this impact.</p>																					

B29: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SILVER STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B29a ▼	Residential development (50-85 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	✓	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	?X
B29b	Residential and business	✓X	0	✓X	✓	0	✓X	?	0	✓✓	✓	X✓	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	?X
B29c *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	?X	?	0	XX	XX	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
B29d	Higher density residential (approximately 120 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	XX	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B29a: Residential development (50-85 dwellings)

As for the nearby Crown Street/ Southampton Street site, this alternative is generally seen as having positive sustainability effects, as it would involve the use of a partially derelict site. The use of such a brownfield site will have significant positive effects on minimising use of undeveloped land (4), and will also have significant positive effects on the supply of housing (13). It is also on a very prominent corner, meaning that there is the opportunity to make a significant positive contribution to making the area cleaner, greener and safer (9). The site is not within a conservation area but is opposite one, and the effect on the setting of this area will be positive (10). Developing a partially derelict site will send out the right economic signals (18), and it will also prevent the anti-social behaviour for which such sites often become a focus (12). Using a site in the central area for housing means that people do not need to travel by car as much (14), meaning positive effects for energy use (3) and pollution (6). Only two areas were identified where there might be a negative effect or mitigation might be required. Firstly, the site, and therefore its residents are in an area of low air quality (6, 11). The effects could be mitigated through design. In addition, it is not known whether the site has any biodiversity value (7), but this could be identified and mitigated at the application stage. There may also be pressure placed on primary education and healthcare facilities (20, 11).

B29b: Residential and business

This alternative would mean continuing with the designation in the Local Plan, which seeks a mix of residential and business space on the site. This alternative would be expected to have many effects similar to the proposed allocation, particularly in terms of cleaner and greener spaces (9), effects on the conservation area (10), and elimination of a potential focus for anti-social behaviour (12). The residential element will also mean a reduction of pressure on undeveloped land (4) and increasing supply of housing (13), although neither of these effects are as strong as under the purely residential approach. The main difference is the business space, and, while this has a significant positive effect in providing more employment opportunities closer to some areas of deprivation to the south of the centre (18), it also has negative effects compared to the housing option. The location of offices a significant distance from the station and transport hub would mean that they would be likely to be accessed by car (14), which affects energy use (3) and pollution (6).

B29c: Do not allocate

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>This alternative would mean leaving a partially derelict site undeveloped, and there are no identified positive effects of such an approach. A significant negative effect of not developing vacant brownfield sites is that pressure increases on greenfield sites (4). In addition, the site is an eyesore on a highly visible corner, which has significant negative effects on creating areas that are cleaner and greener (9), and on the nearby conservation area (10). Derelict sites may be used for fly-tipping, which has potentially polluting impacts (6), or as a focus of anti-social behaviour, and therefore fear of crime (12). It also gives the impression of an area in decline, which is not true in Reading's case, and may therefore not encourage investment in the area (18).</p> <p>B29d: Higher density residential (approximately 120 dwellings) Developing the site for higher density residential use, would have many of the same effects as the current allocation, but the effects would be more pronounced. For instance, while more people would be able to walk to employment or facilities, more people may be exposed to the low air quality. The main differences are in terms of the objectives that relate to the urban design elements. The height of such a development would be likely to be very dominant over the surrounding medium and low density uses, and this would undermine the character and distinctiveness of the area (9), and, significantly, the London Street conservation area (10), meaning negative effects against these objectives.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there may be low air quality. This will require mitigation through design as set out in the RCAAP. Residential development may also place additional strain on the primary education and healthcare facilities in and around the centre, which are at or close to capacity. RCAAP policy RC9 states that applications must mitigate this impact. At application stage, an investigation into the biodiversity merit of the site would highlight any issues or need for mitigation of this impact.</p>																					

B30: 21 SOUTH STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B30a ▼	Residential development of arts venue, only to take place when a replacement facility is operational. (20-35 units)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓ ?X	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	?✓	✓	0	?X
B30b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	?	0	?X	X	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
B30c	Higher density residential (approximately 50 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	?X	?X	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	?✓	✓	0	?X
B30d	Development for community/cultural use	✓X	0	?	?X	?	0	0	0	?	?✓	?✓	✓	X	?X	0	0	✓	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

B30a: Residential development when replacement facility is operational

This policy has significant positive implications for housing provision, as well as anticipated positive implications for community cohesiveness and safety, encouraging social and cultural diversity, and access to existing leisure and healthcare facilities (12, 17 and 11). The site is reasonably accessible, though the effect against objective 14 is not considered to be significantly positive, given that it is not as centrally located (i.e. separated from Reading Station) as some of the other identified opportunity sites. Being located within what is becoming an established residential area highlights the potential for improved community cohesiveness. Unlike several of the other opportunity sites, new development should also benefit from acceptable levels of noise quality (4). Higher density residential development in the Centre is more energy efficient than in other less central locations, and helps to prevent the consumption of undeveloped land in other parts of the Borough. There is potential to achieve high quality design (including elements of diversity and distinctiveness), and development should, in accordance with historic environment policies, be sympathetic to the adjoining Market Place/ London Street Conservation Area and other nearby listed buildings, albeit that the site is not directly visible from the more characteristic parts of the Conservation Area along London Street (10). Although this option results in the loss of the existing theatre use at South Street, the theatre's replacement in a more accessible and prominent location is a better outcome generally. In addition, given that the existing theatre will be vacant when the site becomes available for development, this option will not result in the generation of waste from an existing active use. The impact on minimising the generation of waste is therefore neutral.

B30b: Do not allocate

This alternative generally produces negative outcomes, in relation to the provision of housing and improvements to the appearance of the built environment (13, 9 and 10). It represents lost opportunities for community cohesion and the broadening of social and cultural diversity, as well as economic contributions that could otherwise be made from development on a reasonably accessible site (12 and 18). Leaving the site in a vacant state

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
may over time cause it to become dilapidated, eventually detracting from the surrounding environment. It may also encourage anti-social behaviour on (and within close vicinity) of the site (12).																					
<u>B30c: Higher density residential</u> The most discernable negative impact associated with higher density residential development in this location is the visual impact on surrounding development, which is generally of a lower density. This proposal thus has the potential to be out of character with adjoining development, including the Conservation Area to the west (10). It would also increase pressure on existing education and healthcare facilities (11 and 20). Although the site would be vacant prior to its development, this option proposes significantly higher development than what presently exists on the site, and thus the impacts on waste generation would tend to be negative (5).																					
<u>B30d: Development for community/cultural use</u> Retaining a community or cultural element on the site should assist with strengthening the existing local residential community (12). This facility would also provide opportunities to engage in culture and leisure activity (17). However, the site is not immediately (or particularly easily) accessible from Reading Station, and thus is not ideally located for such a use (14). Economic contributions from the site would therefore be questionable.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: Residential development is likely to place additional strain on the primary education facilities and healthcare facilities in and around the Centre, which are at or close to capacity. This impact could potentially be mitigated by enhancing this infrastructure.																					

B31: READING COLLEGE, KINGS ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B31a ▼	Continued development to support the role of this site in providing higher and further education	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	?	0	?✓	?✓	?X	✓	✓	0	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
B31b	Residential development	✓X	0	X	0	X	X	0	0	?	0	X	0	✓✓	✓X	X	X	0	XX	X	XX
B31c *	Do not allocate	0	0	?X	✓	X	0	0	0	?	0	?X	?	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	?✓	?X

COMMENTS:

B31a: Continued development of the site to support its role in higher and further education

The Kings Road Campus is relatively accessible by bus, and is within walking distance (though not comfortable walking distance) of the centre of town. This should encourage some students to walk into the centre of Reading, or to other facilities and services along the way (11 and 14). The site is also within fairly easy walking distance or bus ride of local leisure and healthcare facilities, though significant increases in the student population may have the potential to place pressure on existing facilities. **Increased status and patronage of the college should bring about positive contributions to the local economy, and help to strengthen the university as a whole (18). It has a significant positive effect in terms of maximising access to education (20). It also brings larger volumes of students into Reading, injecting substantial funds into the local economy (property rentals, retail expenditure, use of leisure facilities etc.).** Increasing the capacity of the university encourages more widespread use, enabling it to cater for a more diverse range of users, which increases the social and cultural diversity of the student population and local area as a whole. There are also opportunities to strengthen the cohesiveness of the university community (12), as well as their interactions with the wider community of Reading. Contributions to visual amenity will be based on the design and construction of new buildings on the campus. There are efficiencies to be gained in large-scale expansion, including energy savings by locating supporting uses and services on campus (convenience shopping, refreshments, entertainment, study facilities etc.), and minimised risk to the consumption of undeveloped land elsewhere for tertiary education (4). There is also much scope to achieve high quality design, including diversity in built form and sustainable design (suitably phased development etc.).

B31b: Residential development

A residential development would mean a significant amount of development, with effects in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). Residential in the Air Quality Management Area could mean greater exposure to poor air quality (11). This large site could **produce a significant amount of new residential (13)**, but the loss of an important education facility would mean **significant negative effects on access to education (20) and the local economy (18).**

B31c: Do not allocate

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>Continuing use of the site as the College has positive implications for the local economy, community cohesion and diversity, and the provision of educational opportunities. However, not allowing the facility to expand to meet demand, when there is recognised scope to do so, means a loss of potential financial contributions, as well as opportunities to further strengthen the College's role in Reading in terms of contributions to the local community and the diversity of population. An inability to cater for need through increased capacity may make it less economically viable to provide supporting services to students on campus. This has the potential to encourage use of other facilities elsewhere, which may be outside of the Borough and in any case, rely on the use of private vehicles.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified if the education use of the facility is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: Mitigation of the environmental effects of development could be secured through compliance with sustainable design and construction policies.</p>																					

B32: KINGS MEADOW POOL, KINGS MEADOW ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B32a ▼	Use of building for leisure or tourism uses	✓X	X	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	?✓	✓✓	✓X	?✓ ?X	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0
B32b *	Do not allocate	✓X	X	0	0	?X	0	?	0	✓X	✓X	0	X	0	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0
B32c	Redevelopment for residential	✓X	XX	?X	?✓	X	?X	XX	0	?	XX	?✓	?X	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	?	0	?X
B32d	Redevelopment for leisure	✓X	XX	?	0	X	?X	X	0	?	XX	?✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B32a: Use of building for leisure or tourism

This policy approach has negative effects for flood risk, as the site is located within the functional floodplain. The proposed development will still have an impact on flood risk, although the proposed use is not particularly vulnerable (2). **The establishment of a new leisure (or leisure-related) facility within Reading Centre has significant positive implications for the provision of leisure opportunities (17), and should encourage combined use (and appreciation of) the adjoining meadows and River Thames.** This should lead to healthy activity and contribute to well-being (11), and may also encourage community interaction (12). There is a risk however of the site becoming unsafe, due to its relative isolation (12). Pedestrian and cyclist access to the site should be very convenient, once cross rail improvements have been made (14, 3 and 11). This approach does not result in the provision of additional housing, although, given that the site has never been used for (and is unsuitable for) housing, this has been recorded as a neutral effect. **Leisure uses should bring about a substantial increase in economic contribution over the current use of the site (18).** Use of the building in its current form will enable it to continue to 'look well' and contribute to local distinctiveness (9). Its ability to 'work well' will be dependent on the selected use and the degree of alterations required. **The alternative has significant positive implications for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (10).** Reuse of the existing building reduces the consumption of resources (building materials etc.). Finally, the site's location in an area of high biodiversity will expose users to some of Reading's valuable natural features and should enhance appreciation, although care will need to be taken to ensure that human intervention does not impact on existing biodiversity values.

B32b: Do not allocate

Retaining the pool building in its current form means that it is not contributing to the local community (through provision of opportunities to engage in leisure etc.) or the local economy (16, 18). It is not aiding in the fostering of community cohesion, nor encouraging use by diverse individuals and groups (11). The impact on objectives 9 and 10 are both positive and negative. Whilst retention of the building would enable it to continue to make contributions to the historic environment and the townscape, the structural integrity of the building would gradually deteriorate over time, making its contributions less pronounced and positive, and reducing the value of its appearance to the surrounding area. This may result in the generation of waste (5). There may therefore be scope for redevelopment or alteration of the building to make it fit for purpose, and more visually appealing.

B32c: Development for residential

Whilst the site is currently accessible and will be even more so once connections across the railway line have been improved, there are significant negative implications for flooding, based on an inclusion within the functional floodplain (2). Development on the meadows will also disrupt the fragile ecosystem existing in this area, and may lead to pollution and river contamination (6). It would necessitate the demolition of a listed building (10), which

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	<p>currently contributes to the diversity of the area and townscape (9). Whilst housing on this site would benefit from an attractive outlook and good access to nearby playing fields (open areas for informal recreation) and other leisure facilities, the site remains reasonably removed from other residential development, which may make it difficult to achieve a sense of community within and surrounding this development. Waste collection and management may also be difficult, given the site's relative isolation (5). This alternative is also based on the removal of a building that has the potential to be re-used, and thus there are negative impacts on minimising the generation of waste (5). Economic implications are difficult to predict, as whilst they would be more positive than at present, it is likely that an appropriate leisure or tourism-related use would be more economically feasible for this site.</p> <p><u>B32d: Development for leisure</u></p> <p>Whilst leisure is less vulnerable than housing in flooding terms, the site's location in the functional floodplain makes it unsuitable for redevelopment for anything other than water-compatible uses. Leisure uses will have similar impacts on biodiversity, physical distinctiveness and visual amenity than the previous option, and will also require demolition of the listed building (7, 9 and 10). This approach may encourage wider use of the adjoining meadows, encouraging interaction and healthy activity (12 and 11). However, there may be some threat to safety (or the perception of safety), given the site's relative isolation (12). There still exists a risk for pollution and contamination on the site (with possible impacts for nearby sites), if the site is to be redeveloped (6). There are negative impacts on minimising the generation of waste (5).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Consideration will need to be applied to the design of the proposed use, as well as access between the site and nearby areas (lighting etc.), to ensure that access is safe, and the facility is widely used. The site is in a zone of high flood risk, and hence, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. There is some predicted risk to local biodiversity value, and therefore, an investigation into the site's merit would need to be made prior to the consideration of future proposals, to highlight any issues/ potential for harm and subsequent need for mitigation.</p>																				

B33: CAVERSHAM LOCK ISLAND, THAMES SIDE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B33a ▼	Development for water-compatible leisure or tourism uses, including some operational development.	✓X	X✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	0	?	0	?✓	?	X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0
B33b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0
B33c	Residential development	✓X	XX	?X	?✓	XX	X	XX	0	?	0	?X	?X	✓✓	X	0	0	?✓	?	0	?X

COMMENTS:

B33a: Development for water-compatible leisure or tourism:

This option recognises the potential for enhanced pedestrian access. If achieved, pedestrian accessibility to the island should be improved, once cross rail accessibility improvements are made (14). Preventing vehicles from accessing the island should help to encourage healthy movement by foot or cycle, reducing the potential for air and noise quality related impacts (11, 14 and 6). However, it may lead to an overflow of parked vehicles in nearby areas, particularly the Kings Meadow carpark. **This option will significantly contribute to the provision of leisure opportunities**, and presumably make contributions to the local economy (17 and 18). Bringing local residents and tourists onto the island encourages them to appreciate its natural diversity, and to interact. However, the separation distance between the island and other nearby development may mean that there is a risk of safety (or negative perceptions of safety). Whilst the site is located within Flood Zone 2, the development of water-compatible uses is seen as an appropriate way of managing flood risk and reducing other related risks (2). This option has the potential to lead to changes in local ecosystems (people movements on the island, as well as upfront and ongoing operational work), which may have an impact on the diversity of wildlife and habitat on the island, and in the surrounding area (7).

B33b: Do not allocate

This policy approach sees Caversham Lock Island continue in its current state, allowing it to make visual contributions to the local area, and function as a haven for wildlife, and a pleasant location for walks and wildlife appreciation. However, this option prevents the use of a quality waterside site for a beneficial purpose, which means a loss of economic contributions, as well as contributions to Reading's leisure and tourism industry. It also means that the island would not benefit from improvements associated with development, in particular, improved pedestrian access to and from the island.

B33c: Residential development

Developing the site for residential uses poses very strong negative risks to existing wildlife and habitats (7). There are associated risks to visual amenity, in terms of the creation of cleaner and greener environments, as well as the potential for increased noise pollution and waste (with no conceivable convenient solutions to waste collection and management). Not being able to access the island by car makes it difficult for many residents, particularly for trips that require the assistance of a vehicle. There may be an overflow of carparking in nearby areas as a result. Timely and convenient access to necessary services will be very difficult (and energy inefficient), though residents may benefit from access to nearby water-based leisure opportunities

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>(including open spaces for recreation). As with option B33c above, the site is isolated from other residential areas, so it may be difficult to foster a sense of community on the island, and safety may be an issue (12). Further residential development places strain on existing healthcare and education facilities in the Centre that are already under pressure.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: As the site is in a zone of high flood risk, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at application stage to examine possible methods of mitigation. It is likely that additional carparking will be required in an appropriate, yet convenient location nearby, if vehicular access to the island is prohibited. Policy RC4p results in a negative effect on housing provision, although the island is thought to be better equipped to accommodate a water compatible leisure use than additional housing, based on its level of biodiversity and significant flood risk. The potential for harm to biodiversity will need to be investigated in conjunction with proposals for development, and any risks will need to be effectively mitigated.</p>																					

B34: 261-275 LONDON ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B34a ▼	Residential development (10-15 dwellings) with District Centre uses on the ground floor London Road frontage.	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
B34b *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	X	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B34c	Development for residential only	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
B34d	Development for offices with ground floor town centre uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓	✓	X	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B34a: Residential development with ground floor town centre uses: Developing the site purely for residential use would mean CO2 emissions (1), use of energy (3) and waste generation (5), although the environmental performance of the buildings would be likely to be an improvement over the current buildings (1, 3). As the site is in the AQMA, there would be negative effects on health of the residents that would need to be mitigated (11). The development would provide housing (13) and make good use of a brownfield site (4), and would remove a potential focus of crime (12). The effect on the historic environment (10) and cleaner and greener environments (9) would be largely dependent on design, although, if the rear yards are incorporated, an improvement against objective 8 would be very likely. Any impacts on the historic park would need to be mitigated. Incorporating ground floor town centre units would mean some additional positive effects. There would now be a **significant positive effect on reducing the need to travel by car (14)** by adding to the diversity of the district centre and enhancing its role thus reducing pollution (6), although at a local level there may be increased car journeys in the Air Quality Management Area (6). There would also be potential positive effects on creating employment opportunities (18) and improving access to leisure (17), although this latter effect will depend on which town centre uses are provided. The effect on health (11) would also be mixed - whilst there would be potential effects on residents as already identified, the accessible nature of the site will encourage walking and cycling.

B34b: Do not allocate: Where no development activity would take place on the site, this would minimise CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5). However, there would also be a missed opportunity for housing provision (12), and would not make good use of an underused brownfield site (4).

B34c: Residential development: Many of the effects would be the same as the residential option (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14), although not

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
incorporating town centre uses would mean less positive effects on the need to travel (14) and provision of local services (15).																					
<u>B34d: Offices with ground floor town centre uses:</u> The effects of a small-scale office development with town centre uses on the ground floor would be in many cases the same as for residential with town centre uses (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17), including a significant positive effect on reducing the need to travel by car (14) . There would be a positive contribution to economic growth, and local job opportunities (18). Since no residents would be present, the negative effects on health would not occur to the same extent (11).																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and is likely to suffer some noise issues, meaning that any effects on potential future residents would need to be mitigated. The effects of the development itself, including more traffic in the AQMA may also have to be mitigated. A historic park/garden is opposite, and a development would need to avoid negative effects on this feature.																					

B35: CRESCENT ROAD CAMPUS

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B35a *▼	Use for FHE as first preference	✓X	✓	X	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	X	X	0	0	✓	0	0	✓
B35b	Develop whole site for mixed use development (including playing field)	✓X	?✓	X	X	?X	?✓	X	0	?✓	?X	✓	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	✓
B35c	Develop whole site for residential development (including playing field)	✓X	?✓	X	XX	?X	?✓	?X	X	?✓	?X	✓X	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	X	X	0	0	XX
B35d	Develop previously developed areas only for residential development	✓X	?✓	X	✓	?X	?✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?✓	?✓	✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	XX
B35e	Develop previously developed areas only for education development	✓X	?✓	X	✓	?X	?✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?✓	?✓	X	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>B35a - Use for education</u> Under this option the site would be allocated to remain as an education facility with large areas of open space. There would be limited development, as much of the change has already taken place, but there would still be some environmental effects in terms of CO2 emissions (1), waste (5) and energy use (3). The site is not within a flood risk area, but provides valuable areas of permeable ground which helps to reduce the risk of surface water run-off flooding elsewhere (2). The retention of the site in its current use would and promote health and well-being by providing access to open space (11, 17). The current use misses an opportunity to provide housing (13) and reduce the need to travel (14). This option would help to maximise necessary education provision (20).</p> <p><u>B35b - Develop whole site for mixed use (including playing field)</u></p>																					

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). Development would result in the loss of existing buildings, although good design can minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (8). Development could result in the use of large areas of open space on the site (green field land) (4). The loss of existing buildings will result in waste (5). Development of the site will result in the loss of areas of green space, affecting biodiversity (7). A mixed use development may provide a leisure use (17) which would contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). There is a potential for effects on the Conservation Area which would need to be avoided (10). Development will provide housing (13). Development close to the local centre would reduce the need to travel (14). Development may provide employment opportunities (18), and may provide education facilities (20).																				
	<u>B35c: Develop whole site for residential (including playing field)</u> Development for residential would have some similar effects to option (iii) (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14). Development would result in the use of large areas of open space on the site (green field land) (4). Development would provide significant amounts of housing (13). Development would result in the loss of education facilities (20).																				
	<u>B35d: Allocate brownfield areas for residential development</u> Development for residential only on previously developed areas would leave the playing fields undeveloped, and would use only those areas which are previously developed. Many of the effects would be similar to the residential option, including a significant effect on education due to the loss of an education facility (20) , although there would no longer be negative effects on open space (4) and biodiversity (7) - however, with the University use ceasing, it is not clear who would manage these playing fields were they to remain.																				
	<u>B35e: Allocate brownfield areas for education development</u> The appraisal of this option, where the previously developed areas would be allocated for education development, is similar to that for the previous option, except that this option would provide an education use (20), and would fail to provide a housing site (13).																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> A potential effect on Thames Basin Heaths SPA as a result of traffic associated with any major residential development has been identified (8, see Appendix 3).																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified if the education use of the facility is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).																				
	MITIGATION: Where options seek to retain open spaces, the effects most likely to require mitigation include any environmental effects associated with development, which will be mitigated through CS1 and associated policy, and any effects on the adjacent Conservation Area. Loss of education would be unlikely to be capable of mitigation - in any case, the policy ensures that this would only occur where the education use is no longer required.																				

B36: UNIVERSITY OF READING WHITEKNIGHTS CAMPUS

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B36a ▼	Continue current allocation to support continued university development	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓
B36b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

B36a: Continue current allocation

This option has positive effects in terms of utilising brownfield land (4), protecting and enhancing wildlife and habitat (7), promoting human health and well being (11), reducing the fear of crime (12), providing high quality housing appropriate to the needs of the area (13), ensuring opportunities to engage in leisure and recreational activity (15). This option has a significant positive effect in terms of **facilitating sustainable economic growth (16) and maximising access to education (17)** through having specific guidance on the type of educational establishment.

B36b: Do not allocate

Option (i) would mean reliance on existing Core Strategy policies which would not be site specific to the Whiteknights Campus. All objectives have a neutral impact bar three, namely appropriately utilising brownfield land (4), protecting and enhancing wildlife and habitat (7) and reducing the fear of crime (12), which have a negative tendency given the lack of a specific policy to help ensure these objectives will be met.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

B37: WORTON GRANGE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B37a ▼	Mix of uses incl housing (175 - 275 units), community, small retail and leisure, public transport interchange, potential for office.	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	X	✓X	?✓	0	✓✓	✓	XX	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓	XX
B37b ▼	Warehousing redevelopment	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
B37c *	Do not allocate	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	?	?	?	?
B37d	Mixed use development without limits on retail or leisure	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	X	✓X	?✓	X	✓	✓	XX	✓X	✓✓	✓X	XX	0	✓	✓/ XX	XX	XX
B37e	Energy centre, transport interchange, small business centre, sorting office	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	X	✓✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0

COMMENTS:

B37a: Development for mixed commercial/residential: This option would continue the current allocation, i.e. residential (186-292 dwellings), offices up to the equivalent level of floorspace as previous, community uses, local scale retail and leisure, open space and a public transport interchange. In terms of CO2 emissions (1) and resources (3), this option would result in negatives given the energies involved in demolition and construction phases, but with potential long-term gains. Subject to suitable mitigation (e.g. SUDS), this option could have positive impact in terms of surface water flooding (2). This option would result in a significant positive in terms of limiting the use of undeveloped land (4). Likely negative impacts in respect of waste (5) and pollution (6) purely as a result of demolition and construction phases. There is the potential for positive impacts on ecological habit (7) given the size of the site and the requirement to provide open space. This option would **significantly improve the quality of greener environments and attractive buildings (9) on site**. Whilst the now-demolished buildings could not be argued to detract from the setting of the neighbouring St. Paul's Church Hall, a Grade II Listed Building, this option has the potential to have a positive impact on relationship with this listed building (10). This site is in an Air Quality Management Area and an area subject to noise issues, as well as limited healthcare provision, meaning a **significant negative impact on health (11)**

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	<p>requiring mitigation. Re-development of this site should be designed to enhance passive surveillance (12) and minimise potential crime problems. It will have a significant positive effect on community cohesion (12) through inclusion of the Little Chef site allowing for linkages with Whitley. Subject to addressing significant design constraints, this option could provide a significant amount of housing (13). By virtue of inclusion of an MRT link as well as local facilities, this option would significantly reduce the need to travel by car (14). It could provide small-scale retail and leisure facilities (15, 17), and the MRT function would promote access to leisure facilities in the centre. This option would significantly enhance local employment (18, 19) over the construction phase but would be reliant on identifying and mitigating for the shortfall of skills within local community in terms of medium-long term employment options generated by the redevelopment. It should be noted, however, that this is dependent on the local centre facilities serving only the development and adjacent housing areas - any larger scheme could impact on existing centres. This option would be required to mitigate for the shortfall in local labour skills (20) but would also have a significant negative impact in terms of additional pressures that would be placed on already strained existing education infrastructure.</p> <p>B37b: Warehouse and distribution (B8) uses: This option assumes around 40,000 sq m of B8 floorspace, car and lorry parking. There would be similar effects to other development options in terms of CO2 (1), climate change adaptation (2), energy (3), waste (5) and passive surveillance (12). This option would result in a positive in terms of limiting the use of undeveloped land (4) given that the floorspace would be an appropriate use for this area. Likely to have neutral impacts on ecological habit (7) given the nature of use proposed. Low-rise buildings would be unlikely to have an effect on St. Paul's Church Hall, a Grade II Listed Building (10). This option would invariably rely on private vehicles and make little use of public transport facilities, but B8 development anywhere relies on HGV travel, and this location prevents longer journeys from the motorway on unsuitable roads (14, 6). This option would significantly enhance local employment (18) over the construction phase but would be reliant on identifying and mitigating for the shortfall of skills within local community in terms of medium-long term employment options generated by the redevelopment.</p> <p>B37c: Do not allocate: Under this option the site would not be allocated for any specific use through the LDF. Therefore, the site would be available for any use, in principle, and hence, would have a significant amount of unknowns.</p> <p>B37d: Mixed-use development without limits on retail/leisure: This option would involve a development for a mix of residential and commercial space, with community uses, open space and public transport provision, similar to the previous option, but without any limitations on the scale of retail and leisure floorspace. Many of the effects would be likely to be the same as the previous mixed use option, e.g. in terms of short-term negatives and long-term positive effects on factors such as climate change (1), resource use (3) and pollution (6). As for the previous options, there would also be significant positive effects on the use of brownfield land (4) and provision of housing (13) and significant negative effects on health (11) and access to education (20), for the same reasons as set out previously. As previously, the open space provision has the potential for a positive effect on biodiversity (7) and surface water drainage (2), whilst the development of the site would be likely to improve the setting of the listed church hall (10). However, the allowance for larger scale retail and leisure would result in some negative effects through larger scale facilities having a negative impact on existing centres within areas of deprivation (e.g. Whitley). In terms of economic growth and regeneration (18) and inequality (19), it should be recognised that such development would create jobs in the local area, and provide for a small, underserved deprived area. However, this would have a significantly negative effect on the vitality and viability of other South Reading centres, particularly Whitley, which serve larger areas of deprivation. The score for objectives 18 and 19 reflects this geographic differentiation in effects. The same issue also applies to the need to travel - provision of a public transport interchange gives a clear positive effect, but provision of large retail space next to a motorway junction would increase car travel (14). Inclusion of the Little Chef site would enhance cohesion with Whitley Wood, but this option would affect community cohesion in Whitley by threatening the district centre facilities (12). Although the aesthetic effects on the physical environment would be likely to be positive (9), large format retail is less likely to achieve the significant improvement sought than a development where smaller scale retail is integrated.</p> <p>B37e: Energy Centre, MRT/Transport Interchange, Small Business Centre and Sorting Office: This use has been highlighted by commentators but, in</p>																				

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	reality, would be unlikely (for financial reasons) to come forward unless part of a larger redevelopment proposal. In terms of C02 emissions (1), resources (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), this option would result in both negative and positive effects given there would be significant energies involved at demolition and construction phases but considering the long-term environmental benefits associated with renewable energies and public travel. An energy centre would have a significant positive effect on adaptation to climate change through creating a source of decentralised energy (2) . Re-use of this vacant brownfield site and buildings would result in a significant positive in terms of limiting the use of undeveloped land (4) . This option could improve the quality of greener environments and attractive buildings (9) on site, although this would depend on design. Re-development of this site should enhance passive surveillance (12) by way of good design. This option could significantly promote the options for sustainable travel (14) . Access to leisure facilities (17) would be enhanced for local people by the improved public transport facilities. This option would significantly enhance local employment (18) over the construction phase but would be reliant on identifying and mitigating the shortfall of skills within the local community in terms of medium-long term employment options generated by the redevelopment.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> A potential significant adverse effect on Thames Basin Heaths SPA has been identified if a major retail development were to be pursued, as it would potentially draw additional traffic along the A329 corridor past the site (8, Appendix 3).																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.																				
	MITIGATION: Transport infrastructure improvements would be required to mitigate any additional trips generated, contributing to low air quality and congestion, although inclusion of MRT provision will help. In terms of air quality and noise issues for future residents, the exposure to any such pollution may need to be mitigated through design. Contributions towards improving the skills set of the local workforce will be required. Mitigation measures in terms of reusing construction waste would help reduce surplus waste. Potential ecological enhancements would be sought; e.g. brown/green roofs on new buildings. Flood compensation would be an unlikely requirement. However, a suitable FRA detailing appropriate sustainable surface water drainage would be required on all redevelopment options. For residential options, the effects most likely to require mitigation include the additional pressures on already strained education, healthcare and leisure infrastructure. Mitigation of any negative effects of retail and leisure can be ensured by limiting its scale in the policy.																				
	This site also has the potential to significantly add to cumulative pressures that would be placed on existing infrastructures by the redevelopment of other major sites within South Reading.																				

B38: PART OF FORMER BERKSHIRE BREWERY SITE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B38a ▼	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0
B38b *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B38c	Non-residential development e.g. hotel	X	X	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	?X	X	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	✓	?✓	0
B38d	Residential development	X	X	X	✓✓	x	X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	?✓	✓X	0	X	0	0	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

B38a: Employment development (B1/B2/B8)

As with any development, there will be negative effects on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste generation (5) and pollution (6) that will require some mitigation. The site is partly within flood zone 2, so a potential negative effect on adaptation to climate change could be felt (2). The effect on the character of the local area would depend on design, but as the site is cleared it is likely to be positive (9). However, the site is adjacent to a listed cottage, so there could be adverse impacts on the historic environment (10). Development would **make a good use of a very significant previously developed site (4) and would represent a significant development contributing to economic growth (18)**, which would also help to address needs in this area of Reading which suffers some deprivation issues (19). Bringing a vacant site into use would remove a potential target for crime and anti-social behaviour (12).

B38b: Do not allocate

As the site has been unused for many years, most of the effects of this option would be neutral, but it would represent an underuse of a previously developed site (4), would continue to detract from the local area (9) and would possibly present a target for crime (12).

B38c: Non-residential development e.g. hotel

Many of the effects of development would be the same as for employment, although the effect on the economy (18) and deprivation (19) would be less significantly positive. Bringing people staying overnight into a flood plain, affected by potential noise, poor air quality and contamination, could have a negative effect on health and well-being (11).

B38d: Residential development

A residential development would share many of the effects already outlined. It could make a contribution to housing provision (13), but given the surrounding uses and environment, is unlikely to represent high quality accommodation. The effects of flooding, air quality, potential contamination and noise on residents would likely mean a significant negative effect on health and well-being (11). The site would be somewhat isolated from existing residential and services, so access to essential facilities (15) would be negative. Development would also have a potential impact on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Many of the environmental effects could be at least partially mitigated by developing to a high level of sustainability. Effects on infrastructure could be mitigated to some extent through making contributions through CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on access to services for residential could be mitigated by including facilities on site. In terms of flood risk, this was investigated as part of the SDPD, and it was concluded that the site could be developed safely without causing effects elsewhere. Contamination will need to be remediated, particularly if residential or hotel uses are to be included in any development.</p>																					

B39: LAND NORTH OF MANOR FARM ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B39a ▼	Redevelop for housing (between 350 - 550 units), extension to the Whitley District Centre, and open space, community uses, in addition to a limited amount of employment	✓X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	?✓	0	✓✓	0	XX	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X	✓X	✓	XX
B39b *	Do not allocate	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?
B39c	Core Employment Area designation	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	✓X	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0
B39d	Redevelopment of individual sites for housing on a piecemeal basis	✓X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	XX	0	XX	0	✓X	✓✓	?✓	0	?X	✓X	?✓	XX

COMMENTS:

B39a: Comprehensive redevelopment for residential-led mixed-use: This option is the SDPD policy, for primarily residential development, with some district centre uses and light industrial uses. In terms of CO2 emissions (1) and resources (3), this option would result in negatives given the energies involved in demolition and construction phases. Subject to suitable mitigation (e.g. SUDS), this option could have a positive impact in terms of surface water flooding (2). This option would result in a **significant positive in terms of limiting the use of undeveloped land (4)**. This option would result in negatives in respect of pollution (6) and waste management (5), largely due to demolition and construction phases. A large site has the potential for habitat or green link creation (7). This option would **significantly improve the townscape of the site (8)**. Parts of this site are within the Air Quality Management Area, are in close proximity to sites where hazardous substances are stored, and may contain some contamination, and these, combined with limited local healthcare provision, mean a **significant negative impact on health (11)** that would need to be taken into account in the design of the development. As a strategic site, this option would require masterplanning which would consider, inter alia, how to incorporate secure design (11) as well as **providing effective links to the existing high quality public transport network and District Centre (14, 15)**, which helps reduce pollution (6)

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>and CO2 (1). Subject to this site being put forward in conjunction with other adjacent land, this option would result in the provision of a significant amount of housing (13); an urban link between the established part of Whitley and Kennet Island. The site would also add pressure on existing leisure facilities, as well as potentially resulting in the loss of the bingo hall (17), which could be mitigated through extension of the District Centre. This option would result in the loss of some industrial/warehouse employment (18), but at the same time would significantly enhance the district centre, providing additional opportunities. This option would have a significant negative impact in terms of additional pressures that would be placed on already strained existing education infrastructure (20).</p>																					
<p>B39b: Do not allocate: The effect of leaving this whole area undesignated would be totally uncertain, and has been appraised as such. The most likely scenario would be that developers would pursue piecemeal residential schemes, the effects of which would be very similar to option B39d.</p>																					
<p>B39c: Core Employment Area designation: Under this option, little development is assumed. This would mean no impacts on CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6) from construction in the short-term, although there are likely long-term effects from continued inefficiency of the buildings. Although this brownfield site would continue in active use (4), this area has vacancy issues, which are likely to continue or worsen if artificially kept in a CEA designation. This designation would prevent residential development (13). The site is reasonably accessible by public transport, although on a local level, it would result in continued HGV use of Basingstoke Road, which has increasingly become a local road (14). The site would provide jobs - however, it is considered that this is something of a weak positive effect, since the Employment Land Review Stage 2 has shown that this is not an area which is essential to retain.</p>																					
<p>B39d: Redevelopment of individual sites for housing: It is assumed that this option would result in the various sites, in various ownerships coming forward at various times. Whilst this would not alter the scores against some of the objectives (1-6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20), for others, it would make a major difference. In particular, since this approach would be likely to result in islands of residential coming forward in employment areas, there would be a very poor residential environment, leading to a significant negative effect on townscape (9). Whilst housing would be provided (13), its quality would be unlikely to be high. This approach would be unlikely to lead to quality links to Whitley (12), and would not be comprehensive enough to promote green links across the area (7).</p>																					
<p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: The effects most likely to require mitigation from any residential development include the additional pressures on already strained education, healthcare and leisure infrastructure, which could be mitigated by provision of on-site facilities associated with the District Centre. Transport infrastructure improvements would be required to mitigate any additional trips generated, and improved links from Kennet Island to Whitley could promote walking and cycling. Mitigation measures in terms of reusing construction waste would help reduce surplus waste. In terms of air and noise quality issues for future residents, the exposure to any such pollution may need to be mitigated through design. The layout would need to be carefully designed to avoid bringing residents into close proximity to hazard sites. Contributions towards improving the skills set of the local workforce will be required. Potential ecological enhancements would be sought; e.g. brown/green roofs on new buildings. Flood compensation would be an unlikely requirement, but a suitable FRA detailing appropriate sustainable surface water drainage would be required on all redevelopment options. Reduction in employment land would not be a major issue in most cases, given the vacancy rates and presence of off-pitch offices, but the reprovision of small units of the Micro Centre within the area would be essential.</p>																					

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
This site also has the potential to significantly add to cumulative pressures that would be placed on existing infrastructures by the redevelopment of other major sites within South Reading; such as Worton Grange and Berkshire Brewery. This will need to be taken into account																					

B40: FOBNEY MEAD, ISLAND ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B40a ▼	Low-intensity leisure use associated with the open space or waterside environment.	?X	?X	?X	✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	✓X	✓✓	0	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	?✓
B40b *	Do not allocate	✓	?X	0	XX	0	0	0	0	XX	?✓	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	?X	0	0
B40c	Revert to meadows	✓	✓✓	0	X	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
B40d	Development for residential	X	XX	X	✓✓	0	X	X	0	?	✓X	✓X	0	✓✓	X	X	0	✓	0	0	X
B40e	Development for office	X	XX	X	✓✓	0	X	X	0	?	✓X	X	0	X	X	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0
B40f	Development for industry and warehousing	X	XX	X	✓✓	0	XX	XX	0	?X	X	X	0	X	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0
B40g	Development for larger scale built leisure	X	XX	X	✓✓	0	X	XX	X	?	✓X	✓X	0	X	X	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

B40a: Small-scale leisure development: This option would involve small-scale leisure uses in line with the open and waterside character of the area. The fact of development taking place may have negative effects in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and effects on floodwaters in the functional floodplain (2), although, in each of these cases, the effects will be smaller than for larger scale development. The promotion of leisure use of open space and waterside space will have **significant positive effects in widening the range of leisure facilities (17) and promoting informal recreation, and therefore healthy lifestyles (11)**. A visitor centre, if built, could also have an educational use (20). Such small-scale leisure should help to secure the open character of the surrounding areas and thus retain their biodiversity value (7) and ensure an attractive and green environment (9), and should also create local jobs (18). Another positive effect would be the beneficial use of a previously-developed site (4). The impact on the historic environment (10) would be more mixed - whilst development would provide a better context to Fobney Lock, it could disturb archaeological remains, which would require mitigation. The main negative effects would be in terms of loss of a potential housing site (13) and, by providing facilities which are difficult to access without a car, failing to reduce the need to travel (14).

B40b: Do not allocate: The only clear positive benefit to not developing the site would be in that it would minimise CO2 emissions on site (1). In addition, the site is partially within an Area of Archaeological Potential, and not developing would preserve any remains (10). There would be a

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	<p>significant negative effect of leaving a large, soon to be vacant previously-developed site undeveloped (4). Abandoning a site to vacancy would have a significant negative effect on creating more attractive and greener environments (9) and may be a target for crime (12). It could also lower the perception of Reading for investors (18), although the site is not particularly visible, and would discourage riverside walking, which contributes to healthy lifestyles (11). Not developing the site would miss an opportunity to provide both housing (13) and leisure (17). Finally, retention of buildings and hardstanding in the functional floodplain will not assist adaptation to climate change (2), although the buildings are small-scale so the effects will be small.</p>																				
	<p>B40c: Revert to meadows: The effects of this option would be mainly positive, particularly in environmental terms. There would be a significant positive effect on adaptation for climate change by providing important flood meadows in the functional floodplain (2). It would also have a significant positive effect in terms of promotion of biodiversity (7). The general environmental enhancement of the area will have a significant positive effect on more attractive and greener environments (9). There will also be a significant positive effect on provision of opportunities for informal recreation (17), thus encouraging healthy lifestyles (11). Not developing the site will mean minimising CO2 emissions (1), and not disturbing archaeological remains (10). The only potential negative effects would be the loss of a potential housing site (13) and not making use of a previously-developed site (4).</p>																				
	<p>B40d: Development for residential: Many of the effects for all of the development options are similar. Any type of development would mean CO2 emissions (1) and use of energy (3), and development in an area not very accessible by public transport and walking and cycling means not reducing the need to travel (14) and air pollution from vehicles (6). Development in areas of biodiversity interest would have a negative effect on this objective (7). There would be a significant negative impact from substantial development in the flood plain in terms of impeding floodwaters (2). Development would also pose a risk to archaeological remains that would need to be mitigated, although may also provide a better context to surrounding areas of historic character (10). On the other hand, development of brownfield land would make a significant positive contribution to minimising the need to use undeveloped land (4). In terms of residential specifically, there would be a significant positive effect on provision of housing (13), and the access for future residents to recreation opportunities would be good (17), leading to healthy lifestyles (11), although in the latter case, there is a risk to health from flooding, and there is a recognised issue with healthcare facilities in South Reading. There are issues in terms of education provision in South Reading, and, unless a school was part of the development, access to schools would be difficult from this isolated site (20).</p>																				
	<p>B40e: Development for offices: Many of the same effects would be felt for office development as for residential or other development (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14), including the significant effects. More specifically to a development for offices, there would be a significant positive effect in terms of providing employment opportunities (18) and a potential positive effect on inequality by providing jobs close to areas of relatively high unemployment (19). However, this development would miss an opportunity to provide for housing (13).</p>																				
	<p>B40f: Development for industry and warehousing: The effects would mainly be the same as development for offices (1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 18), including the significant effects on objectives 2, 4 and 18. However, some of the negative effects would be enhanced. For instance, the negative effect on pollution (6) becomes a potentially significant negative effect by locating industrial processes next to important watercourses. A negative effect on biodiversity becomes a significant negative effect (7) since noisy uses will cause more disturbance. The negative effect on greener environments (8) is also accentuated since it is more difficult to design industrial buildings that make a positive contribution to an attractive landscape. However, the effect on inequality is strengthened as these uses are more likely to match the skills of available labour in the area (19).</p>																				
	<p>B40g: Development for larger scale leisure: This option would involve development for a leisure use that would fall under the NPPF as a ‘town centre use’. In the main, the effects would be similar to development for offices for many objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, 14, 19), including the significant effects against objectives 2 and 4. However, as for industry, noisy uses may have a significant negative effect on biodiversity (7). The effect on</p>																				

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>employment opportunities would be less marked, as a use would be likely to have less labour (18). A leisure use would enhance the leisure offer of Reading (5), although it would not be significant as it could not be regarded as an accessible leisure use. Although this use may promote informal recreation once on site, it would be less possible to reach by foot or cycle than a town centre location (11).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> A potentially significant adverse impact on Thames Basin Heaths SPA has been identified associated with the large scale built leisure option due to traffic being drawn past the site, leading to noise and disturbance and air quality issues (8, see Appendix 3).</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any development option on the site would need to mitigate any effects on floodwaters, as well as, potentially, biodiversity. Enhancement of sustainable transport measures would also assist in mitigating some of the negative effects. Specifically for any residential proposal, effects on limited education and healthcare facilities would need to be mitigated.</p>																					

B41: 211-221 OXFORD ROAD, 10 AND REAR OF 8 PROSPECT STREET

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B41a ▼	Residential development with District Centre uses on the ground floor.	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
B41b *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B41c	Development for residential only	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
B41d	Development for offices with ground floor town centre uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	✓	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B41a: Residential development with ground floor town centre uses: Developing the site purely for residential use would mean CO2 emissions (1), use of energy (3) and waste generation (5), although the environmental performance of the buildings would be likely to be an improvement over the current buildings (1, 3). The provision of housing and town centre uses in a district centre location would have a **significant positive effect on reducing the need to travel by car (14)** and therefore reduce pollution overall, but at a local level there may be increased car journeys in the Air Quality Management Area (6). As the site is in the AQMA and is potentially contaminated, there would be negative effects on health of the residents that would need to be mitigated (11). The development would provide housing (13) and make good use of a brownfield site (4). The effect on the historic environment (10) would be largely dependent on design. Any impacts on the listed building opposite and nearby conservation area would need to be mitigated. There would also be potential positive effects on creating employment opportunities (18) and improving access to leisure (17), although this latter effect will depend on which town centre uses are provided. The effect on health (11) would also be mixed - whilst there would be potential effects on residents as already identified, the accessible nature of the site will encourage walking and cycling.

B41b: Do not allocate: Where no development activity would take place on the site, this would minimise CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5). However, parts of the area to the rear detract from the setting of the primary school and conservation area (10). There would also be a missed opportunity for housing provision (12).

B41c: Residential development: Many of the effects would be the same as the residential option (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13). However, the effect on the need to travel would be less positive if the opportunity were not taken to include town centre uses in this accessible district centre location.

B41d: Offices with ground floor town centre uses: The effects of a small-scale office development with town centre uses on the ground floor would be in many cases the same as for residential with town centre uses (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14, 17), including a **significant positive effect on reducing the need to**

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>travel by car (13). There would be a positive contribution to economic growth, and local job opportunities (18). Since no residents would be present, the negative effects on health would not occur to the same extent (11).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The site is within an Air Quality Management Area, is potentially contaminated and is likely to suffer some noise issues, meaning that any effects on potential future residents would need to be mitigated. The effects of the development itself, including more traffic in the AQMA may also have to be mitigated. Although not immediately adjacent to the site, there are features of historic interest nearby, and a development would need to avoid negative effects on these features.</p>																					

B42: REAR OF 303-315 OXFORD ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B42a ▼	Comprehensive development for residential (10-12 dwellings)	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	?X
B42b *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B42c	Development for commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
B42d	Development for mixed use residential and commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	?X
B42e	Development for retail	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	X	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
B42f	Development for community use/leisure	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓	X	✓	✓	0	?✓	✓X	0	?

COMMENTS:

B42a: Development for residential: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). **The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4)** and minimise pollution (6), although placing more vehicles in an AQMA could also mean a localised negative effect on objective 6. Development would result in waste (5). The site is in an AQMA, and any adverse effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Development of this area would remove a potential focus for crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and would reduce the need to travel (14). Potential effects on education infrastructure in this part of Reading would need to be investigated and mitigated (20).

B42b: Do not allocate: Under this option the site would remain as residential gardens and garages, with parking for businesses fronting onto Oxford Road. This retention of existing uses would save on CO2 emissions (1), resources (3) and minimise the generation of waste (5). The layout of the area is such that it does not feel particularly safe, and may encourage anti-social behaviour, as such the retention of the site as is may be detrimental to creating and maintaining a safe environment (9, 12). This option would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13).

B42c: Development for commercial: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). **The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4)** and minimise pollution (6), although placing more vehicles in an AQMA could also mean a localised negative effect on objective 6. Development would result in waste (5). Development of this area would remove a potential focus for crime (12). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would reduce the need to travel (14). Development would provide new employment opportunities (18).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p>B42d: Development for mixed use: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4) and minimise pollution (6), although placing more vehicles in an AQMA could also mean a localised negative effect on objective 6. Development would result in waste (5). The site is in an AQMA, and any adverse effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Development of this area would remove a potential focus for crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and would reduce the need to travel (14). Development would provide new employment opportunities (18). Potential effects on education infrastructure in this part of Reading would need to be investigated and mitigated (20).</p> <p>B42e: Development for retail: The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would provide new employment opportunities (18).</p> <p>B42f: Development for community use/leisure: The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (14). Development may provide opportunities to access community or leisure facilities, which may include an educational component (17, 20). Development may provide new employment opportunities (18).</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The location in the AQMA means that any impacts on residents from air quality, or on the AQMA overall from additional vehicles, would need to be mitigated. In construction terms, waste creation should be mitigated. Any effects on education infrastructure of any additional housing would have to be identified and mitigated.</p>																					

B43: DELLWOOD HOSPITAL, LIEBENROOD ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B43a ▼	Development or conversion for residential (11-17 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	✓X	✓	?✓	✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	0
B43b *	Do not allocate	?	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?	✓	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
B43c	Development of whole site for residential	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	0	X	XX	?✓	✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	0
B43d	Development of whole site for commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	0	X	XX	?✓	X	X	0	X	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B43a: Retention of palliative care and new residential: This option would result in part of the site being retained for palliative care, and the manor building being allocated for residential use – either for conversion or development. This retention of an existing use and building would save on resources (3), **minimise the use of greenfield land (4)** and the generation of waste (5) and minimise pollution (6), on one part of the site, but possible development on the other part of the site would result in CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). The effect on the manor building would depend on whether or not it was demolished, although the building is not listed (10). This option would help to retain necessary healthcare provision (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development will provide housing (13). The site is on a public transport route, and it is possible to access the centre by foot (14).

B43b: Do not allocate: Under this option the site would remain in a palliative care use. This retention of an existing use would save on resources (3) and minimise the generation of waste (5), although the current performance of the building in terms of CO2 emissions is not known (1). This option may result in the retention of a historic manor building on the site, however due to its poor state; it is not clear how positive this effect will be (10). This option would help to maximise necessary healthcare provision (11). The current use misses an opportunity to provide housing (13) and reduce the need to travel (14).

B43c: Development for residential: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). **The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4)**, minimise pollution (6). Development would result in the loss of an existing historic building (although the building is not listed) (10) and would result in waste (5). **Development would result in the loss of healthcare facilities (11)**. Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and may reduce the need to travel, depending on provision made as part of the development (14).

B43d: Development of whole site for commercial: The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to residential development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12). **Development would minimise the use of undeveloped land (4)**. **Development would result in the loss of**

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
healthcare facilities (11). Development misses an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would provide employment opportunities (18), although journeys to commercial premises in this location would mainly be by car (14).																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age and disability has been identified if the healthcare use is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).																					
MITIGATION: The effects most likely to require mitigation include the effects of the loss of a healthcare use. For the development options, mitigation measures in terms of reusing construction waste would help reduce surplus waste. The loss of the historic building would also be a negative effect, however this would be difficult to mitigate or prevent.																					

B44: ELVIAN SCHOOL, BATH ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B44a ▼	Development for residential (70-110 dwellings) and education or alternative community use on the part of the site excluding the playing field	✓X	?✓	X	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	0	?✓	X	X	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓	X	0	0	0	✓
B44b *	Do not allocate	?	✓	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0
B44c	Mixed use—replacement school, leisure club and residential, including development of playing field	✓X	?✓	X	XX	?X	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	✓X	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	✓
B44d	Development of whole site for residential, including playing field	✓X	?✓	X	XX	?X	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	X	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	XX
B44e	Development for residential only, using only previously developed areas.	✓X	?✓	X	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	0	?✓	X	X	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	X	0	0	0	XX
B44f	Development for commercial	✓X	?✓	X	XX	?X	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	0	?✓	X	✓	0	X	0	✓	0	XX
B44g	Development for education	✓X	?✓	X	?X	?X	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓
B44h	Development for leisure use	✓X	?✓	X	XX	?X	?✓	?	0	?✓	X	?✓	?✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓✓	✓	0	XX

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
COMMENTS:																					
<p>B44a: Development for residential and education only on previously developed areas: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). Good design can minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would help to preserve undeveloped land (4). The site is in an Air Quality Management Area, meaning potential risks to health for inhabitants, which would require mitigation (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (11). Development will provide a significant amount of housing (13), and reduce the need to travel as the site is on a good transport route (13). Development may provide employment opportunities (16), and would provide education facilities (20). There would be benefits in retaining permeable ground (2), and retaining potential wildlife habitats (7).</p> <p>B44b: Do not allocate: Under this option, it is uncertain as to which use or uses would come forward on the site, therefore the effects on sustainability objectives cannot be predicted at this stage for a number of the objectives. The site is not within a flood risk area, but provides valuable areas of permeable ground which helps to reduce the risk of surface water run-off flooding elsewhere (2). The retention of the site in its current use would value and protect wildlife and habitat on the site (7). This option may result in the retention of two historic buildings on the site (10).</p> <p>B44c: Mixed use development including school, residential racquets club: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). Good design can minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in the use of large parts of the school playing fields (green field land) (4). The loss of an existing building will result in waste (5). Development of the site will result in the loss of areas of green space (7). Development could result in the loss of the two historic buildings on the site (10). The site is in an Air Quality Management Area, meaning potential risks to health for inhabitants, which would require mitigation (10). A mixed use development would provide a leisure use (17) which would contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (11). Development will provide a significant amount of housing (13), and reduce the need to travel as the site is on a good transport route (13). Development may provide employment opportunities (18), and would provide education facilities (20).</p> <p>B44d: Development for residential: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). Good design can minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in the use of large parts of the school playing fields (greenfield land) (4). The loss of an existing building will result in waste (5). Development of the site will result in the loss of significant areas of green space (7). Development could result in the loss of the two historic buildings on the site (10). The location in the AQMA means a potential negative effect on health (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development would provide a significant amount of housing (13), and reduce the need to travel (14). Development would result in the loss of the site for education purposes (20).</p> <p>B44e: Development for residential only on previously developed areas: The effects of this option would be largely the same as for residential development (1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-14, 20), including providing a significant amount of housing (13). However, there would also be significant benefits in reducing damage to undeveloped land (4), and further benefits in retaining permeable ground (2), and retaining potential wildlife habitats (7).</p> <p>B44f: Development for commercial: The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to residential development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12). Development would result in the use of large parts of the school playing fields (green field land) (4). Development will miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would reduce the need to travel as the site is on a good transport route (14). Development would provide employment opportunities (18). Development would result in the loss of education facilities (20).</p>																					

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B44g: Development for education:</u> The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development options (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12). Depending on the scale of development, some of the school playing fields (greenfield land) may be lost (4). The retention of the site in its current use would value and protect wildlife and habitat on the site (7). This option may result in the retention of two historic buildings on the site (9). Development will miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would reduce the need to travel as the site is on a good transport route (14). Development would provide education facilities (20).</p> <p><u>B44h: Development for leisure:</u> The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to residential development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12). Development would result in the use of large parts of the school playing fields (greenfield land) (4). The impact on wildlife and habitats on the site would be dependent on the type and scale of leisure development (7). Development could result in the loss of the two historic buildings on the site (9). The provision of leisure facilities could contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11). Development will miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would reduce the need to travel as the site is on a good transport route (14). Development would ensure opportunities to access leisure facilities (17). Development would provide employment opportunities (18). Development would result in the loss of education facilities (20).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified if the education use is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects most likely to require mitigation include the effects of the loss of an education use (healthcare provision) and greenfield land and the wildlife and habitats on the site. There is also a potential need for mitigation of any impacts on residents from living within the AQMA. For the development options, mitigation measures in terms of reusing construction waste would help reduce surplus waste. Impacts on the historic environment could be mitigated by retention of the two locally listed halls.</p>																					

B45: ALICE BURROWS HOME, DWYER ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B45a ▼	Development for residential and/or residential care (17-27 dwellings)	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?	?	X	0	0	0	0
B45b *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	XX	✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	XX	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B45c	Development for commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	X	?	?	X	0	✓	0	0
B45d	Development for leisure/community use	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	X	?	?	X	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B45a: Development for residential (dwellings or residential care): Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). The site is not within a flood risk area and good design will ensure that extreme weather events can be mitigated (2). **The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4).** The loss of a building would not be an efficient use of resources, however good design can minimise pollution (6); however the loss of an existing building will result in waste (5). Development would utilise an unused site, and good design will help to ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development will provide housing (13). The site is not within 800m of a GP, therefore good transport links would have to be provided to ensure good access to services (14, 15).

B45b: Do not allocate: Under this option, the derelict site would remain as it is. **This option would result in Brownfield land standing derelict and unused (4).** **The disuse of the site would result in the site becoming more derelict and overgrown, which may result in crime and the fear of crime (9, 12).** This option would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). However, no activity taking place would save CO2 emissions (1), energy (3) and minimise waste generation (5).

B45c: Development for commercial: The physical process of development would have similar effects on CO2 emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), energy efficiency (3) and minimising pollution (6), **and minimising the use of brownfield land (4).** However the loss of an existing building will result in waste (5). Development would utilise an unused site, and good design will help to ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). An office development would represent the loss of a residential opportunity (13). Good transport links would have to be provided to ensure good access to services (14, 15). Provision of offices will provide employment opportunities (18).

B45d: Development for leisure/community use: A leisure/community development option would have some of the same effects as other redevelopment options in terms of the environmental consequences (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9). **The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4).** It would enhance leisure / community provision (16) and this may have a positive effect on community cohesion (12), and may provide employment opportunities (18). However, it would be a missed opportunity for residential (13). Leisure or community development could help promote healthy lifestyles, or provide some health facilities, depending on the specific use of the site (11).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effects due to age has been identified if the use of the site as provision for older people is to be lost (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: For the development options, mitigation measures in terms of reusing construction waste would help reduce surplus waste, as would compliance with existing policies on sustainable design and construction. Depending on the effects upon the transport network, there may also be some mitigation required in terms of sustainable travel.</p>																					

B46: PARK LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE LAURELS AND DOWNING ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B46a ▼	Continue current allocation to reprovide school, develop remaining sites	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	?X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓
B46b *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	?X	0	0	X
B46c	Develop school on the Laurels without using Downing Road	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓X	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓
B46d	Development including town centre uses on Park Lane site	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X	0	0	✓✓

COMMENTS:

B46a: Continue current allocation to reprovide school, develop remaining sites

There would be the same short term environmental costs and potential long term benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO2 (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). This option would result in the **loss of a significant amount of undeveloped land (4)**. This could have some marginal effects in terms of wildlife (7) and climate change adaptation (as a result of potential loss of trees and permeable ground) (2). **A significant amount of residential would be provided (13)**, as well as **a new school with associated facilities thus maximising access to education (20)** and other services (14) and **reducing the need to travel (14)**. The provision of a school on a single site would reduce road crossings for pupils and therefore have a positive effect on health and safety (11). Bringing facilities together onto one site also has potential positive effects on community cohesion (12). The effect on the local character would depend entirely on design (9). The Park Lane Primary building, although not listed, contributes well to the heritage of the local area, and development would risk effects on that building (10).

B46b: Do not allocate

Not allocating the site would retain buildings, with associated environmental benefits, but the environmental performance of those buildings in the long term may not be optimal (1, 3, 5, 6). Undeveloped land would be preserved (4), along with any wildlife benefits it may have (7). It would mean that the current arrangement of school premises would continue, with impacts on health and safety from road crossings (11).

B46c: Develop school on the Laurels without using Downing Road

Although this option would in theory offer some of the same benefits as B46a without the adverse effects on undeveloped land (4), in practice a new school is unlikely to be deliverable without making the Downing Road site available for development. This means that the positive effects are less categorical than for B46a, because there is less certainty that they will happen.

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B46d: Development including town centre uses on the Park Lane site</u> This option is largely the same as B46a, but additional town centre uses on Park Lane would have significant positive effects on the need to travel (14) and access to services (15).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A potential adverse effects due to age has been identified if the school is not to be reprovided on a single site (16, see Appendix 4).</p> <p>MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on climate change mitigation could be mitigated by ensuring the development includes trees and gardens with permeable surfaces, and green infrastructure could also be beneficial in terms of wildlife. Effects on the historic environment could be mitigated by some retention of all or part of the Park Lane Primary School building within any development. Loss of the Downing Road playing field would need to be justified by an assessment of whether the site is needed, and may require some off-site mitigation.</p>																					

B47: 784-794 OXFORD ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B47a ▼	Development for residential use (10-17 dwellings)	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0
B47b *	Do not allocate	✓	?X	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B47c	Development for commercial	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
B47d	Development for mixed use including residential	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
B47e	Development for retail	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
B47f	Development for community use	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:

B47a: Development for residential: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site in Flood Zone 2 could have a negative effect on water flows. The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4), minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in waste (5). This site is in an Air Quality Management Area, as well as partly in Flood Zone 2, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Development would result in the loss of employment uses (18).

B47b: Do not allocate: Under this option the site would remain in the current uses (Car showroom, commercial, B1 offices and residential). This retention of existing uses would save on CO2 emissions (1), resources (3) and minimise the generation of waste (5). This option would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). A part of the site is within Flood Zone 2, and the coverage by hardstanding could have a negative effect on water flows in the event of a flood.

B47c: Development for commercial: Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site in Flood Zone 2 could have a negative effect on water flows. The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4), minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in waste (5). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing, although there is housing on the site (13). Development in this out-of-centre location would increase the need to travel (14). Development would result in the loss of employment uses, but this is likely to be mitigated by new employment uses provided (18).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B47d: Development for mixed use including housing:</u> Development would emit CO2 (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site in Flood Zone 2 could have a negative effect on water flows (2). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4), minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in waste (5). This site is in an Air Quality Management Area, as well as partly in Flood Zone 2, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), which would reduce the need to travel (14), although other uses in this out-of-centre location would have an opposite effect. Development would result in the loss of employment uses, but this is likely to be mitigated by new employment uses provided (18).</p> <p><u>B47e: Development for retail:</u> The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would result in the loss of employment uses, but this is likely to be mitigated by new employment uses provided (18).</p> <p><u>B47f: Development for community/leisure:</u> The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (10). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development may provide opportunities to access community or leisure facilities (17). Development would result in the loss of employment uses, but this is likely to be mitigated by new employment uses provided (18).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: An effect which would have to be mitigated would be the loss of employment uses on the site. In construction terms, waste creation should be mitigated. The site is in an Air Quality Management Area, and effects on residents and on the AQMA itself would need to be mitigated. The site is partly located in Flood Zone 2, which may require some mitigation. However, it should be possible to improve the effects on floodwaters by reducing the areas of hardstanding and/or orientating buildings so that the area in Flood Zone 2 is not developed.</p>																					

B48: PART OF FORMER BATTLE HOSPITAL, PORTMAN ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B48a ▼	Development for residential use (net gain of 45-95 dwellings)	✓X	X	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	XX	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	?X
B48b *	Do not allocate	✓	X	✓	XX	✓	?X	0	0	XX	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B48c	Mixed use development - commercial and residential	✓X	X	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	✓	0	?X	✓	?✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	?X
B48d	Industrial and commercial development	✓X	X	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

B48a: Residential development: A residential development on this large site could provide **significant amounts of housing (13)**, and, by making use of a surplus brownfield site, could make a **significant contribution to minimising use of undeveloped land (4)**. It would also **significantly improve the attractiveness of the site (9)**, and could also reduce the potential for the area to become a focus for crime (12). Housing on this site would have good access to the Oxford Road district centre (as extended), reducing the need to travel and therefore pollution and CO2 (14, 6, 1) as well as providing good access to services (15). However, as with any development, there will be CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5) associated with the development process. An intensive development on site will have a negative effect on water flows (2). The risk from flooding, coupled with the potential contamination of the site, means a **significant negative effect on health (11)**, requiring mitigation, which should be referenced in the policy. In addition, there is the potential for new housing to affect capacity of schools (20).

B48b: Do not allocate: The existing built environment on this site consists of older building that are generally quite run down, the site is not accessible by the public and is mainly within a flood zone 2. Leaving the buildings as they are, covering most of the site, will have a negative effect on adaptation to climate change (2) in terms of affecting water flows. As the site is quite run down and there is very little vegetation on the site, the **current use significantly detracts from the built environment (9)**. As the site is not accessible to the public, but backs onto a new residential development at the old Battle Hospital site, there may be a risk of crime in the area (12), and potential contamination on the site would not be dealt with (6). It would also represent a **significant underuse of previously developed land (4)**. However, there would be benefits in terms of CO2 emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5) of no development taking place.

B48c: Mixed use development (commercial and housing): Most of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, **including significant positive effects on the use of undeveloped land (4)** and a negative effect on water flows (2). However, the reduced amount of housing will also mean that some other effects are reduced, such as the contribution to housing provision (13). The introduction of commercial development into the scheme could help facilitate economic growth (18).

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<p><u>B48d: Industrial and commercial development:</u> Some of the effects of developing would be the same as for residential (1, 3, 5,) and there would continue to be a negative effect on water flows in the event of a flood (2). Industrial use could result in noise and dust effects on neighbouring residents (6). An industrial and commercial development would be more likely to be functional than attractive (8), although it would still be likely to be an improvement over the current site. This use of the site would contribute to economic growth in the area (18).</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The position in Flood Zone 2 is a constraint on development, and any effects on floodwaters, or from potential flooding on the health of residents, would need to be satisfactorily mitigated in any scheme. However, the SFRA Level 2 alongside the SDPD has demonstrated that the site is capable of being developed safely. Potential contamination on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools, would also need to be addressed.</p>																					

B49: DEE PARK

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B49a ▼	Continue current allocation for major regeneration	0	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	?✓	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓
B49b *	Do not allocate	0	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	?✓	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>B49a: Identify for a major area regeneration</u></p> <p>This will ensure that this site is allocated for an appropriate mix of housing at a greater density than presently exists thereby resulting in a significant positive impact in respect of the utilisation of brown field land (4), the creation of attractive and functional buildings (9) and the provision of high quality housing (13). This option will ensure the provision of improved leisure and educational facilities thereby having positive impacts in respect of promoting accessible leisure facilities (17) and providing some additional education facilities (20). As a result of this site’s allocation for redevelopment, this option would also result in positives, or a tendency towards a positive, in respect of improving human health (11), promoting vibrant communities (12) and reducing the need to travel (14). However, parts of the site are potentially affected by surface water flooding (2), and this needs to be taken into account in developing proposals for the area.</p>																					
<p><u>B49b: Do not allocate</u></p> <p>As the development is now well underway and covered by a detailed application, it is considered that not identifying it in the plan would not lead to any particular difference in sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: The only effect potentially requiring mitigation is on surface water flooding. This should therefore be flagged up in any policy, to be assessed in greater detail at planning application stage.</p>																					

B50: THE MEADWAY CENTRE, HONEY END LANE

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B50a ▼	Develop for district centre	✓X	?X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	?✓	?	✓✓	✓✓	0	?✓	✓	✓	0
B50b *	Do not allocate	X✓	0	X✓	0	X✓	X✓	0	0	XX	0	0	?X	0	X	X	0	?✓	X	X	0

COMMENTS:

B50a: Develop for district centre

Whilst the process of development will have some environmental costs (1, 3, 5, 6), these must be offset against the potentially improved long term performance of new buildings. Development for a district centre will potentially need to use some of the undeveloped land to the rear (4), which may have some significance for wildlife (7) and provides shading (2). The removal of tired and unattractive buildings would have a **significant positive effect on the local townscape (9)**. Regeneration of the centre with a new thriving centre will **significantly reduce the need to travel (14) and promote access to essential services (15)**, thus boosting the economy and addressing inequality (18, 19). There is no guarantee that housing will be part of any development, so the impact on the delivery of housing (13) is uncertain.

B50b: Do not allocate

Many of the effects identified are the opposite of the effects identified for the previous option, as without intervention, the centre can be expected to deteriorate to the extent that it can no longer fulfil its role. In particular, there is expected to be a **significant negative effect on the townscape (9)** from an unattractive and decaying centre.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: Impacts on many of the environmental objectives can be mitigated through sustainable design and construction measures. The design can incorporate re-provision of any green areas to be lost, or enhancement of remaining areas. However, an option that involved not identifying the centre would have wide-ranging effects that would be very hard to mitigate.

B51: LAND AT LOWFIELD ROAD

		Sustainability Objectives & Effect																			
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
B51a ▼	Development for residential (21-34 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	✓	0	?✓	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	?X
B51b *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	XX	✓	?✓	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B51c	Cemetery use	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

B51a: Development for residential: There would be a negative impact given the energy involved in the demolition of the existing mobile homes and use of energy in redevelopment/ rebuilding. Additionally, any new use would release more energy compared to the current vacant use of the site (1). The redevelopment of the site would also use resources (3). The re-use of the site would have a **positive impact in terms of appropriately utilising brownfield land** (4). Re-use of the land would however, involve addressing the potential contamination and ensuring pollution is minimised (6). Any redevelopment would need to comply with current design policies helping ensure housing is high quality and attractive (9, 13). The development would remove a potential focus of crime (12), and be in a location where there is good access to informal recreation (17, 11). There could be a negative effect on school places (20).

B51b: Do not allocate: Under this option, the site would remain as a vacant Mobile Home Park. Whilst a vacant Mobile Home Park would have a positive impact in terms of minimising CO2 emissions and the use of resources (1,3), the vacant status of the site, **is clearly an inefficient use of a valuable brownfield site** (4). It also conflicts with the objective of providing housing (13) as the existing Mobile Homes are vacant. A vacant site would also fail to achieve broader policy objectives in terms of viability, reducing the fear of crime (12) and creating cleaner and greener environments (9).

B51c: Cemetery use: The option of using this Council-owned site to expand the adjacent Henley Road Cemetery has been mooted for some time. Such an extension of green space has the potential for positive effects on biodiversity (7) and cleaner and greener environments (8). Use of a vacant site could also reduce the fear of crime (12), and the use of brownfield land to meet the need for cemetery space would be an efficient use of such land. Since such an option would involve short-term works on the land, there is the potential for minor effects on climate change (1), energy (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), although these would not be expected to continue after the works end.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8, see Appendix 3) from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups (16, see Appendix 4) from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: The effects most likely to require mitigation relate to the potential contamination of the land and the effects of reintroducing a residential use on the already strained education infrastructure. Redeveloping the site would also require mitigation in terms of reusing construction waste to help reduce surplus waste, and remediating any contamination.

APPENDIX 3: HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS, SCREENING LEVEL

APPENDIX 3A: POLICY OPTIONS - POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONALLY-DESIGNATED WILDLIFE SITES

Q3: HOW MUCH HOUSING?

HAZARD	Option 3.1: Provide 699 homes each year		Option 3.2: Provide around 600 homes each year		Option 3.3: Provide around 630 homes each ye		Option 3.4: Provide significantly > 700 homes each yea	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	Y	There is potential for this level of housing to result in an increase in visits to the site, given its proximity to parts of west Reading, although this would depend on the distribution of housing.	Y	There is potential for this level of housing to result in an increase in visits to the site, given its proximity to parts of west Reading, although this would depend on the distribution of housing.	Y	There is potential for this level of housing to result in an increase in visits to the site, given its proximity to parts of west Reading, although this would depend on the distribution of housing.	Y	There is potential for this level of housing to result in an increase in visits to the site, given its proximity to parts of west Reading, although this would depend on the distribution of housing.
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	This level of development will not necessarily mean high levels of development in the flood plain that would have effects this far upriver.	N	This level of development will not necessarily mean high levels of development in the flood plain that would have effects this far upriver.	N	This level of development will not necessarily mean high levels of development in the flood plain that would have effects this far upriver.	Y	This level of development would be likely to necessitate significant building in the flood plain, which would impact water flows some distance upriver unless adequately mitigated.

[illegible]

Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

Q10: EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING BALANCE

HAZARD	Option 10.1: Do not limit employment development		Option 10.2: Do not limit employment development but expect new development to mitigate its impacts on housing		Option 10.3: Place a limit on employment development based on how much housing is to be provided in Reading		Option 10.4: Place a limit on employment development based on how much housing is to be provided in the housing market area	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	Y	High levels of employment could lead to increased traffic on roads passing the site.	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	Y	High levels of employment could lead to increased traffic on roads passing the site.	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	Y	High levels of employment could lead to increased traffic on roads passing the site.	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	Y	High levels of employment could lead to increased traffic on roads passing the site.	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	There is no direct effect, & limiting employment is unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	Given the distance from the site, there is no direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and development is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and development is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and development is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and development is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site

[illegible]

Q22: RICHFIELD AVENUE & CARDIFF ROAD INDUSTRIAL AREA

HAZARD	Option 22.1: Retain as an employment area		Option 22.2: More mixed commercial area, with uses that are not traditional employment uses, such as leisure and retail uses, hotels, vehicle sales etc.		Option 22.3: Development for other uses such as residential	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water

Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No change from current situation	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No change from current situation	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No change from current situation	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No change from current situation	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

Q28: ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING

[illegible]

Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

Q29: WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE OR ADAPTABLE HOUSING

HAZARD	Option 29.1: No requirement		Option 29.2: More than 7% wheelchair accessible/ adaptable		Option 29.3: Less than 7% wheelchair accessible/ adaptable	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

Q30: WATER EFFICIENCY

HAZARD	Option 30.1: No requirements above building regulations		Option 30.2: Proportion of dwellings meet optional standard		Option 30.3: All dwellings meet optional standard	
	PSE ¹ (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

¹ Potentially significant effects

River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.	N	Water abstraction in Reading is not from water bodies that have any particular connection to this site.
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

Q31: SPACE STANDARDS

HAZARD	Option 31.1: No space standards		Option 31.2: Proportion of new dwellings meet space standards		Option 31.3: All new dwellings meet space standards	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Air pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water pollution and quality	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Water flows	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Climate change	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Landscape effects	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect
Lighting	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect	N	No potential effect

APPENDIX 3B: SITES WITH NO POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONALLY-DESIGNATED WILDLIFE SITES

The full matrix of hazards and options for each of the below sites is not included here for ease of presentation. However, it has been produced in order to make the assessment, and is available on request.

A1: BRUNEL ARCADE, STATION APPROACH (WITH POSSIBLE APEX PLAZA EXTENSION)

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A2: 27-28 MARKET PLACE

Site is very small, and none of the options would involve any particular intensification of development.

A3: 29-31 MARKET PLACE

Site is very small, and none of the options would involve any particular intensification of development.

A4: 32 MARKET PLACE

Site is very small, and none of the options would involve any particular intensification of development.

A5: 37-43 BLAGRAVE STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A6: BRISTOL AND WEST ARCADE, 173 FRIAR STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A7: PRIMARK, 32-42 WEST STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A8: LAND AT RICHFIELD AVENUE & TESSA ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A9: FORMER COX & WYMAN, CARDIFF ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A10: LAND AT READING WEST STATION

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A11: CAVERSHAM WEIR

Any development would be very small scale. Whilst generation of hydropower has the potential to alter water flows in the immediate vicinity, the sites further upriver are far too distant to be affected.

A12: VIEW ISLAND

Any development would be very small scale in nature.

A13: READING UNIVERSITY BOAT CLUB, PROMENADE ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A14: LAND AT KENTWOOD HILL

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A15: 7 LIPPINCOTE COURT

Any development would be very small scale in nature.

A16: READING LINK RETAIL PARK

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A17: 103 DEE ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A18: ALEXANDER HOUSE, KINGS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality - any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows - the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change - due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation - development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects - development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting - any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A19: PART OF READING GOLF COURSE, KIDMORE END ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A20: REAR OF 200-214 HENLEY ROAD, 12-24 ALL HALLOWS ROAD AND 4, 7 AND 8 COPSE AVENUE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A21: REAR OF 13-14A HAWTHORNE ROAD AND 282-292 HENLEY ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A22: REAR OF 8-26 REDLANDS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A23: LAND ADJACENT TO 40 REDLANDS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A25: THE ARTHUR CLARK HOME, DOVEDALE CLOSE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A26: REAR OF 1 & 3 WOODCOTE ROAD & 21 ST PETER’S HILL

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A27: LAND AT CONWY CLOSE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A28: 16-18 BENNET ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

A30: LAND NORTH OF ISLAND ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality - any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

B1: FRIAR STREET AND STATION ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B2: FRIARS WALK AND GREYFRIARS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B3: STATION HILL

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B4: NORTH OF THE STATION

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B5: RIVERSIDE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B6: NAPIER ROAD JUNCTION

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B7: NAPIER COURT, NAPIER ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B17: 108-116 OXFORD ROAD, 10 EATON PLACE AND 115-125 CHATHAM STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B18: 143-145 OXFORD ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B19: FORMER READING FAMILY CENTRE, NORTH STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B20: 9-27 GREYFRIARS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B21: 2-8 THE FORBURY AND 19-22 MARKET PLACE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B22: 3-10 MARKET PLACE, ABBEY HALL AND ABBEY SQUARE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B23: 37-43 MARKET PLACE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B24: READING CENTRAL LIBRARY, ABBEY SQUARE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B25: THE ANCHORAGE, BRIDGE STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B26: THE ORACLE EXTENSION, BRIDGE STREET AND LETCOMBE STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B27: 25-31 LONDON STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B28: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SOUTHAMPTON STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B29: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SILVER STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B30: 21 SOUTH STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B31: READING COLLEGE, KINGS ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B32: KINGS MEADOW POOL, KINGS MEADOW ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B33: CAVERSHAM LOCK ISLAND, THAMES SIDE

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not change travel patterns to central Reading sufficiently to have an impact on this site.

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Reading Central Area Action Plan, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2008. No significant effects were identified.

B34: 261-275 LONDON ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B39: LAND NORTH OF MANOR FARM ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – Habitat loss would be likely to come from visitors to the site. Residential use at Manor Farm Road was assessed in the SDPD and not considered likely to result in significant effects, and it is outside the 7 km buffer where visits are likely. However, additional major residential sites in South Reading will need to be carefully considered.

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B41: 211-221 OXFORD ROAD, 10 AND REAR OF 8 PROSPECT STREET

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B42: REAR OF 303-315 OXFORD ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B43: DELLWOOD HOSPITAL, LIEBENROOD ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B44: ELVIAN SCHOOL, BATH ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B45: ALICE BURROWS HOME, DWYER ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B47: 784-794 OXFORD ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B48: PART OF FORMER BATTLE HOSPITAL, PORTMAN ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B49: DEE PARK

Although a very large development (over 700 dwellings), around half of the new homes are replacements for demolished homes. Around half of the development has now been completed in any case. The remainder of the development, which already has planning permission in any case, is not expected to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and the remainder not yet completed would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effect, and the remainder not yet completed would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the remainder of the site not yet completed there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

B50: THE MEADWAY CENTRE, HONEY END LANE

Development would be unlikely to significantly change travel patterns, as the centre is already a district centre that attracts trips. None of the options proposed would therefore be likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

B51: LAND AT LOWFIELD ROAD

None of the options propose a development of the site that is likely to have any significant effect on any of the sites.

Noise, disturbance & vibration – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Air pollution & quality – any development would be too distant from any of the international sites to have any direct effects, and would not be significant enough to generate significant traffic in the area

Water pollution & quality – any development would be too distant, and downriver, from any of the international sites to have any effect.

Water flows – the development, and any abstraction to serve the development, is downriver from any of the international sites and is not expected to significantly alter water flows

Climate change – due to the scale of the site there are no clear significant effects

Habitat loss & degradation – development would be too distant from any of the sites (including over the 7 km buffer of Thames Basin Heaths SPA) to result in significant visits

Landscape effects – development would not be visible from any of the sites

Lighting – any development would be too distant from the site to have a lighting effect

NB: This allocation was part of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which was subject to a Screening Habitat Regulations Assessment in 2011. No significant effects were identified.

APPENDIX 3C: SITES WITH POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONALLY-DESIGNATED WILDLIFE SITES

For each site where one or more of the options has a potentially significant effect on one or more of the internationally-designated wildlife sites, the full matrix of options and hazards is shown below.

A24: LAND AT SEARLES FARM

HAZARD	A24a: Open space associated with any major residential development on nearby land. (71 ha)		A24b: Residential development for approximately 1,500 homes. (58 ha)		A24c: Do not allocate for development or change		A24d: Residential development of whole area supported by other uses	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	Y	The potential scale of development could mean that visitors to the site could increase.	N	No development proposed	Y	The potential scale of development could mean that visitors to the site could increase.
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No development proposed	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site
Water flows	N	No development proposed	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	N	No development proposed	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site

Little Wittenham SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No development proposed	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site
Water flows	N	No development proposed	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	N	No development proposed	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	N	No development proposed	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	N	No development proposed	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Not within the 7km buffer where it is considered that significant effects may result, and there would be easily accessible open space to use for recreation.	N	No development proposed	N	Not within the 7km buffer where it is considered that significant effects may result, and there would be easily accessible open space to use for recreation.
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site

Continued on next page

HAZARD	A24e: Commercial development		A24f: Leisure development (whole or majority of site)		A24g: Small scale and water-compatible leisure development in parts of the site to support open space function	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site
Water flows	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	N	Development would be small scale and water compatible and would not affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water

Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site
Water flows	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	Y	A development of a functional floodplain on this scale could have significant implications further afield on water flows in the Kennet corridor, which would need to be investigated further.	N	Development would be small scale and water compatible and would not affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	Y	A development on this scale on the southern side of Reading could draw significantly more traffic past the site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No impact likely this far downriver of site
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	Development would be small scale and water compatible and would not affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site	N	Non-residential development would be unlikely to mean significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

A29: LAND BOUNDED BY ISLAND ROAD, LONGWATER AVENUE, A33 AND SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

[illegible]

Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	No development proposed	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	Y	If a regional level retail facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	Y	If a regional level retail facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	Y	Outside 7km buffer, but a large scale residential development in combination with other south Reading sites could mean more visits.
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

A31: LAND SOUTH OF ISLAND ROAD AT SMALLMEAD

HAZARD	A31a: Development for employment use within use classes B1c/B2/B8		A31b: Do not allocate		A31c: Development for residential use		A31d: Development for leisure use	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	No development proposed	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Little Wittenham SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects

Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	No development proposed	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	N	No development proposed	Y	Outside 7km buffer, but a large scale residential development in combination with other south Reading sites could mean more visits.	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

A32: LAND AT THE MADEJSKI STADIUM

[illegible]

Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	No development proposed	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site	N	Development downriver from site
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level retail and leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level retail and leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	Development downriver from site	N	No development proposed	N	Development downriver from site	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	Y	Outside 7km buffer, but a large scale residential development in combination with other south Reading sites could mean more visits.	N	No development proposed	Y	Outside 7km buffer, but a large scale residential development in combination with other south Reading sites could mean more visits.	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

B35: CRESCENT ROAD CAMPUS

[illegible]² Potentially significant effects

B37: WORTON GRANGE

[illegible]

Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area if retail uses are limited.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area if retail uses are limited.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Habitat loss would be likely to come from visitors to the site. Residential use at Worton Grange was assessed in the SDPD and not considered likely to result in significant effects. However, additional major residential sites in South Reading will need to be carefully considered.	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Habitat loss would be likely to come from visitors to the site. Residential use at Worton Grange was assessed in the SDPD and not considered likely to result in significant effects. However, additional major residential sites in South Reading will need to be carefully considered.	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area if retail uses are limited.	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC										
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

B40: FOBNEY MEAD, ISLAND ROAD

HAZARD	B40a: Low-intensity leisure use associated with the open space or waterside environment.		B40b: Do not allocate		B40c: Revert to meadows		B40d: Development for residential	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Little Wittenham SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water

Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC								
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	No development proposed	N	No development proposed	N	Too distant from site

Continued on next page

HAZARD	B40e: Development for office		B40f: Development for industry and warehousing		B40g: Development for larger scale built leisure	
	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS	PSE (Y/N)?	COMMENTS
Aston Rowant SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Chilterns Beechwoods SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Hartslock Wood SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Kennet & Lambourn Floodplains SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Little Wittenham SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site

Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
River Lambourn SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Water flows	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.	N	Water abstraction is downriver from this site and is not expected to affect water flows.
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site
Thames Basin Heaths SPA						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	Y	If a regional level leisure facility, could draw significantly more traffic past site.
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Would be unlikely to result in more visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	Y	More traffic could mean lighting effects
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC						
Noise, disturbance and vibration	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Air pollution and quality	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area	N	No direct effect, & unlikely to mean significant traffic in area
Water pollution and quality	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Water flows	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water	N	No immediate link by water
Climate change	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects	N	No clear significant effects
Habitat loss and degradation	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site	N	Too distant to result in significant visits to site
Landscape effects	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site	N	Not visible from site
Lighting	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site	N	Too distant from site

APPENDIX 4: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS, SCREENING LEVEL

Q3: HOW MUCH HOUSING?

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The policy would set out how much housing is to be provided in Reading up to 2036.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The policy is intended to benefit those in need of a home, as well as the wider community through provision of housing to effectively service the local economy.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of adequate housing to fulfil identified needs.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There is evidence that a lack of housing disproportionately affects younger people, who are unable to leave home and form their own households, which was highlighted in the SHMA. Provision of the full objectively assessed need or more would help to remedy this, but provision below this level is likely to lead to a continuing burden on young people in particular.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain An adverse effect due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is not currently any justification for this impact. Failure to provide for the full need due to capacity constraints in Reading could potentially be justified if the need were being met elsewhere, but that stage has not yet been reached.

Q10: EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING BALANCE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The policy would aim to manage how employment and housing provision are to be balanced in Reading over the plan period.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The policy is intended to benefit the wider community through provision of sustainable patterns of development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A sustainable balance of employment and housing.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This issue is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This issue is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This issue is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This issue is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Planning for a level of employment that is greater than the housing to support it can lead to strains on the housing market. As set out in relation to Q3, there is evidence that a lack of housing disproportionately affects younger people, who are unable to leave home and form their own households, which was highlighted in the SHMA. Provision of the full objectively assessed need or more would help to remedy this, but provision below this level is likely to lead to a continuing burden on young people in particular.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The amount of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain An adverse effect due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is not currently any justification for this impact. Failure to provide for the full need due to capacity constraints in Reading could potentially be justified if the need were being met elsewhere, but that stage has not yet been reached.

Q22: RICHFIELD AVENUE & CARDIFF ROAD INDUSTRIAL AREA

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around the future of this industrial area. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the area.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A residential option could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain In terms of risks from flooding, if a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required.

Q28: ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy If a policy is included, it will aim to ensure that new dwellings are designed to be accessible and adaptable so that people can continue to live in them as they age and their circumstances change.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Residents of the homes would benefit through not needing to move houses.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If a policy is included, the intended outcome will be to ensure that sufficient properties were accessible and adaptable.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Residents.			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Accessible and adaptable homes would benefit all people regardless of race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Accessible and adaptable homes would benefit all people regardless of gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of sufficient housing that is accessible and adaptable would benefit people with disabilities. However, failure to provide sufficient housing would have an adverse effect by meaning that residents would need to seek alternative housing as their circumstances change.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Accessible and adaptable homes would benefit all people regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of sufficient housing that is accessible and adaptable would benefit people as they age. However, failure to provide sufficient housing would have an adverse effect by meaning that residents would need to seek alternative housing as their circumstances change.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Accessible and adaptable homes would benefit all people regardless of religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain An adverse effect of not providing sufficient adaptable and accessible housing due to disability and age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is not currently any justification for this impact.

Q29: WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE OR ADAPTABLE HOUSING

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy If a policy is included, it will aim to ensure that a proportion of new dwellings are available in new developments for those using wheelchairs			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Those who use wheelchairs would benefit through provision of adequate housing.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If a policy is included, the intended outcome will be to ensure that sufficient wheelchair accessible or adaptable housing is provided.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Residents.			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes would benefit those in need regardless of race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes would benefit those in need regardless of gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of sufficient housing that is wheelchair accessible and adaptable would benefit people with disabilities. However, failure to provide sufficient housing would have an adverse effect by meaning that those using wheelchairs would not be able to occupy housing suited to their needs.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes would benefit those in need regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes would benefit those in need regardless of age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes would benefit those in need regardless of religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain An adverse effect of not providing sufficient wheelchair adaptable and accessible housing due to disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is not currently any justification for this impact.

Q30: WATER EFFICIENCY

17. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy If a policy is included, it will aim to ensure that new dwellings are designed to use water efficiently.			
18. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All people would benefit from a more efficient use of water resources.			
19. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If a policy is included, the intended outcome will be to avoid wasteful use of water through the design of new dwellings.			
20. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people			
21. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
22. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of race.			
23. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
24. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of gender.			
25. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
26. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of disability.			
27. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
28. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of sexual orientation.			
29. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
30. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of age.			
31. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
32. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The efficient use of water benefits all people regardless of religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain Water efficiency will not have a differential effect on any specific group.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

Q31: SPACE STANDARDS

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy If a policy is included, it will aim to ensure that new dwellings have adequate internal space for occupants to live with a reasonable quality of life			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Occupants of new properties, by being provided with adequately sized accommodation.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If a policy is included, the intended outcome will be to avoid dwellings being provided without space for storage and without sufficient space to live with a reasonable quality of life.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, occupants			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Occupants who would benefit from sufficient space could come from any racial group, and there is no evidence that this would affect some groups more than others.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There is no evidence that this would affect one gender more than another.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Greater internal space is needed for people with certain disabilities or who need to use a wheelchair. This issue is covered in greater depth when discussing accessible housing, but the impact on people with disabilities of seeking more internal space is likely to be positive.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There is no evidence that this would affect people with one sexual orientation more than another.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There is no evidence that this would affect people of a particular age any more than any other.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There is no evidence that this would affect people of a particular religious belief more than another.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain The only potential adverse effect is on people with certain disabilities if there are no minimum space standards.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain The impact could be effectively mitigated by ensuring compliance with the optional building regulations standards on accessible and adaptable homes, which is covered elsewhere in this assessment.

A1: BRUNEL ARCADE, STATION APPROACH

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Brunel Arcade site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A2: 27-28 MARKET PLACE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Market Place site is allocated for re-use or refurbishment, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of a listed building.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the preservation of a heritage asset.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a re-used heritage asset that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and enhances the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A3: 29-31 MARKET PLACE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Market Place site is allocated for re-use or refurbishment, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of a listed building.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the preservation of a heritage asset.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a re-used heritage asset that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and enhances the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A4: 32 MARKET PLACE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Market Place site is allocated for re-use or refurbishment, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of a listed building.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the preservation of a heritage asset.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a re-used heritage asset that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and enhances the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A5: 37-43 BLAGRAVE STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Blaggrave Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A6: BRISTOL AND WEST ARCADE, FRIAR STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Bristol and West Arcade site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A7: PRIMARK, 32-42 WEST STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Primark site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Options that would lead to a loss of retail in the town centre could have a negative impact on access of older people to retail facilities, as some older groups are more reliant on public transport rather than the car.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain If an option involving the loss of retail were pursued, a full Equality Impact Assessment would be required.

A8: LAND AT RICHFIELD AVENUE AND TESSA ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Richfield Avenue site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A development that promotes out of centre retail development can have a detrimental impact on older age groups, because there tends to be lower levels of access to a car amongst the oldest age groups. This means that these groups rely on town centres, which out-of-centre development can negatively affect. A residential option could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain The impact in terms of retail could be justified by means of a retail impact assessment, but this has not been carried out yet. It would be necessary to undertake such an assessment if a retail allocation were to be pursued. In terms of risks from flooding, if a residential

			allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required.
--	--	--	--

A9: FORMER COX & WYMAN SITE, CARDIFF ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Cox & Wyman site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A development that promotes out of centre retail development can have a detrimental impact on older age groups, because there tends to be lower levels of access to a car amongst the oldest age groups. This means that these groups rely on town centres, which out-of-centre development can negatively affect.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain The impact in terms of retail could be justified by means of a retail impact assessment, but this has not been carried out yet. It would be necessary to undertake such an assessment if a retail allocation were to be pursued.

A10: LAND AT READING WEST STATION

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the site at Reading West station is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A11: CAVERSHAM WEIR

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Caversham Weir is allocated for hydropower generation. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? If allocated, the wider community would potentially benefit from renewable energy, and the operators of the facility would also benefit.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a source of renewable energy			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, operator, neighbours, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that the use proposed will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A12: VIEW ISLAND

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether View Island is allocated for a conservation and ecology area. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? If allocated, the wider community would potentially benefit from the use.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be to conserve the biodiversity value and to enhance access to biodiversity for the wider community			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, operator, neighbours, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that the use proposed will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A13: READING UNIVERSITY BOAT CLUB, PROMENADE ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Boat Club site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A residential option could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain If a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required.

A14: ALLOTMENTS AND ADJACENT LAND AT KENTWOOD HILL

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Kentwood Hill site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, allotment holders, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A15: 7 LIPPINCOTE COURT

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Lippincote Court site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A16: READING LINK RETAIL PARK

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Reading Link Retail Park site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A development that promotes out of centre retail development can have a detrimental impact on older age groups, because there tends to be lower levels of access to a car amongst the oldest age groups. This means that these groups rely on town centres, which out-of-centre development can negatively affect.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain The impact could be justified by means of a retail impact assessment, but this has not been carried out yet. It would be necessary to undertake such an assessment if a retail allocation were to be pursued.

A17: 103 DEE ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Dee Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A18: ALEXANDER HOUSE, KINGS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Alexander House is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A19: PART OF READING GOLF COURSE, KIDMORE END ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Reading Golf Course site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A20: REAR OF 200-214 HENLEY ROAD, 12-24 ALL HALLOWS ROAD & 4, 7 & 8 COPSE AVENUE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether this back garden site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A21: REAR OF 13-14A HAWTHORNE ROAD AND 282-292 HENLEY ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether this back garden site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A22: REAR OF 8-26 REDLANDS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether this back garden site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A23: LAND ADJACENT TO 40 REDLANDS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Redlands Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.		
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.		
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.		
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community		
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.		
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.		
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.		
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.		
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or community, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.		
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y✓	N
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site is currently occupied by the Reading Gospel Hall trust. The loss of this facility could be considered to have an impact on groups that use it due to their religious belief.		
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N
Please explain A potential adverse impact due to religious belief has been identified.		
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N
Please explain The loss of this facility was justified in allocating this site in the SDPD, due to there no longer being a need for the facility. This would need to be considered again in a new allocation.		

A24: LAND AT SEARLES FARM

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area around Searles Farm is allocated for development or for open space associated with a wider housing development. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial and efficient use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? If allocated for open space, the wider community would potentially benefit from the use. If allocated for development, developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an open space allocation is included, the outcomes would be to provide an area of public open space. If a development allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, future neighbours and occupants of any associated housing, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. This could also apply outside the site, as the development is of a scale that could significantly affect water flows elsewhere.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. This could also apply outside the site, as the development is of a scale that could significantly affect water flows elsewhere.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain If a residential allocation were taken forward, the flood issue would have to be dealt with thoroughly, including a full flood risk assessment.

A25: THE ARTHUR CLARK HOME, DOVEDALE CLOSE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Arthur Clark Home is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The Arthur Clark Home provided care and day centre uses to elderly people. Although it is now closed, different options for development will have different effects on groups according to age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain As this is the site of a former care home, options involving its loss for care use could have negative effects due to age.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification at present, but an allocation that involved loss of the care use would need a full equality impact assessment.

A26: REAR OF 1 & 3 WOODCOTE ROAD AND 21 ST PETER'S HILL

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether this back garden site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A27: LAND AT CONWY CLOSE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Conwy Close site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development. Those in need of affordable housing will potentially benefit significantly.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A28: 16-18 BENNET ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Bennet Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
17. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
18. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
19. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
20. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
21. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
22. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A residential option could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain If a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required, but this has not been carried out yet.

A29: LAND BOUNDED BY ISLAND ROAD, LONGWATER AVENUE, A33 AND SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Island Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?		Y	N✓
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?		Y	N✓
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?		Y✓	N
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?		Y	N✓
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?		Y✓	N
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A development that promotes out of centre retail development can have a detrimental impact on older age groups, because there tends to be lower levels of access to a car amongst the oldest age groups. This means that these groups rely on town centres, which out-of-centre development can negatively affect. Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?		Y	N✓
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain The impact could be justified by means of a retail impact assessment, but this has not been carried out yet. It would be necessary to undertake such an assessment if a retail allocation were to be pursued. If a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required, but this has not been carried out yet.

A30: LAND NORTH OF ISLAND ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Island Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

A31: LAND SOUTH OF ISLAND ROAD AT SMALLMEAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Island Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?		Y	N✓
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?		Y	N✓
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?		Y✓	N
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. Development on potentially contaminated land could also differentially impact those with certain disabilities.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?		Y	N✓
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?		Y✓	N
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. Development on potentially contaminated land could also differentially impact some older future residents whose health is compromised.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?		Y	N✓
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain If a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required, but this has not been carried out yet. Equally, an assessment of contamination and possible mitigation would be required.

A32: LAND AT THE MADEJSKI STADIUM

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Island Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. Development on potentially contaminated land could also differentially impact those with certain disabilities.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? A development that promotes out of centre retail development can have a detrimental impact on older age groups, because there tends to be lower levels of access to a car amongst the oldest age groups. This means that these groups rely on town centres, which out-of-centre development can negatively affect. Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary. Development on potentially contaminated land could also differentially impact some older future residents whose health is compromised.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain Retail impact could be justified by means of a retail impact assessment, but this has not been carried out yet. It would be necessary to undertake such an assessment if a retail allocation were to be pursued. If a residential allocation were taken forward a flood risk assessment would be required, but this has not been carried out yet. Equally, an assessment of contamination and possible mitigation would be required.

B1: FRIAR STREET AND STATION ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B2: FRIARS WALK AND GREYFRIARS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B3: STATION HILL

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B4: NORTH OF THE STATION

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B5: RIVERSIDE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B6: NAPIER ROAD CORNER

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B7: NAPIER COURT, NAPIER ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the SDPD, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B8: CATTLE MARKET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B9: GREAT KNOLLYS STREET AND WELDALE STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B10: CHATHAM STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B11: BROAD STREET MALL

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B12: HOSIER STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B13: READING PRISON

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area, as well as making beneficial use of a historic site.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B14: FORBURY RETAIL PARK

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B15: KENAVON DRIVE AND FORBURY BUSINESS PARK

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B16: GAS HOLDER

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the area is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Development of residential in the flood plain could have a differential effect on those with mobility issues in the event of evacuation being necessary.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain In allocating the site in the RCAAP, work was undertaken to demonstrate that the site could be developed safely.

B17: 108-116 OXFORD ROAD, 10 EATON PLACE & 115-125 CHATHAM STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oxford Road/Eaton Place/Chatham Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Owner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site includes a doctor's surgery. Loss of the surgery could potentially have a differential effect on some groups due to disability if it is not replaced. In terms of the development, none of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site includes a doctor's surgery. Loss of the surgery could potentially have a differential effect on some groups due to disability if it is not replaced. In terms of the development, depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential or leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain It may be possible to justify the loss of the surgery if it can be adequately replaced elsewhere, but that is not known at this stage, so an impact assessment may be needed at draft plan stage.

B18: 143-145 OXFORD ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oxford Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y✓	N	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The snooker club has now changed to be use as a place of worship. Development of this site is therefore likely to result in a greater effect on the religious group that uses the facility, unless there is adequate replacement elsewhere.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact on some groups due to religious belief has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain It may be possible to justify the loss of the facility if it can be adequately replaced elsewhere, but that is not known at this stage, so an impact assessment may be needed at draft plan stage.

B19: FORMER READING FAMILY CENTRE, NORTH STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the North Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site is currently in a temporary education use, which means that any loss of its education function is likely to impact disproportionately on younger people.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain This has not been justified at this stage, but were the allocation to be carried forward it would require clarity that the education use of the site is no longer needed or can be accommodated elsewhere.

B20: 9-27 GREYFRIARS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Greyfriars Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The use proposed would benefit the whole community regardless of age.			
12. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
13. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B21: 2-8 THE FORBURY AND 19-22 MARKET PLACE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Forbury/Market Place site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B22: 3-10 MARKET PLACE, ABBEY HALL AND ABBEY SQUARE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Market Place site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B23: 37-43 MARKET PLACE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Market Place site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail or residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B24: READING CENTRAL LIBRARY, ABBEY SQUARE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Central Library site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Loss of the library could have an effect on specific groups due to disability, as some functions of the library are of particular assistance to certain groups (for instance large print books for partially sighted people).			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Loss of the library could have an effect on specific groups due to age, as some functions of the library are of particular assistance to certain groups. For instance, elderly people may be less likely to have internet access at home, and may rely on the library.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain Yes, there are reasons to believe that loss of the library could have a particular effect on specific groups due to age and disability.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain At this stage, there is no justification of these effects. The existing allocation relies upon the library being replaced elsewhere, and this may mitigate any effects highlighted here.

B25: THE ANCHORAGE, BRIDGE STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Anchorage site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B26: THE ORACLE EXTENSION, BRIDGE STREET AND LETCOMBE STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oracle extension site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of retail, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B27: 25-31 LONDON STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the London Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B28: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SOUTHAMPTON STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Crown Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B29: CORNER OF CROWN STREET AND SILVER STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Crown Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B30: 21 SOUTH STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the South Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B31: READING COLLEGE, KINGS ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Reading College site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Reading College caters mainly to younger people, and any option that involved its loss could have a detrimental effect on those groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain There is a potential detrimental effect on younger people from any option that involved the loss of Reading College.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no current justification for the effect. A full impact assessment would be required were such an option to be pursued.

B32: KINGS MEADOW POOL, KINGS MEADOW ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Kings Meadow Pool is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B33: CAVERSHAM LOCK ISLAND, THAMES SIDE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Caversham Lock Island is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of leisure, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B34: 261-275 LONDON ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the London Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B35: CRESCENT ROAD CAMPUS

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Crescent Road Campus is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site was previously used for educational use, so loss of the education function could have a more significant effect on the younger age groups than other groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A loss of an education function would have a potential detrimental effect on younger age groups.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification at this point. An allocation that involved a loss of education would need to be accompanied by a full impact assessment.

B36: UNIVERSITY OF READING WHITEKNIGHTS CAMPUS

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Whiteknights Campus is allocated for continued development associated with the university, and what that development would be.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The university, students and staff and the wider community will benefit from a thriving university in the town.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a policy that can support the university continuing to meet many of its needs on the campus whilst not causing wider impacts on the surrounding areas.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? University, students, staff, visitors, wider community, Wokingham Borough Council.			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to age.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B37: WORTON GRANGE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Worton Grange site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B38: PART OF FORMER BERKSHIRE BREWERY SITE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the former bottling plant is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B39: LAND NORTH OF MANOR FARM ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the land north of Manor Farm Road is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B40: FOBNEY MEAD, ISLAND ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Fobney Mead is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B41: 211-221 OXFORD ROAD, 10 AND REAR OF 8 PROSPECT STREET

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oxford Road/Prospect Street site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B42: REAR OF 303-315 OXFORD ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oxford Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B43: DELLWOOD HOSPITAL, LIEBENROOD ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Dellwood Hospital site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y✓	N	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Loss of all or part of a healthcare facility may have a detrimental impact on specific groups due to disability, depending on the function of the specific facilities to be lost.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Loss of all or part of a healthcare facility may have a detrimental impact on specific groups due to age, depending on the function of the specific facilities to be lost.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential negative effect on specific groups due to both age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification identified at this stage. An allocation that resulted in the loss of a healthcare use would need to be accompanied by a full impact assessment.

B44: ELVIAN SCHOOL, BATH ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Elvian School site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The site was previously used for educational use, so loss of the education function could have a more significant effect on the younger age groups than other groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A loss of an education function would have a potential detrimental effect on younger age groups.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification at this point. An allocation that involved a loss of education would need to be accompanied by a full impact assessment.

B45: ALICE BURROWS HOME, DWYER ROAD

17. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Alice Burrows Home is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
18. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
19. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
20. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
21. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
22. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
23. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
24. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
25. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
26. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
27. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
28. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
29. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
30. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The Alice Burrows care home provided care to elderly people. Although it was demolished some time ago, different options for development will have different effects on groups according to age.			
31. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
32. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain As this is the site of a former care home, options involving its loss for care use could have negative effects due to age.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification at present, but an allocation that involved loss of the care use would need a full equality impact assessment.

B46: PARK LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE LAURELS & DOWNING ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Park Lane primary school is reprovided on one site and what the options for the remaining land are.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Pupils and staff will benefit directly, as would landowners and developers, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Students, staff, landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Not reproviding the school will mean the school site continues to be split into a variety of sites, which makes moving between the sites difficult and makes the school less able to meet its needs for pupils.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse effect due to age has been identified
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain Justification for an approach of not providing the school would need to draw on most recent information about needs.

B47: 784-794 OXFORD ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Oxford Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B48: PART OF FORMER BATTLE HOSPITAL, PORTMAN ROAD

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the remainder of the Battle Hospital site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B49: DEE PARK

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether Dee Park is allocated for development. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?		Y	N✓
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?		Y	N✓
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?		Y	N✓
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?		Y	N✓
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?		Y	N✓
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?		Y	N✓
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

B50: THE MEADWAY CENTRE, HONEY END LANE

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Meadway Centre is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
5. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
6. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to race.			
7. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
8. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to gender.			
9. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
10. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to disability.			
11. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
12. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? There are not considered likely to be any differential impacts due to sexual orientation.			
13. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y✓	N	
14. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? District and local centres are vital for a range of people, but particularly those without access to a car, which includes many older people. An option of not allocating the site for a new centre could contribute to the centre's further decline and have a disproportionate impact on older people.			
15. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
16. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y✓	N	Please explain A potential adverse impact due to age has been identified as a result of not allocating the site.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N✓	Please explain There is no justification for this impact at this stage.

B51: LAND AT LOWFIELD ROAD

17. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy The options for the policy are around whether the Lowfield Road site is allocated for development, and what that development would be. If allocated, the aim would be to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.			
18. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a high-quality, well-designed development.			
19. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? If an allocation is included, the outcomes would be a well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.			
20. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers, wider community			
21. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N✓	
22. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to race.			
23. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N✓	
24. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to gender.			
25. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N✓	
26. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.			
27. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N✓	
28. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to sexual orientation.			
29. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N✓	
30. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Depending on the exact types of uses proposed, e.g. types of residential, they may appeal to one or more particular age groups. However, there is no reason to consider they would necessarily have an adverse impact on other age groups.			
31. Are there concerns that the function/policy does or <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N✓	
32. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? None of the options for use or development considered are uses that are likely to have a differential effect according to religious belief.			
17. Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?	Y	N✓	Please explain No, there is no reason to believe that any of the options will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain

Planning Section

Reading Borough Council

Civic Centre

Reading

RG1 7AE

Tel: 0800 626540

Email: ldf@reading.gov.uk

Website: www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf



Reading
Borough Council

Working better with you