

Reading Borough Local Plan

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

OF THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

May 2017



www.reading.gov.uk



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Non-technical Summary3
2.0 Introduction4
2.1 Requirement for the Sustainability Appraisal4
2.2 Components of the Local Plan5
2.3 What does this report contain?5
2.4 Policy Context6
2.5 Limitations6
2.6 Who carried out the Sustainability Appraisal?7
3.0 Baseline Information8
3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Baseline Information8
3.2 Review of Other Plans and Programmes10
4.0 Framework for Sustainability Appraisal11
4.1 Sustainability Objectives11
5.0 Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal13
5.1 Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope13
5.2 Task A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives13
5.3 Task A2: Collecting baseline information13
5.4 Task A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems13
5.5 Task A4: Developing sustainability appraisal framework14
5.6 Incorporating Habitat Regulations Assessment14
5.7 Incorporating Equality Impact Assessment16
5.8 Task A5: Consulting the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability framework17
5.9 Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects17
5.10 Task B1: Testing the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability framework17
5.11 Task B2: Developing the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives18
5.12 Task B3: Evaluating the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives18
5.13 Task B4: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects19
5.14 Task B5: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan19
5.15 Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report19
5.16 Stage D: Seeking representations on the Sustainability Appraisal Report from consultation bodies and the public19
5.17 Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring19
5.18 Task E1: Preparing and publishing post-adoption statement20
5.19 Task E2: Monitoring significant effects of implementing the local plan20
5.20 Task E3: Responding to adverse effects20
6.0 Significant Sustainability Implications21
7.0 Consultation22
8.0 References23

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Testing the core objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework30
Appendix 2: Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan32
Appendix 3: Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan324
Appendix 4: Equality Impact Assessment of the Local Plan335

1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.0.1 This document is a Sustainability Appraisal of the policies and sites set out in the Draft Local Plan. It takes each option for a policy 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 Report¹.
- 1.0.2 The object of the exercise is to highlight what the likely effects of each policy or site will be. This allows alternatives 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, with draft policies in place, this report attempts to come to a picture of what the overall effects of the plan are and what measures will be needed to mitigate adverse effects.
- 1.0.4 The proposed development management policies show overwhelmingly positive sustainability effects, for instance making the best use of previously-developed land, improving the environment and providing much needed housing.
- 1.0.5 For all development options, there are some environmental costs, such as carbon dioxide emissions, energy use and waste generation. Mitigation of effects is a constant feature and can be partially achieved through compliance with other policies. Certain potentially negative effects requiring mitigation regularly appear. These include the following:
- Air quality issues: The Air Quality Management Area² is extensive and covers the most accessible parts of the Borough. There will clearly be a need to consider measures to mitigate the effects on residents from the local air quality, and on the quality of the air from additional traffic;
 - Other pollution effects: sites which may be subject to noise or have potential contamination will require mitigation measures;
 - Education and healthcare infrastructure: certain areas of the Borough are under pressure in terms of education and healthcare capacity. This is an issue which has been considered in drawing up the Local Plan;
 - Flood risk: allocations must consider the extent to which new development in the floodplain puts potential residents at risk, and affects flood risk elsewhere. Clearly, where effects cannot be mitigated, allocations on such sites should not be pursued.
- 1.0.6 The Sustainability Appraisal has been published for public consultation alongside the Draft Local Plan. Details regarding the consultation can be found in section 7 of this report.

¹ The 2014 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report can be found at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

² A map of the Air Quality Management Area can be viewed at http://beta.reading.gov.uk/media/1229/Air-Quality-Management-Area/pdf/Air_Quality_Management_Area.pdf

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Requirement for the 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)³. This was enshrined in national law by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004⁴, 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 the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 2.1.2 The Sustainability Appraisal process is intended to be an integral part of preparing a Local Development Plan, 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 contributes to sound plan making. Sustainability Appraisal should inform the evaluation of options and 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.
- 2.1.4 Sustainability Appraisal is a multi-stage process, most of which is undertaken in separate appraisals of individual plans. The national guidance on sustainability appraisal⁵ 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 and programmes and sustainability objectives
- A2- Collect baseline information
- A3- Identify sustainability issues and problems
- A4- Develop 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

STAGE E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

- E1- Prepare and publish post-adoption statement
- E2- Monitor significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

³ Further information on the EU Directive requiring Strategic Environmental Assessment can be found at <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/sea-legalcontext.htm>

⁴ Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act can be found at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/section/19>

⁵ National Guidance on Sustainability Appraisal <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal/>

- 2.1.5 Tasks A1 to A5 were carried out in 2014 in developing the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Therefore, they do not need to be repeated in this report, although 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. A brief overview of changes to baseline information that have occurred since the 2014 Scoping Report can be found in section 3.1.4 of this report.

2.2 Components of the Local Plan

- 2.2.1 The Local Plan replaces the current development plans (the Core Strategy, Reading Central Area Action Plan and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) and combines what were previously three separate documents into one Local Plan that sets out how Reading will develop up to 2036.
- 2.2.2 The Local Plan includes the vision and objectives, spatial strategy for development and core policies to help in implementing the strategy. The Local Plan identifies key sites, allocates land for a range of uses and guides applicants on a range of policies.
- 2.2.3 Alongside the Local Plan, the Council has produced a Proposals Map. This is a map showing the relevant policies and allocations from the Borough's Local Plan. The map has development plan document status, and therefore requires a Sustainability Appraisal, but the map cannot introduce new policy by itself - it merely represents the content of the Local Plan.

2.3 What does this report contain?

- 2.3.1 The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the policies and sites set out in the Local Plan. These policies work at a range of levels, from policies for dealing with broad strategic matters, such as how to accommodate Reading's housing need, to policies for different development on specific sites.
- 2.3.2 This report covers Stages B, C and D of the above list. Stage A is dealt with in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2014). Stage E cannot be undertaken before the Local Plan is adopted.
- 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 effects the plan or policy 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. This is undertaken in Appendix 1.
- 2.3.5 The Appraisal then moves into assessing each element of the Local Plan against the sustainability objectives. Each policy or site is assessed in turn, in order of how they appear in the document, along with a range of alternative approaches for each. This is undertaken mainly in Appendix 2, but with detailed Habitat Regulations Assessment in Appendix 3 and Equality Impact Assessment in Appendix 4.
- 2.3.6 In addition, this document does not appraise sites that are not proposed to be included in the Local Plan. A number of sites had previously been suggested for development, and are

not to be allocated for a variety of reasons. These sites were appraised in the Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options (2016).

2.4 Policy Context

- 2.4.1 The Council currently has a number of adopted documents with 'local plan' status, specifically the Core Strategy⁶ (adopted 2008, amended 2015), Reading Central Area Action Plan⁷ (adopted 2009) and Sites and Detailed Policies Document⁸ (adopted 2012, amended 2015), together with the associated Proposals Map⁹. There are also a number of Supplementary Planning Documents¹⁰ in place that provide more detail to the policies in the three documents.
- 2.4.2 The new Local Plan, as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme¹¹, is to replace the three documents listed above with a simple, comprehensive document. The LDS sets out the timescales for this process, with adoption currently anticipated in late 2018. The first stage was the publication of an Issues and Options¹² report for consultation (Jan 2016), which is a discussion paper considering what the key issues would be and what the options are for dealing with these issues. Then, the process moved to production of a draft Local Plan during 2016-17 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.
- 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 Local 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 Local Plan will explain why such decisions have been made.

⁶ The Core Strategy can be found on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

⁷ The Reading Central Area Action Plan can be found on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

⁸ The Sites and Detailed Policies Document can be found on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

⁹ The Proposals Map can be found on the Council's website at <http://reading.addresssafe.com/app/exploreit/default.aspx>

¹⁰ Supplementary Planning Documents can be accessed on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

¹¹ The Local Development Scheme can be found on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

¹² Report for Consultation on Issues and Options can be viewed on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/newlocalplan>

2.6 Who carried out the Sustainability Appraisal?

- 2.6.1 The production of the Sustainability Appraisal 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 has significantly influenced the content of the Local Plan.

3.0 BASELINE INFORMATION

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Baseline Information

- 3.1.1 Baseline information for Reading Borough is contained within the Council's Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Detailed baseline data and indicators are located within Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report. The information will provide the basis for predicting and monitoring effects and will help to identify sustainability problems and alternative ways of dealing with them. Sufficient information on the current and future state of the plan area is included to allow the plan's effects to be adequately predicted.
- 3.1.2 The exact information in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report will inevitably become out-of-date in some respects, although the longer term issues highlighted will generally remain. Therefore, this Sustainability Appraisal considers whether more up-to-date information is available that will affect the outcome of a particular policy or site. The Council's Annual Monitoring Reports¹³ will contain updated information on some, but not all, of these indicators. In particular, the AMR will contain information on development activity over the monitoring year.
- 3.1.3 In general, the information presented in the 2014 Scoping Report which has informed this Sustainability Appraisal includes the following:
- Reading Borough is a tightly drawn authority, and the urban area of Reading extends significantly beyond the Borough boundaries;
 - Substantial recent development, particularly developments in the town centre, have raised Reading's profile and strengthened its core;
 - Reading is one of the major contributors to an overall strong regional and sub-regional economy;
 - In overall terms, there are low levels of unemployment and general affluence;
 - However, there are some significant pockets of deprivation in parts of Reading where unemployment is high and income is low;
 - There is a disparity in skill and qualification levels, with higher than average levels of both highly qualified people and people with low or no qualifications;
 - There is a substantial need for affordable housing;
 - Reading is a major transport hub, and its station is the second busiest outside London;
 - Although the Borough is primarily urban, it also includes two important landscape types - the flood meadows of the Thames and Kennet, and the fringe of the Chiltern Hills; and
 - There is a distinct historic environment, including over 850 listed buildings, two Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 15 Conservation Areas, as well as archaeological remains.
- 3.1.4 However, there are some important elements which have either changed since the Scoping Report, or which call for more detail, which are nevertheless essential for an appraisal, particularly of options for sites. Three important assessments have been completed since the publication of the scoping report (the Economic Development Needs Assessment¹⁴, the

¹³ Annual Monitoring Reports can be accessed on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

¹⁴ The Central Berkshire Economic Development Needs Assessment can be accessed on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

Strategic Housing Market Assessment¹⁵ and the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment¹⁶). The conclusions and implications of each are summarised below:

- The Economic Development Needs Assessment (published October 2016) was prepared on behalf of the Berkshire authorities of Bracknell Forest, Windsor and Maidenhead, Wokingham and Reading and considers the objectively assessed economic development needs throughout the plan period (2013-2036). Future need is expressed in terms of amount of floor space and type of employment use. Key findings informing the local plan process are as follows:
 - Berkshire has recorded strong growth in recent years, outperforming regional and national averages. There is a strong concentration of jobs in high-value telecoms, IT, professional services and utilities.
 - Reading accommodates the majority of both office and industrial space.
 - Reading represents the main office location and offers a wide range of accommodation from small scale office suites to large headquarters style spaces.
 - Reading's strong industrial market benefits from access to strategic roads and a 'critical mass' of industrial occupiers and sites of which the majority of demand comes from local businesses.
 - The study recommends that Reading plan to accommodate new office and industrial space in order to ensure that growth potential is not constrained. The ENDA recommends a total of 52,775 sq. m of office space and 148,440 sq. m of industrial and warehouse space.
 - Reading faces particular constraints in accommodating new development due to its tight administrative boundary. Historically, unmet need is met just on the outside of the Borough boundary in Wokingham or West Berkshire.
 - Market intelligence suggests that the trend of decentralisation from Central London is expected to continue as employers look to reduce real estate costs. Reading will benefit from its highly-skilled workforce.
- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (published February 2016) was prepared on behalf of Berkshire (including South Bucks) and considers the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing. The SHMA identifies the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures the local population is likely to need over the plan period. It is not the job of the SHMA to consider issues related to land supply, development constraints and infrastructure, but simply consider need for housing. It is for the local plan itself to consider what level of housing provision can be sustainably accommodated. Key findings informing the local plan process are as follows:
 - Out-migration of residents from London is expected to continue.
 - Reading's OAN for the plan period is 699 dwellings per annum and the specific housing mix should seek to accommodate more 3-bed properties, as well as more properties for aging residents.
 - The affordable housing need (net per annum) in Reading is 406 dwellings.
 - House prices have outstripped growth in earnings, leaving more and more residents unable to purchase their own homes.
 - The growth of Reading's economy is fundamentally shaped by connectivity and will be affected by changes concerning the M4, Crossrail, Heathrow Airport expansion and/or digital connectivity infrastructure.

¹⁵ The Strategic Housing Market Assessment can be accessed on the Council's website at <http://www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf>

¹⁶ The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment can be accessed on the Council's website at

- The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment was prepared by Reading Borough Council and examines the potential for accommodating residential and economic development within the borough. The SHMA and EDNA look at need for new development, whilst the HELAA looks at the capacity for delivering that development. The HELAA identified sites and broad locations with potential for development and then assessed development potential, suitability, availability and achievability. Key findings informing the local plan are as follows:
 - There is capacity to provide 15,250 dwellings from 2013 to 2036 (657 per annum) in Reading Borough. When considered against identified need, this means there is a shortfall of 954 homes up to 2036.
 - There is sufficient capacity to meet office and industrial/warehousing space needs within the Borough.
 - For office space, a surplus of 66,000 sq. m exists over identified needs.
 - For industry/warehousing space, a shortfall of 46,000 sq. m was identified, but it is expected that this can be met within the borough through on-site expansions within existing employment areas.

3.2 Review of Other Plans and Programs

- 3.2.1 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive states that an SEA must provide information on the 'relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.'
- 3.2.2 The Local Plan must be consistent with national planning guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes on various topics. Consistency with these documents will be taken into account in considering the Local Plan at Examination.
- 3.2.3 The Local Plan must also consider international, national, regional, sub-regional and local plans and programmes, as well as the strategies of neighbouring authorities. A full list of relevant plans and programs considered is included in the 2014 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, Section 2, Task A1.

4.0 FRAMEWORK FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

4.1 Sustainability Objectives

- 4.1.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework (found in the 2014 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, Appendix 3) sets out the sustainability objectives against which the effects of the plan will be assessed. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework contains 20 environmental, social and economic objectives, which are set out below. The Framework also lists sub-questions 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, 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.

- 4.1.2 It is not considered that there is any reason to make 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 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 where relevant.

5.0 STAGES OF A SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1 Stage A: Setting the Context and Objectives, Establishing the Baseline and Deciding on the Scope

5.1.1 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

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

5.1.3 The above Stage A tasks were undertaken in drawing up the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report last updated and consulted upon in September 2014. No fundamental issues with the consultation Scoping Report were raised.

5.2 Task A1 - Identifying other relevant policies, plans, programmes, and sustainability objectives

5.2.1 The 2014 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report sets out a list of plans, programs and sustainability objectives that are relevant to the sustainability appraisal of plans and policies in Reading. Appendix 1 of the Scoping Report includes more detail on each relevant plan or objective at all levels: international, U.K., South East, Berkshire/Sub-regional, Reading and adjoining areas.

5.3 Task A2 - Collecting baseline information

5.3.1 The 2014 Scoping Report Appendix 2 contains a table setting out the range of important baseline information that builds a picture of Reading. This information on social, environmental and economic characteristics will help provide the basis for predicting and monitoring effects.

5.3.2 The exact information in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report may have become out-of-date, although the longer term issues that they highlight will generally remain throughout the plan period. Therefore, when individual sustainability appraisals are undertaken, they will need to consider whether more up-to-date information is available that will affect the outcome of the appraisal.

5.4 Task A3 - Identifying sustainability issues and problems

5.4.1 A collection of the most significant issues affecting Reading was included in section 4 of the Scoping Report and were identified through baseline information set out by task A2 and research and studies completed during recent years. The list of issues below is not intended to be comprehensive and more detail can be found in the scoping report.

Environmental Issues

- Impacts on climate change
- Mitigation of climate change
- Poor air quality
- Contamination of land
- Resource use
- Historic environment
- Risk of flooding
- Culverting
- Tree cover
- Fragmentation of wildlife habitats

Social Issues

- Inequality between communities
- Provision of housing
- Affordability of housing
- Access to open space
- Access to services and facilities
- Crime
- Health

Economic Issues

- Balance between employment and labour
- Qualifications and skills
- Balance of the economy
- Transport infrastructure

5.5 Task A4 - Developing the sustainability appraisal framework

- 5.5.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework is the main output of the Scoping Report. Appendix 3 of the Scoping Report contains a detailed Sustainability Assessment Framework that includes 20 objectives, sub-questions for each, relevant baseline indicator and overall aim.
- 5.5.2 This task also assesses potential conflict between the 20 objectives. Table 3 of the Scoping Report details this assessment and provides explanation. Overall, objectives which are likely to promote significant amounts of development have an inherent potential tension with some environmental objectives. In many cases, these tensions can be satisfactorily managed through mitigation or other policy approaches.
- 5.5.3 Objective 8 has been developed to encompass the screening stage of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Similarly, objective 16 encompasses the screening stage of the Equality Impact Assessment.

5.6 Incorporating Habitat Regulations Assessment

- 5.6.1 Objective 8 encompasses the screening stage of the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

- 5.6.2 A Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Stage for new planning policy is required in line with Article 6(3) of the EU Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC)¹⁷ and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010¹⁸ (as amended), commonly known as the Habitats Regulations. The purpose is to consider whether the proposals would be likely to have significant effects on the identified Natura 2000 sites¹⁹ (sites identified in Article 3 of the European Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC) and whether a full Appropriate Assessment is required.
- 5.6.3 The Directive includes a requirement, which emerges through Regulation 102, that all plans that are ‘likely to have a significant effect on a European site’ should ‘make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site in view of that site’s conservation objectives.’ The NPPF states that ‘Ramsar’ sites²⁰, which constitute identified wetland sites of international importance, should receive the same level of protection as Natura 2000 sites.
- 5.6.4 The Council has decided to incorporate the screening stage of the Habitat regulations Assessment process within the sustainability appraisal. Appraisal against Objective 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”) would fulfil this requirement. A full Appropriate Assessment, if required, would need to be a separate document as it will need to go into much greater depth.
- 5.6.5 The overall methodology for the screening exercise goes through seven sequential stages:
- Stage 1: Identify the sites to be assessed
 - Stage 2: Identify relevant characteristics of the sites likely to be affected
 - Stage 3: Identify potential hazards
 - Stage 4: Identify other plans and strategies that may give rise to combined effects
 - Stage 5: Determine potential significant effects
 - Stage 6: Assess need for additional Appropriate Assessment stages
 - Stage 7: Consultation
- 5.6.6 The Scoping Report includes stages 1-4 of the screening exercise. Stages 5-7 can only be undertaken in relation to a specific plan or proposal and are included in this report.
- 5.6.7 Appendix 3 of this report contains the results of the screening exercise. If a likely significant effect is identified on any of the sites in terms of any potential hazards, a full appropriate assessment will be required. This will be produced as a separate document.
- 5.6.8 Appropriate consultation on Habitat Regulations screening assessments will cover the following (unless there is a clear reason not to, for instance if a plan has a very limited scope and is highly unlikely to have any relationship with the identified sites):
- Natural England (consulted on SA reports in any case);

¹⁷ More information on the EU Habitats Directive can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/habitatsdirective/index_en.htm

¹⁸ The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 can be found at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made>

¹⁹ An interactive map of Natura 2000 sites can be accessed at <http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/biodiversity/interactive/natura-2000-european-protected-areas>

²⁰ An interactive map of Ramsar sites can be accessed at [https://rsis.ramsar.org/rsi-search/?f\[0\]=regionCountry_en_ss%3AUnited+Kingdom](https://rsis.ramsar.org/rsi-search/?f[0]=regionCountry_en_ss%3AUnited+Kingdom)

- Any wildlife trust within whose area one of the sites assessed falls (in the case of the sites identified here that would mean Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, Surrey Wildlife Trust and Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust);
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds;
- Plantlife; and
- Buglife.

5.6.9 More detail can be found in section 7 of the Scoping Report.

5.7 Incorporating Equality Impact Assessment

- 5.7.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EqulA) is a tool for identifying the potential impact of a council's policies, services and functions on its residents and staff. This process is a legal requirement, under a number of acts and focuses on how a policy or function will affect people from different groups or individuals in particular with regard to race, gender, disability, sexual orientation, age or religious belief (the 'equality strands').
- 5.7.2 Reading Borough Council has a clear process for meeting the requirements of undertaking EqulAs. The following sequential stages are required, where relevant:
- *Equality Relevance Test* - to identify whether policies being assessed have a relevance to the equality duties
 - *Stage 1* - Initial Screening or Desktop Exercise to ascertain whether a partial or full assessment is required
 - *Stage 2* - Partial Impact Assessment will be necessary if the initial screening identifies a differential negative impact on any of the groups. If the outcome highlights real concerns then a stage 3 assessment will be required.
 - *Stage 3* - Full Impact Assessment is carried out to investigate where there is an adverse impact and the EqulA will address how to reverse the impact.
 - *Equality Impact Assessment Report* - A report summarising the findings and required actions resulting from the assessments under stages 1-3
- 5.7.3 The Council has decided to incorporate the Equality Relevance Test and Stage 1 of the process, i.e. the initial screening or desktop exercise, within the sustainability appraisal. Appraisal against Objective 16 ("Avoid significant negative effects on groups or individuals with regard to race, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation") fulfils the requirement to carry out an Equality Relevance Test and a Stage 1 Initial Screening Stage, and would highlight whether a full Equality Impact Assessment is required. A full assessment, if required, would need to be a separate document.
- 5.7.4 The Equality Relevance Test involves asking three questions and deciding on an overall level of relevance - low, medium or high. Where the relevance is low, no further assessment is required. Where relevance is medium or high, the process moves onto Stage 1, the initial screening.
- 5.7.5 Stage 1 is based around the completion of a pro-forma that leads to an overall conclusion of whether or not there is likely to be an adverse impact as a result of a policy or proposal, and whether this adverse impact can be justified.
- 5.7.6 Completed Stage 1 pro-formas can be found in Appendix 4 of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options.

5.7.7 If an adverse impact cannot be justified, the process moves on to a Stage 2 partial impact assessment, which will need to be taken as a subsequent exercise to sustainability appraisal.

5.7.6 More information about the Equality Impact Assessment methodology can be found in section 8 of the Scoping Report.

5.8 Task A5 - Consulting the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal report

5.8.1 In November 2013, a consultation paper on proposed changes to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was published. This included all three of the statutory bodies²¹, along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.

5.8.1 A number of changes were made to the report as a result of consultation responses and are set out in more detail in the Report of Consultation, available on the Council's website. Appendix 4 of the Scoping Report contains a tracked changes version of the sustainability objectives to show the changes that were made after consultation.

5.9 Stage B: Developing and Refining Alternatives and Assessing Effects

5.9.1 Stage B of the Sustainability Appraisal process consists of the following:

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

5.10 Task B1 - Testing the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework

5.10.1 During the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan, each objective is considered against the sustainability appraisal framework. This helps to highlight tensions between different objectives.

5.10.2 The compatibility assessment confirms general consistencies between the two sets of objectives.

5.10.3 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 are necessarily addressed by other policies in the plan.

²¹ Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency

5.11 Task B2 - Developing the Local Plan Options including reasonable alternatives

- 5.11.1 The options for the Local Plan are those set out in Appendix 2. The Issues and Options Report provides some commentary on how many of the options have been derived.
- 5.11.2 For each policy or site allocation, a range of alternative options have been identified and appraised. Although not an absolute requirement, the guidance on undertaking Sustainability Appraisals notes that a 'no plan/no policy' and a 'business as usual' option offer a good basis for appraising effects. There are therefore options for every policy or site that equate to these. Generally, 'no policy' is taken to mean no Local Plan policy or no allocation for the site, whilst 'business as usual' means that an equivalent Local Plan policy or allocation, if any exists, would be carried forward.
- 5.11.3 Alongside 'no policy' and 'business as usual,' any use for a development site which has been nominated during consultation is also assessed. Finally, a range of other reasonable alternatives are assessed. These differ from policy to policy, or site to site. For instance, where a policy sets a threshold, alternative thresholds may be assessed. In the case of sites, alternative options will depend on the location, site size and constraints, but should cover all of the reasonable potential alternative uses of each site.
- 5.11.4 As previously stated, it is important to ensure that alternatives are reasonable. There is little point in appraising a policy approach if it would be out of conformity with the Local Plan and therefore unsound. For this reason, alternative options are limited to those which would be appropriate given the existing policy context.

5.12 Task B3 - Evaluating the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives

- 5.12.1 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 is assessed in turn against the 20 sustainability objectives. This can be found in Appendix 2.
- 5.12.2 The potential options on each site have been appraised according to their predicted impact on the sustainability objectives using the criteria below:

✓✓	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

- 5.12.3 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, and the analysis that has gone into those objectives is set out in Scoping Report Appendix 3 and 4. These

assessments identified a number of options where a full assessment would need to be carried out were the option to be taken forward in the Local Plan.

- 5.12.4 For each appraisal, a written commentary has been included to explain and justify the scoring. However, commentary has only been included where it is required to explain or clarify the scoring, and where it might not otherwise be clear. Neutral effects have not generally been discussed in the commentary.

5.13 Task B4 - Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

- 5.13.1 The stage involves considering measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing the Local Plan, in the form of mitigation measures. Each site and policy appraisal considers and identifies potential mitigation where appropriate. Each table in Appendix 2 contains a short discussion on mitigation.

5.14 Task B5 - Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

- 5.14.1 This stage recognises the value of monitoring, in terms of testing the actual significant effects of implementation against those in the Sustainability Appraisal. The proposed mitigation measures (B4) include some recommendations as to how the significant effects could be monitored and it is anticipated that these preliminary proposals for monitoring would continue to be developed and outlined.

5.15 Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

- 5.15.1 This report forms the main output of Stage C.

5.16 Stage D: Seeking representations on the Sustainability Appraisal Report from consultation bodies and the public

- 5.16.1 Public consultation will take place for a minimum of six weeks following the publication of this document. This is a significant consultation exercise including all three of the statutory bodies²², along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.

- 5.16.2 If, after consultation, it is felt that significant changes are required to the Local Plan, it will be necessary to produce a new Local Plan Draft document and revise this Sustainability Appraisal. If the Inspector's binding report requires that significant changes be made following the examination, an appraisal of these changes will be carried out.

5.17 Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

- 5.17.1 Stage E of the Sustainability Appraisal process consists of the following and will occur after adoption of the Local Plan:

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

²² Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

5.18 Task E1 - Preparing and publishing post-adoption statement

- 5.18.1 Following adoption of the Local Plan, a post-adoption statement will be prepared and published. This will outline how environmental considerations have been integrated into the Local Plan, how opinions expressed during public consultation have been taken into account, the reasons for choosing the plan as adopted and the measures that are to be taken in order to monitor the significant effects of implementation.

5.19 Task E2 - Monitoring significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

- 5.19.1 Monitoring the success of policies should help to provide an indication of whether the significant effects predicted as part of the SA are consistent with actual effects, once the plan is being implemented. As such, monitoring will facilitate an assessment as to whether the predictions of the sustainability appraisal were accurate, whether the plan is contributing towards the achievement of the desired sustainability objectives and whether the mitigation measures are performing as well as expected. This is a valuable process, as it will help in ensuring that any problems arising during implementation of the Local Plan can be identified, and future predictions made more accurately.

- 5.19.1 Generally, monitoring of policies will be presented in the Annual Monitoring Report, based on the indicators and using the data sources identified. This monitoring and review will be essential to the successful delivery of the objectives and policies, and will function as an important feedback mechanism to assess performance, identify unforeseen circumstances and enable adjustments and revisions to be made, if necessary.

5.20 Task E3 - Responding to adverse effects

- 5.20.1 Monitoring the significant effects of the implementation of the Local Plan will identify, at an early stage, any unforeseen impacts of implementation, allowing appropriate remedial action to be taken.

6.0 Significant Sustainability Implications

- 6.0.1 The following section contains a summary illustrating the key sustainability effects associated with the options. More detail on the effects is available in Appendix 2.
- 6.0.2 The predicted significant effects of the policies in the Local Plan were mostly positive.
- 6.0.3 For site allocations, by far the majority of significant sustainability effects are positive. A number of the sites have significant positive effects in making the best use of previously-developed land (4) and provision of housing (13).
- 6.0.4 The only significant negative effects are related to allocated development sites where development would be located in the floodplain or Air Quality Management Area, would have an effect on education or healthcare facilities or would mean a loss of greenfield land. In general, the Local Plan provides the policy context for successfully mitigating these effects and allocation policies highlight matters which would need to be addressed in planning applications. More detail on flooding issues is available on the Council's website.

7.0 Consultation

- 7.0.1 This Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan has been published for public consultation, alongside the Local Plan document itself. This is a significant consultation exercise, including all three of the statutory bodies²³, along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.
- 7.0.2 Your representations on the Sustainability Appraisal are welcomed. Please send any comments by 5:00pm on 14 June 2017.

LDF@reading.gov.uk

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

²³ Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

- Department for Communities and Local Government (2015), **Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal**
- GL Hearn Limited (2016), **Berkshire (including South Bucks) Strategic Housing Market Assessment**
- Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (2016), **Central Berkshire FEMA Economic Development Needs Assessment**
- Reading Borough Council (2008, amended 2015), **Core Strategy**
- Reading Borough Council (2009), **Reading Central Area Action Plan**
- Reading Borough Council (2012), **Proposals Map**
- Reading Borough Council (2012, altered 2015), **Sites and Detailed Policies**
- Reading Borough Council (2014), **Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report**
- Reading Borough Council (2014), **Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report**
- Reading Borough Council (2015), **Annual Monitoring Report**
- Reading Borough Council (2016), **Consultation on Issues and Options**
- Reading Borough Council (2016), **Statement of Consultation on Issues and Options**
- Reading Borough Council (2016), **Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options**
- Reading Borough Council (amended 2016), **Local Development Scheme**
- The European Commission (2007), **Guidance document on the strict protection of animal species of community interest under the 'Habitats' Directive**
- The European Commission (2008), **Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment**

Matrix of Key Sustainability Effects

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CC1: Presumption is favour of sustainable development													✓✓					✓✓		
CC2: Sustainable design and construction																				
CC3: Adaptation to climate change		✓✓				✓✓	✓✓													
CC4: Decentralised energy	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓			✓✓	✓✓													
CC5: Waste minimisation					✓✓															
CC6: Accessibility and the intensity of development														✓✓						
CC7: Design and the public realm									✓✓											
CC8: Safeguarding amenity																				
CC9: Securing infrastructure													✓✓					✓✓		
EN1: Protection and enhancement of the historic environment										✓✓										
EN2: Area of archaeological significance										✓✓										
EN3: Enhancement of conservation areas										✓✓										
EN4: Locally important heritage assets										✓✓										
EN5: Protection of key views and vistas																				
EN6: New Development in a Historic Context																				
EN7: Local green space and Public Open Space																	✓✓			
EN8: Undesignated open space											✓✓						✓✓			
EN9: Provision of new open space																				
EN10: Access to open space									✓✓		✓✓			✓✓			✓✓			
EN11: Waterspaces		✓✓					✓✓		✓✓	✓✓	✓✓						✓✓			
EN12: Biodiversity and green network				✓✓			✓✓		✓✓											
EN13: Major landscape features and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty									✓✓											
EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands							✓✓		✓✓											
EN15: Air quality	✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓				✓✓									
EN16: Pollution and water resources						✓✓														
EN17: Flooding																				
EM1: Provision of employment development																		✓✓		

EM2: Location of employment development				✓✓										✓✓					
EM3: Loss of employment land																	✓✓		
EM4: Maintaining a variety of premises																	✓✓		
H1: Provision of housing																			
H2: Density and mix													✓✓						
H3: Affordable housing													✓✓					✓✓	
H4: Standards for new housing													✓✓						
H5: Accommodation for vulnerable people																			
H6: Protecting the existing housing stock																			
H7: Residential conversions																			
H8: House extensions and ancillary accommodation																			
H9: Private and communal outdoor space																			
H10: Development of private residential gardens																			
H11: Student accommodation																			
H12: Provision for gypsies and travellers																			
H13: Suburban regeneration and renewal																			
TR1: Achieving the transport strategy														✓✓					
TR2: Major Transport Projects														✓✓					
TR3: Access, traffic and highway-related matters														✓✓					
TR4: Cycle routes and facilities														✓✓					
TR5: Car and cycle parking														✓✓					
RL1: Network and hierarchy of centres														✓✓					
RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development														✓✓		✓✓	✓✓		
RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres														✓✓					
RL4: Betting shops and pay-day loan companies																		✓✓	
RL5: Impact of town centre uses																			
RL6: Protection of leisure facilities and public houses											✓✓					✓✓			
OU1: New and existing community facilities																			
OU2: Hazardous installations											✓✓								

OU3: Telecommunications								✓✓	✓✓										
OU4: Advertisements								✓✓											
OU5: Shopfronts and Cash Machines									✓✓	✓✓									
CR1: Definition of Central Reading																			
CR2: Design in Central Reading									✓✓										
CR3: Public realm in Central Reading																	✓✓		
CR4: Leisure, culture and tourism in Central Reading																	✓✓		
CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading																	✓✓		
CR6: Living in Central Reading												✓✓	✓✓						
CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading																			
CR8: Small shop units in Central Reading																			
CR9: Terraced housing in Central Reading										✓✓									
CR10: Tall buildings												✓✓					✓✓		
CR11: Development in the station/river Major Opportunity Area												✓✓							
CR11a: Friar St and Station Rd				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓				✓✓		
CR11b: Greyfriars Rd Corner												✓✓	✓✓						
CR11c: Station Hill and Friars Walk				✓✓					✓✓			✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓	
CR11d: Brunel Arcade and Apex Plaza				✓✓					✓✓			✓✓	✓✓					✓✓	
CR11e: North of Station				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓	
CR11f: West of Caversham Rd				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓	
CR11g: Riverside				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓						
CR11h: Napier Rd Junction				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓						
CR11i: Napier Court				✓✓							XX	✓✓							
CR12: Development in the west side Major Opportunity Area												✓✓					✓✓		
CR12a: Cattle Market				✓✓							XX	✓✓							
CR12b: Great Knollys St and Weldale St				✓✓							XX	✓✓	✓✓					XX	
CR12c: Chatham St, Eaton Place and Oxford Rd				✓✓					✓✓			✓✓	✓✓						
CR12d: Broad St Mall				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓				✓✓		
CR12e: Hosier St				✓✓									✓✓						

CR13: Development in the east side Major Opportunity Area														✓✓					✓✓		
CR13a: Reading Prison									✓✓									✓✓	✓✓		
CR13b: Forbury Retail Park				✓✓							XX			✓✓	✓✓						
CR13c: Kenavon Dr and Forbury Business Park				✓✓										✓✓	✓✓						
CR13d: Gas Holder				✓✓										✓✓	✓✓						
CR14a: Central Swimming Pool, Battle St				✓✓										✓✓	✓✓						
CR14b: Former Reading Family Centre, North St																					
CR14c: 17-23 Queen Victoria St															✓✓						
CR14d: 173-175 Friar St and 27-32 Market Place																					
CR14e: 3-10 Market Place, Abbey Hall and Abbey Square								✓✓	✓✓												
CR14f: 1-5 King St				✓✓				✓✓	✓✓					✓✓	✓✓						
CR14g: The Oracle Extension, Bridge St and Letcombe St															✓✓						
CR14h: Central Club, London St		XX													✓✓						
CR14i: Enterprise House 89-97 London St														✓✓							
CR14j: Corner of Crown St and Southampton St				✓✓				✓✓						✓✓	✓✓						
CR14k: Corner of Crown St and Silver St				✓✓				✓✓						✓✓	✓✓						
CR14l: 187-189 Kings Rd				✓✓										✓✓	✓✓						
CR14m: Caversham Lock Island and Caversham Weir, Thames side																		✓✓			
CR15: Abbey quarter									✓✓												
SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area																			✓✓		
SR1a: Former Land Fill, Island Rd				✓✓		XX												✓✓	✓✓		
SR1b: North of Island Rd				✓✓															✓✓		
SR1c: Island Rd A33 Frontage																			✓✓	✓✓	
SR2: Land north of Manor Farm Rd Major Opportunity Area				✓✓										✓✓							
SR3: South of Elgar Road Major Opportunity Area														✓✓							
SR4a: Pulleyn Park, Rose Kiln Ln				✓✓										✓✓							
SR4b: Rear of Newcastle Rd																					

SR4c: 169-173 Basingstoke Rd													✓✓						
SR4d: 16-18 Bennet Rd																	✓✓		
SR4e: Part of Former Berkshire Brewery site				✓✓													✓✓		
SR4f: Land south west of Junction 11 of the M4																			
SR5: Leisure and Recreation use of the Kennetside Areas																			
WR1: Dee Park				✓✓				✓✓					✓✓						
WR2: Park Lane Primary School, The Laurels and Downing Road				XX									✓✓	✓✓					✓✓
WR3a: Former Cox and Wyman Site, Cardiff Rd				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓					
WR3b: 2 Ross Rd and part of Meadow Rd													✓✓						
WR3c: 28-30 Richfield Ave		XX																	
WR3d: Rivermead Leisure Centre, Richfield Ave																	✓✓		
WR3e: Yeomanry House, Castle Hill																			
WR3f: Junction of Berkeley Avenue and St Saviours Rd																			
WR3g: 211-221 Oxford Rd, 10 and rear of 8 Prospect St														✓✓					
WR3h: Rear of 303-315 Oxford Rd				✓✓															
WR3i: Part of Former Battle Hospital, Portman Rd				✓✓				✓✓		XX			✓✓						
WR3j: Land at Moultsford Mews																			
WR3k: 784-794 Oxford Rd																			
WR3l: 816 Oxford Rd																			
WR3m: 103 Dee Rd										✓✓									
WR3n: Amethyst Ln																			
WR3o: The Meadway Centre, Honey End Lane								✓✓						✓✓	✓✓				
WR3p: Alice Burrows Home, Dwyer Rd				✓✓															
WR3q: Norcot Community Centre, Lyndhurst Rd																			
WR3r: Charters Car Sales, Oxford Rd																			
WR3s: Land at Kentwood Hill				XX															
WR3t: Land at Armour Hill				XX															
CA1a: Reading University Boat Club, Thames Promenade																			

CA1b: Part of Reading Golf Course, Kidmore End Road				XX									✓✓						
CA1c: Land at Lowfield Rd				✓✓															
CA1d: Rear of 200-214 Henley Rd, 12-24 All Hallows Rd and 4, 7 & 8 of Copse Ave													✓✓						
CA1e: Rear of 13-14A Hawthorne Rd 282-292 Henley Rd																			
CA1f: Rear of 1 & 3 Woodcote Rd and 21 St Peters Hill																			
CA2: Caversham Park																			
ER1a: The Woodley Arms PH, Waldeck St																			
ER1b: Dingley House, 3-5 Craven Rd																			
ER1c: Land Rear of 8-26 Redlands Rd																			
ER1d: Land Adjacent to 40 Redlands Rd													✓✓						
ER1e: St Patricks Hall, Northcourt Ave																			
ER1f: Hamilton Centre, Bulmershe Rd													✓✓						
ER1g: Alexander House, Kings Rd																			
ER1h: Arthur Hill Swimming Pool, 221-225 Kings Rd																			
ER1i: 261-275 London Rd																			
ER1j: Palmer Park Stadium Area																✓✓			
ER1k: 131 Wokingham Rd																			
ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading																	✓✓		✓✓
ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital											✓✓								

7.0 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, including reducing its effects on, and adapting to, climate change;	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, including walking and cycling;	Offer outstanding cultural opportunities, which are based on multiculturalism, local heritage and high quality, modern arts and leisure facilities;	Ensure that Reading is a highly socially-inclusive community 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
0	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.

CC1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE 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
CC1(i) *	No policy	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	0	XX	?X	?X	0	?X	XX	?X	?X
CC1(ii) ▼	Presumption in favour of sustainable development	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓

COMMENTS:

CC1(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would render the plan unsound. A presumption in favour of sustainable development has become a requirement under the NPPF. The aim of this policy is encourage responsible growth. It would result in development that improves economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Omission of such a policy would have a tendency to negatively affect almost every sustainability objective. Irresponsible growth would harm CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), the historic environment (10), health (11), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), leisure/recreation (17), inequality (19) and education (20). Because the policy includes a positive approach whereby applications are approved wherever possible, the omission of this policy could bring significant negative effects with regard to delivering needed housing (13) and economic growth (18).

CC1(ii): Presumption in favour of sustainable development

A presumption in favour of development seeks to strike a balance between the need for growth and environmental, social and economic sustainability. The presumption requires that development be approved without delay if it does not compromise the key principles of sustainability. This could bring significant positive effects in terms of housing delivery (13) and economic growth (18). Sustainability effects would tend to be positive with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), historic environment (10), health (11), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), leisure/recreation (17), inequality (19) and education (20).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options. MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.																					

CC2: SUSTAINABLE 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
CC2(i) *	No policy	XX	XX	XX	0	?X	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC2(ii) ▼	Business as usual (require all major dev. achieve 50% BREEAM excellent)	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC2(iii)	Require all major non-residential development to meet 100% BREEAM excellent, minor 'very good' as a minimum	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>CC2(i): No policy</u> A ‘no policy’ option would fail to require developments to conserve water and energy, reduce emissions, source materials responsibly and manage construction waste. With so much development expected throughout the plan period, this would bring significant negative effects with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), and natural resource use (3). Other negative effects would occur in relation to waste (5), pollution (6) and wildlife and the natural environment (7) since BREEAM standards require developers to mitigate nearby ecological impacts.																					
<u>CC2(ii): Business as usual (require all major dev. achieve 50% BREEAM ‘excellent’)</u> This option continues the current policy which requires of all major development that 50% of the provision achieve BREEAM ‘excellent.’ This would continue to bring some positive benefits, but not to the extent of option (iii). A tendency towards positive effects would occur with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), waste (5), pollution (6) and wildlife (7).																					
<u>CC2(iii): Require all major non-residential development to meet 100% BREEAM excellent, minor ‘very good’ as a minimum</u> This option would bring the most positive sustainability effects with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), waste (5), pollution (6) and wildlife (7). Both positive and negative effects would occur with regard to economic development. On one hand, environmentally-friendly units may attract investment and business. On the other, it may present additional costs for types of development that have difficulty achieving the standard, such as schools and some industrial or warehouse units. These possible negative effects will be mitigated by language in the policy that requires an ‘excellent’ standard “where possible.”																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: For a number of uses, including offices, the requirement for BREEAM ‘excellent’ ratings is unlikely to significantly affect viability. In cases where some types of development may find it difficult to meet these standards, developments will have the opportunity to demonstrate that the highest possible standard is being achieved in lieu of an ‘excellent’ rating.																					

CC3: ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

		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
CC3(i) *	No policy	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CC3(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (SDPD DM1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
CC3(iii)	Continue current policy with additional SuDS detail	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would rely on CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction. Thus, this option would still bring a tendency towards positive effects, but these impacts would not be as positive as they could be, since CC2 lacks detail on elements such as adaptation to climate change. Positive effects would still occur in areas covered by BREEAM assessments, such as CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), waste (5), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), health (11) and sustainable transport (14). More positive effects may occur in relation to housing provision (13) and economic growth (18) as the lack of regulation can sometimes spur growth or enable it to occur more quickly.

CC3(ii): Continue with current policy (SDPD DM1)

This option would more clearly address climate change adaptation and bring more significant positive effects, although not as significant as option (ii). A tendency toward positive effects would occur in relation to health (11), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14) and economic growth (18). Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), waste (5), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7).

CC3(iii): Continue current policy with additional SuDS detail

The effects of this option are similar to that of option (ii), but are more pronounced. Additional detail regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems would increase positive sustainability effects by preventing harmful water runoff that can increase pollution and contribute to flooding during extreme weather events. This additional detail leads to significant positive effects with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7).

Conclusion

		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>Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

CC4: DECENTRALISED ENERGY

		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
CC4(i) *	No policy	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CC4(ii) ▼	Business as usual (SDPD DM2)	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓	0
CC4(iii)	Require decentralised energy only on non-residential sites of 1000 sq. m or more	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC4(i): No policy

This option would mean reliance on policy CC2 and national policy. This option would have a number of positive impacts across a range of objectives, but these impacts would not be as positive as they could be, since CC1 lacks detail on when decentralised energy should be considered. There would be a tendency towards positive effects in terms of the issues covered by CC2, which refers to energy efficient design measures including the use of CHP, such as reducing CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7). More positive effects may occur in relation to housing provision (13) and economic growth (18) as the lack of regulation can sometimes spur growth or enable it to occur more quickly.

CC4(ii): Business as usual (SDPD DM2)

This option would bring many of the same positive effects as option (i) and (iii), but the positive effects would be more pronounced in terms of CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7). Positive effects in terms of housing (13) and economic growth (18) would be less pronounced.

CC4(iii): Require decentralised energy only on non-residential sites of 1000 sq. m or more

This option would completely defer residential energy standards to the building regulations and would only apply to non-residential. Thus, positive effects would be less pronounced because requirements would only apply to non-residential development. Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7). Economic growth (18) would see a tendency towards positive effects.

		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>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

CC5: WASTE MINIMISATION

		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
CC5(i) *	No policy	0	?X	?X	?X	XX	?X	?X	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC5(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS2)	0	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC5(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would rely on European policy and legislation (e.g. Landfill Directive) along with national policy, but fails to provide detail regarding waste minimisation in development design, construction and demolition. This would bring a tendency towards negative effects with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7) and landscape character (9). Significant negative effects would occur with regard to minimising the generation of waste and promoting sustainable approaches to waste management (5).

CC5(ii): Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS2)

Continuing with the current policy would provide more detail with regard to minimising and promoting sustainable approaches to waste (5) and yield significant positive effects. Moderate positive effects would occur in relation to adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), natural environment (7) and landscape character (9) since waste often requires land, emits pollution or has negative impacts on amenity.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

CC6: ACCESSIBILITY AND THE INTENSITY OF 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
CC6(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	X	0	?X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	XX	X	X	0	0	0	0
CC6(ii) ▼	Scale and density must relate to accessibility	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC6(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in large scale, high density development in inaccessible locations. This would bring negative sustainability effects, most significantly in terms of sustainable transport (14). By decreasing access to sustainable transport, negative effects would also occur with relation to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), pollution (6) and health (11). By failing to encourage high densities at transport hubs, a 'no policy' option may encourage building on undeveloped land (4). Poorly located development would increase travel times to essential services and facilities (15).

CC6(ii): Scale and density must relate to accessibility

This option would ensure that the highest density developments would occur near public transport hubs. This would decrease use of the car bringing significant positive effects in terms of sustainable transport (14) and a tendency towards positive effects with regard to natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4) and pollution (6). Health (11) would be positively impacted through the encouragement of active transport, such as walking and cycling, and improved air quality with reduced CO₂ emissions (1). With travel times reduced, facilities would be more accessible (15). This option would bring positive effects with regard to equality (16), since locating residents in accessible locations can improve accessibility and quality of life for individuals with disabilities and older residents.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified, but not within the proposed option.

		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
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.																					

CC7: DESIGN AND THE PUBLIC REALM

		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
CC7(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
CC7(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC7(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to address design considerations and result in inappropriate or unattractive development. This would bring negative effects with regard to the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), historic environment (10), crime and community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14) and economic growth (18).

CC7(ii): Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS7)

This option would continue the current policy, requiring development to enhance the character and appearance of its area. This policy ensures that development proposals include provision of green spaces and landscaping and would bring positive effects to the natural environment (7). It also ensures that development protect and enhance the historic environment (10) and create safe and accessible environments where crime does not undermine community cohesion (12). Attractive environments can encourage walking and other sustainable modes of transport (11, 14), as well as spur economic growth (18). The most significant positive sustainability effect would occur with regard to townscape character (9).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

CC8: SAFEGUARDING AMENITY

		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
CC8(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC8(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (SDPD DM4)	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC8(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to ensure that new development does not reduce the quality of the environment for nearby residents. This may result in smaller employment uses locating within residential neighbourhoods and bringing negative effects, such as noise, air pollution, loss of privacy or visual dominance. This would result in negative effects with regard to pollution (6), townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12), housing (13) and sustainable transport (14).

CC8(ii): Continue current policy (SDPD DM4)

The current policy allows for some smaller employment uses in residential areas, provided that amenity requirements are met. This would ensure that existing residential properties retain an acceptable living environment, which is a key element of high quality of life. With so much development expected throughout the plan period, this policy strikes a balance between allowing growth and protecting amenity. It would bring positive effects with regard to pollution (6) and sustainable transport (14) by limiting HGV traffic, noise and disturbance. This would improve townscape character (9), as well. Human health (11), Community cohesion (12) and housing quality (13) would be positively affected by improved living environments, access to sunlight and privacy. Economic growth and employment (18) may see mixed effects. This policy could negatively affect businesses wishing to locate in residential areas, but it could also drive development to more appropriate, sustainable out of centre locations and bring positive effects.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups 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
MITIGATION: In the event that smaller employment uses are unable to locate in residential areas due to amenity concerns, a sufficient amount of other more suitable sites will be made available.																					

CC9: SECURING 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
CC9(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	X	X	XX	X	X	0	X	XX	0	X
CC9(ii) ▼	Continue with existing priorities (SDPD DM3, Core Strategy CS9, CS13, CS32)	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓
CC9 (iii)	New policy with additional priorities	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?X	?✓	?X	?X	?X	0	?✓	?X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CC9(i): No policy

The omission of an infrastructure policy would fail to deliver the infrastructure needed to support growth throughout the plan period. Without a policy, there will be negative effects with regard to most sustainability objectives, including CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape/townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), recreation/leisure/culture (17) and education (20). The most significant effects would occur with regard to housing provision (13) and economic growth (18) as strategic infrastructure is critical to achieving both objectives.

CC9(ii): Continue with existing priorities (SDPD DM3, Core Strategy CS9, CS13, CS32)

This option aims to deliver needed infrastructure within a range of limited priorities. Each infrastructure category is assigned a priority level, with the highest priority given to those infrastructure types that are critical to delivering economic and residential growth, such as transport and education. Prioritising the most critical infrastructure needs helps to ensure that the most needed areas are not neglected. Existing priority for transport would bring positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), pollution (6) and sustainable transport (14) by encouraging sustainable modes and providing capacity near new development. Landscape and townscape character (9) would also improve by prioritising green space, public realm enhancements and street care. The most significant positive effects would occur with regard to housing provision (13) and economic growth (18). Providing the needed infrastructure would support new residential building by connecting residents to facilities and encourage business in Reading by strengthening transport links, employment skills initiatives and quality of life.

		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>CC9(iii): New policy with additional priorities</u> This option expands the range of infrastructure priorities. This may broaden the type of infrastructure provided and would ensure some provision, but it would likely lead to neglect of highest priority projects in a context of limited resources. A wider range of priorities would result in greater competition for limited funding which may reduce the level of provision achieved, e.g. affordable housing or education provision. A tendency toward negative effects would occur in relation to the highest priority infrastructure categories: health access (11), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), economic growth (18) and education (20). Other priorities would still see a tendency towards positive sustainability effects: CO ₂ emission (1), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape/townscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and recreation/leisure/culture (17).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified with the preferred option.																					

EN1: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

		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
EN1(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0
EN2(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS 33)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
EN3(iii)	New policy providing more detail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN1(i): No policy

The omission of a policy establishing protection and enhancement of the historic environment leave the town's historic assets vulnerable to degradation. The NPPF states that local authorities must set forth strategies to proactively protect and enhance the historic environment. Not doing so would negatively affect the historic environment significantly. Because heritage assets contribute positively to the achievement of other sustainability objectives, omission of a protection policy would result in negative effects with regard to townscape character (9), culture (17) and economic growth (18).

EN1(ii): Continue with current policy (Core Strategy CS33)

The current core strategy policy generally protects and seeks enhancement of heritage assets including listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, locally listed buildings and their settings. While the policy would result in positive sustainability effects, it does not go far enough to illustrate a proactive strategy to protect and enhance the historic environment. This option would bring a tendency towards positive benefits with regard to townscape character (9), culture (17) and economic growth (18) while bringing moderate positive effects to the historic environment itself (10).

EN1(iii): New policy providing more detail

This option largely reflects the same themes as the current policy, but provides more detail. Subsequent policies expound upon these efforts and provide detailed protection and enhancement policies for different kinds of assets. This would increase the significance of positive effects. Significant positive effects would occur with regard to the historic environment itself (10), while related positive effects would occur in relation to townscape character (9), culture (17) and 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>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN2: AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

		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
EN2(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0
EN2(ii) ▼	Business as usual (no separate policy, but mentioned in EN1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0
EN2(iii)	New policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN2(i): No policy

This option would fail to protect areas of archaeological importance. This would lead to significant negative effects with regard to the historic environment (10). Because archaeological surveys often increase the cost of development or cause delays, there may be some effect on housing provision (13) or economic growth (18), but these are unclear. Negative effects to the historic environment far outweigh housing or economic concerns with this option.

EN2(ii): Business as usual (no separate policy, but mentioned in EN1)

This option would defer to the current Core Strategy policy CS33 (similar to EN1) which ensures protection of “features of archaeological importance.” This would provide some protection, but does not go as far as option (iii) which includes a separate policy providing detail specific to archaeological assets. This would bring a tendency towards positive effects with regard to the historic environment (10). Again, there may be unclear effects on housing provision (13) and economic development (18).

EN2(iii): New policy

This option would result in the highest amount of protection for areas of archaeological significance by providing detailed requirements specific to this type of heritage asset. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to the historic environment (10). Again, there may be some effect on housing provision (13) and economic development (18). On one hand, archaeological investigations may hinder development by delaying construction or increasing costs. On the other, valuing heritage assets including sites of archaeological significance, can contribute to place-making and spur economic growth (18) and a sense of 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
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN3: ENHANCEMENT OF CONSERVATION AREAS

		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
EN3(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	XX	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN3(ii) ▼	Continue with current policies (no separate policy, mentioned in EN1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN3(iii)	New policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in further degradation and loss of character in the Borough's Conservation Areas. This would result in negative sustainability effects with regard to townscape character (9) and significant negative effects with regard to the historic environment (10). Many Conservation Areas are experiencing a loss of character as a result of HMO development. On one hand, HMOs help to meet the need for flexible, affordable housing in the borough. On the other, they can result in loss of character in historic areas. Thus, housing (13) effects are unclear.

EN3(ii): Continue with current policy (no separate policy, CAs mentioned in EN1)

This option would rely on EN1 (broadly equivalent to Core Strategy CS 33). This would grant cursory protection to Conservation Area simply as a type of heritage asset. Thus, some level of protection would be extended to Conservation Areas, but not to the level of detail in option (iii). This would result in a tendency towards positive benefits with regards to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Again, effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.

EN3(iii): New policy

A new policy would provide detailed guidance for development within Conservation Areas and seeks to reduce visual clutter, restore original features and promote the Conservation Areas to residents and visitors. This would bring more pronounced positive benefits than option (ii). Positive effects would occur with regard to townscape character (9) and significant positive effects would occur in relation to the historic environment itself (10). Again, effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.

		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>Conclusion Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN4: LOCALLY IMPORTANT HERITAGE ASSETS

		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
EN4(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	XX	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN4(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (no separate policy, mentioned in EN1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN4(iii)	New policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>EN4(i): No policy A 'no policy' option would likely result in further degradation or lack of recognition for local assets that are not listed by Historic England. This would result in negative sustainability effects with regard to townscape character (9) and significant negative effects with regard to the historic environment</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>(10). There is a possibility that local listing could affect housing provision, either positively or negatively. On one hand, valuing local assets could create a sense of place and help to contribute to a high quality of life. Negative effects would occur if too many assets were protected to such an extent that housing delivery was inhibited. Thus, housing (13) effects are unclear.</p> <p><u>EN4(ii): Continue with current policy (no separate policy, mentioned in EN1)</u> This option would rely on EN1 (broadly equivalent to Core Strategy CS 33). This would grant cursory protection to locally listed assets simply as a type of heritage asset. Thus, some level of protection would be extended to locally listed assets, but not to the level of detail in option (iii). This would result in a tendency towards positive benefits with regards to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Again, effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.</p> <p><u>EN4(iii): New policy</u> A new policy would provide detailed guidance for locally important heritage assets and seeks to establish criteria for inclusion and conserve character, significance and setting. This would bring more pronounced positive benefits than option (ii). Positive effects would occur with regard to townscape character (9) and significant positive effects would occur in relation to the historic environment itself (10). Again, effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN5: PROTECTION OF SIGNIFICANT VIEWS WITH A HERITAGE INTEREST

		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
EN5(i) *▼	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN5(ii)	New policy protecting specific views identified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN5(iii)	New policy protecting views generally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN5(i): No policy

This option would continue 'business as usual' and provide no special protection for views of acknowledged historical significance. Some views would still be considered during the determination of applications, based on existing landscape or tall buildings evidence, but these views are not necessarily historic. This would result in a tendency towards negative effects with regard to landscape and townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10).

EN5(ii): New policy protecting specific views identified

This option would extend protection to a limited number of specific views with acknowledged historical significance. Protected views would be stated in the policy and supported by a views assessment. This would result in positive sustainability effects with regard to landscape and townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Because the number of protected are limited, this should not unduly impede development.

EN5(iii): New policy protecting views generally

This option would extend protection to a much larger number of views and simply describe criteria for views worthy of protection. While it would bring positive benefits with regard to landscape and townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10), it may go too far in protecting large areas of the Borough and unnecessarily deter development. For this reason, there is a tendency towards negative effects with regard to housing provision.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

		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 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN6: NEW DEVELOPMENT IN A HISTORIC CONTEXT

		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
EN6(i) *▼	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN6(ii)	New policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN6(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would rely on cross-cutting design policies. This would require that development reflect the character of its setting, but does not mention heritage elements specifically. Thus, this would bring a tendency towards negative effects with regard to landscape/townscape character (9) and historic environment (10).

EN6(ii): New policy

This option would form an integral part of the Local Plan's efforts to develop a positive strategy for the historic environment. Rather than relying on cross-cutting design policies, this option would provide more detail specific to heritage and require that new development reflect existing historic character. This would bring positive sustainability effects in relation to landscape/townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Effects regarding housing provision (13) and economic growth (18) are unclear. On one hand, this policy could lead to negative effects if it were to hinder development by imposing additional considerations. On the other, requiring new development to reflect existing historic character would help to create a sense of place that can encourage housing and economic development.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

EN7: LOCAL GREEN SPACE AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

		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
EN7(i) *	No policy	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	?✓	X	0	0	X	0	0	0
EN7(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (no separate Local Green Space designation, similar to SDPD SA16)	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0
EN7(iii)	New policy with inclusion of Local Green Space designation	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	?✓	✓	?	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN7(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to protect important areas of public open space from loss or harmful development. This would bring many negative sustainability effects. Because public open space can encourage walking, cycling and sport, this would bring negative effects with regard to health (11), sustainable transport (14) and recreation, leisure and culture (17). Since much of the public space within the Borough is undeveloped, failure to protect these spaces would also bring negative effects in relation to adaptation to climate change (2) and use of greenfield land (4) and the natural environment (7). Finally, public spaces provide important roles in creating community cohesion (12) and attractive landscapes and townscape (9). The effect of a 'no policy' option on housing provision (13) may have a tendency for positive effects, since loss of public open space would make more land available for housing. The negative effects far outweigh this concern. Failing to protect key open spaces could mean a loss of space and increased reliance on the closest designated areas for recreation (8).

EN7(ii): Continue with current policy (no separate Local Green Space designation, similar to SDPD SA16)

This option would continue the current policy which protects a number of public open spaces, but has no special designation of local green space for spaces of particular merit deserving of Local Green Space protection outlined within the NPPF. This option would still bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), use of greenfield land (4), natural environment (7), landscape character (9), 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
	community cohesion (12) and sustainable transport (14). Positive effects would result in relation to recreation, leisure and culture (17). The effect of this option on housing (13) is unclear.																				
	<u>EN7(iii): New policy with inclusion of Local Green Space designation</u> This option would introduce Local Green Space designation according to the guidelines outlined the NPPF. This would bring more significant positive effects in terms of recreation, leisure and culture (17) by providing an additional level of protection to sites most deserving. Effects to the natural environment (7), landscape character (9) and community cohesion (12) would also be more pronounced than in option (ii). A tendency towards negative effects would occur with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), health (11) and sustainable transport (14). Effects on housing (13) are unclear.																				
	<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																				
	MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified. Care must be taken to ensure that a balance is struck between public open space protection and housing land availability.																				

EN8: UNDESIGNATED OPEN SPACE

		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
EN9(i) *	No policy	0	?X	0	XX	0	?X	XX	XX	XX	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0
EN9(ii)	Policy requiring retention open space	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
EN9(iii) ▼	Policy containing a presumption in favour of retention of open space, but allows for replacement provision in exceptional circumstances	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN9(i): No policy

The absence of a policy aiming to protect undesignated open space would carry a number of potential significant adverse effects in terms of undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7), character (9) and recreation (17). 'No policy' may negatively affect adaptation to climate change (2) and pollution (6). Failing to protect key open spaces could mean a loss of space and increased reliance on the closest designated areas for recreation (8). This option may positively affect housing provision (13) due to the constrained nature of RBC's boundaries and the limited amount of land available for residential development. All other effects are expected to be neutral.

EN9(ii): Policy requiring retention of open space

A policy requiring retention of open space would have potentially significant positive impacts in terms of undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7), character (9), health (11) and recreation (17). This policy would likely positively affect the objective with regard to pollution (6), while it may positively affect adaptation to climate change (2). This policy may have a tendency to negatively impact housing provision (13) if it prevented much needed residential development on much of the land in the Borough.

		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>EN9(iii): Policy containing a presumption in favour of retention of open space, but allows for replacement provision in exceptional circumstances</u> Many of the effects of this policy are similar to option (ii) while having less of a tendency to negatively impact housing provision (13). Positive effects with regard to undeveloped land (4) may be less positively significant because this policy would allow for replacement provision elsewhere in exceptional circumstances. This option aims to strike a balance between protection of undesignated open space and Reading's need for housing development.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it helps to reduce the tension between housing provision (13) and the benefits of open space by allowing replacement provision in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative effects as a result of loss of undesignated green space can be mitigated through adequate replacement of such spaces or improvements to existing spaces or sports and recreation facilities. This can be achieved through on-site provision or planning contributions.</p>																					

EN9: PROVISION ON NEW OPEN SPACE

		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
EN9(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	X	X	0	X	X	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	0
EN9(ii) ▼	Continue with current policies (CS29 and DM16)	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0
EN9(iii)	All development provide on-site provision	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0
EN9(iv)	All development fulfil requirement through contributions	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN9(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would result in a lack of provision of open space both at new major developments and existing areas with existing deficit of open space. This would bring negative effects with regard to landscape and townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12) and recreation, leisure and culture (17). A tendency towards negative effects would occur in relation to the natural environment (7), as public open space can often provide habitat for wildlife within the urban environment. Failing to provide open space in line with population growth will increase reliance on the closest designated areas for recreation (8). A tendency towards positive effects would occur in housing provision (13) since more land would be available for housing if open space provision was not required. The negative consequences of this policy option far outweigh any possible positive benefits with regard to housing.

EN9(ii): Continue with current policies (CS29 and DM16)

This option would continue to apply the current policy which requires developments of 50 or more dwellings or development in areas identified as deficient to provide open space on-site. Developments with less than 50 units in areas with proficient open space may meet this requirement through the use of appropriate planning contributions. This approach attempts to strike a balance between open space and housing provision. It would bring positive

		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>effects with regard to the natural environment (7), landscape and townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12) and recreation, leisure and culture (17). Housing provision (13) may see both positive and negative effects. On one hand, provision of open space may take up land that could be used for housing. On the other, open space provides an important contribution to quality of life for residents in housing developments.</p> <p><u>EN9(iii): All development provide on-site provision</u> This option would ensure open space provision at the expense of housing provision (13) and may affect viability. It would bring positive effects in terms of the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12) and recreation, leisure and culture (17), but it would have a tendency to negatively affect housing provision (13).</p> <p><u>EN9(iv): All development fulfil requirement through contributions</u> This option would allow all developments regardless of size to provide open space through planning contributions, rather than on-site provision. This would still result in positive benefits with regard to open space, but these effects would be less pronounced due to the constrained nature of land within the borough and limited ability of the Council to provide such spaces. A tendency towards positive effects would occur in relation to the natural environment (7), landscape and townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12) and recreation, leisure and culture (17). Effects on housing are unclear (13).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Care should be taken to ensure that a balance is struck between housing provision and open space. Open space should be provided to the extent that it does not negatively affect viability or housing delivery.</p>																			

EN10: ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE

		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
EN10(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	XX	0	XX	0	?✓	XX	0	0	XX	0	0	0
EN10(ii) ▼	Where possible, developments will improve links to existing open spaces	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	?X	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN10(i): No policy

The 'no policy' option would potentially have negative impacts in terms of character (9), health (11), sustainable transport (14) and recreation (17) as residents would have less access to existing open space. 'No policy' may bring both positive and negative effects for wildlife (7). In some cases, these links can also serve as green links for wildlife. Despite this positive effect, increased resident footfall to open spaces could decrease biodiversity value. Not requiring developers to provide access may free up more land and funding for housing provision (13). Thus, no policy may have a tendency to impact housing provision positively, but this is not certain. All other effects are expected to be neutral.

EN10(ii): Where possible, developments will improve links to existing open spaces

Requiring developers, where possible, to improve links to existing open spaces will potentially bring positive effects in terms of character (9), health (11), sustainable transport (14) and recreation (17) as residents would have increased access to existing open space. Requiring developers to provide access improvements may carry minor negative effects for housing provision (13) if access points or paths claim land or monies needed for housing provision. Regardless, the positive impacts far outweigh these concerns.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option, because it aims to increase public access for recreation, encourages walking and cycling, improves landscape character and promotes health lifestyles.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups 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
MITIGATION: Increased resident access to open space may erode wildlife habitat. Thus, site plans should carefully plan access in order to avoid wildlife disturbances. Site plans should also carefully plan how much land and funding is needed for access improvements as to not prevent much needed housing provision.																					

EN11: WATERSPACES

		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
EN11(i) *	No policy	0	XX	0	X	0	0	XX	0	XX	XX	X	0	0	?X	0	0	XX	0	0	0
EN11(ii)	Development should not harm the character of waterways	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?	0	0
EN11(iii) ▼	Development should not harm character and should enhance where possible, ensuring public access	0	✓✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN11(i): No policy

The 'no policy' option is likely to have negative effects with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7), landscape character (9), historic environment (10), health (11) and recreation (17). With regard to need to travel by car (14), neglecting waterspaces may have a tendency to impact this objective negatively, as waterside paths currently provide some of our best cycling and walking routes within the Borough, not to mention boating.

EN11(ii): Development should not harm the character of waterways

This policy option makes some effort to prevent the negative impacts that would accompany a 'no policy' option, but does not necessarily seek to enhance waterways. Of the objectives negatively impacted by the 'no policy' option, this option brings tendencies for slight positive impacts with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7), landscape character (9), historic environment (10), health (11), travel by car (14) and recreation (17). It is unclear whether protection of waterspaces would facilitate economic growth (18) to the degree that enhancement would.

EN11(iii): Development should not harm character and should enhance where possible, ensuring public access

		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 policy option brings the most significant positive effects with regard to the following sustainability objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation to climate change (2)—responsible development and enhancement of waterspaces could build in resiliency in times of increased flooding and rainfall Wildlife (7)—enhancement of natural waterspaces and surrounding land would value, protect and enhance biodiversity Landscape and character (9)—maintaining attractive and clean waterspaces would greatly contribute to landscape and townscape character Historic environment (10)—many historically significant sites are near waterspaces Health (11) and recreation (17)—enhancement of waterside paths for walking and cycling, as well as encouraging opportunities for water sport would enhance health and recreation opportunities <p>Other positive effects are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped land (4)—much of the borough's undeveloped land surrounds waterways, these could be enhanced and protected to increase landscape value and drive development toward previously built land Sustainable transport (14)—waterways should be enhanced to provide more opportunities for walking, cycling and water transport, thus reducing the need to travel by car Economic growth (18)—enhancement of water ways could increase amenity value and bring economic growth and regeneration centred on waterspaces <p>Conclusion Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and reduces harm to waterspaces.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EN12: BIODIVERSITY AND GREEN NETWORK

		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
EN12(i) *	No policy	X	XX	0	XX	0	X	XX	0	XX	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN12(ii)	Development must retain biodiversity value and green network connectivity	?✓	?✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN12(iii) ▼	Development must retain and should seek to enhance biodiversity and green network connectivity	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

EN12(i): No policy

The 'no policy' option brings the most significant negative effects with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9). In accomplishing CO₂ reduction (1) and pollution (6), effects are likely to be negative, but less significantly so. In terms of housing provision (13), a 'no policy' option that allows biodiverse wildlife sites and portions of the green network to be developed, may have positive effects and help to deliver housing targets.

EN12(ii): Development must retain biodiversity value and green network connectivity

A policy emphasising retention of biodiversity value and the green network would bring significant positive effects with regard to protecting undeveloped land (4) and moderately positive effects with regard to pollution (6), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9). In reducing CO₂ emissions (1) and providing adaptation for climate change (2), effects have a tendency to be positive. In terms of housing provision, widespread retention of biodiversity areas and the green network may have a tendency to negatively impact housing delivery, since available, developable land is scarce within RBC's tight administrative boundaries.

EN12(iii): Development must retain and should seek to enhance biodiversity and green network connectivity

		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>A policy requiring retention and enhancement of biodiversity and the green network would carry the same positive effects as policy option ii, but its positive effects would be more significant with regard to undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9). A tendency to negatively impact housing provision (13) remains, but the positive effects likely outweigh this concern.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (iii) is the preferred option because it delivers the most positive effects in terms of promoting the use of undeveloped land and protecting and enhancing biodiversity and the green network.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: In cases where biodiversity conservation interferes with housing delivery, sites must be carefully planned to maintain and enhance the natural environment while ensuring the amount and type housing appropriate to the area's needs.</p>																					

EN13: MAJOR LANDSCAPE FEATURES AND AREAS OF OUTSTANDING BEAUTY

		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
EN13(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	XX	0	0	XX	0	XX	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
EN13(ii) ▼	No planning permission for development that would detract from Major Landscape Features	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN13(i): No policy

The 'no policy' option brings the most significant negative effects with regard to undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9). In terms of housing provision (13), a 'no policy' option that allows for major landscape areas (and adjacent areas that may affect landscape character) to be developed may have positive effects and help to deliver housing targets due to the constrained nature of land within the borough.

EN13(ii): No planning permission for development that would detract from Major Landscape Features

A policy requiring retention and enhancement of major landscape areas would carry significant positive impacts with regard to landscape character (9) and positive, but less significant, impacts with regard to undeveloped land (4) and wildlife (7). A tendency to negatively impact housing provision (13) exists due to the constrained nature of land within the borough, but the positive effects likely outweigh this concern.

Conclusion

It is considered that option (ii) would have the most positive sustainability effects. This option is most likely to result in significant retention and improvement of landscape character (9).

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: In cases where major landscape preservation interferes with housing delivery, sites must be carefully planned to maintain and enhance landscape character while ensuring the amount and type housing appropriate to the area's needs.

EN14: TREES, HEDGES AND WOODLANDS

		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
EN14(i) *	No policy	0	X	0	0	0	0	XX	0	XX	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN14(ii)	Policy protecting trees, hedges and woodlands from removal or damage	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN14(iii) ▼	Policy protecting and improving the level of tree cover, requiring development to make provision for tree planting	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN14(i): No policy

'No policy' would bring significant negative effects with regard to wildlife and the natural environment (7) and landscape character (9) and moderate negative effects in adaptation to climate change (2). Effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.

EN14(ii): Policy protecting trees, hedges and woodlands from removal or damage

Protection of existing trees, hedges and woodlands would not significantly undermine sustainability, but would not carry significant positive effects either. The moderate positive effects of this option exist for wildlife and the natural environment (7). With regard to adaptation to climate change (2), this option carries a tendency for positive effects, since trees increase shading and reduce cooling costs along with many other economic and environmental benefits. Effects on housing provision (13) are unclear.

		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>EN14(iii): Policy protecting and improving the level of tree cover, requiring development to make provision for tree planting</p> <p>This option brings the same positive effects, but more significantly. Significant positive effects would occur with regard to wildlife and the natural environment (7) and landscape character (9). Moderate positive effects are expected in adapting to climate change (2).</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is considered that option (iii) would have the most positive sustainability effects. In terms of housing provision (13), the impacts of protecting trees, woodlands and hedges are unclear. Due to the constrained nature of land within the borough, protecting large areas of woodland could reduce the amount of land available needed to meet local housing needs, but tree cover represents such a small portion of total land use and this is unlikely to have an impact.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues</p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues</p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

EN15: AIR QUALITY

		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
EN15(i) *	No policy	XX	X	0	0	0	XX	X	?	X	0	XX	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

		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
EN15(ii)	Development that would worsen air quality will not take place unless effects can be mitigated, no further requirements for sensitive uses (residential, schools, hospitals, care homes)	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN15(iii) ▼	Option (ii) and sensitive uses within the AQMA must mitigate effects or make appropriate financial contributions	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	?	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN15(i): No policy

'No policy' would bring significant negative sustainability effects in terms of CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and health (11). Moderate negative effects would occur with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), wildlife and the natural environment (7), and landscape character (9). For housing provision (13) and economic growth (18), there exists a tendency to positive effects, since more development may be permitted in the absence of an air quality policy. Worsened air quality may be associated with a tendency to negative effects, since active transport users (cyclists, for example) suffer more in poor air quality environments. The absence of air quality regulation may encourage more car use.

		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>EN15(ii): Development that would worsen air quality will not take place unless effects can be mitigated, no further requirements for sensitive uses (residential, schools, hospitals, care homes)</u></p> <p>This option would bring moderate positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9) and health (11). For sustainable transport (14), air quality considerations may have a tendency towards positive effects.</p> <p><u>EN15(iii): Option (ii) and sensitive uses must mitigate effects or make appropriate financial contributions</u></p> <p>This option requires that development only take place where air quality effects can be mitigated and requires mitigation of planning contributions for sensitive uses within the Air Quality Management Area. This would bring significant positive impacts with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7) and health (11). Moderate positive impacts would occur with regard to landscape character (9) as improved air quality creates an attractive and clean environment. Housing provision (13) effects are uncertain. If large residential developments are denied planning permission for failing to mitigate air quality effects, this could negatively affect provision, but clean air contributes to healthy environments for residents. Effects concerning sustainable transport (14) may see a tendency for positive effects, since clean air encourages active transit such as walking and cycling.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (iii) is considered to have the most positive sustainability impacts and represents the recommended approach. Any concerns about housing delivery are outweighed by environmental benefits in this case.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

EN16: POLLUTION AND WATER RESOURCES

	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
EN16(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	XX	X	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
EN16(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (CS34)	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN16(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to protect the environment from harmful land, noise or light pollution. This may result in poor water quality, decrease the efficiency of local sewerage and wastewater treatment infrastructure or lead to high levels of light and noise. This would bring significant negative effects with regard to pollution (6) and moderate negative effects in relation to the natural environment (7), landscape and townscape character (9), health (11) and economic growth (18).

EN16(ii): Continue current policy (CS34)

This option continues the current policy CS34 that aims to protect the local environment from harmful land, noise or light pollution. This would bring positive effects with regard to the natural environment (7), landscape and townscape character (9), health (11) and economic growth (18). Significant positive effects would occur in relation to sustainability objective 6 (pollution).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

EN17: FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

		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

		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
EN17(i) *	No policy	0	XX	0	XX	0	0	X	0	?X	0	XX	0	?✓	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0
EN17(ii) ▼	Planning permission will not be permitted in areas identified as being a risk of flood	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	XX	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
EN17(iii)	Planning permission will not be permitted in areas identified as being at high risk of flood, in areas of lower risk development may move forward if it passes the exception test in the NPPF	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN17(i): No policy

No policy would bring significant negative impacts in adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), and health and safety (11). Moderate negative impacts would occur with regard to wildlife and the natural environment (7). Landscape character (9) may be negatively affected by development in flood risk areas, since many areas of major landscape character are flood prone. Housing provision (13) may be positively affected by the absence of a flood policy, because it would make much more land available for development. Failing to address flooding issues would have significant negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and

		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
older residents.																					
<u>EN17(ii): Planning permission will not be permitted in areas identified as being a risk of flood</u> This policy option would effectively prevent all development in flood prone areas, regardless of the level of risk. It would bring significant positive sustainability impacts in terms of adaptation to climate change (2), undeveloped land (4), and health and safety (11), but it would bring significant negative effects in terms of housing provision (13). Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to the natural environment (7) since many flood prone sites are rich in biodiversity. Landscape character (9) may also see a tendency for positive effects.																					
<u>EN17(iii): Planning permission will not be permitted in areas identified as being at high risk of flood, in areas of lower risk development may move forward if it passes the exception test in the NPPF</u> This option brings moderate positive sustainability effects while making more of an effort to enable housing provision (13). Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to adaptation to climate change (2) and health and safety (11) by directing development to the areas of flood risk that pass the exception test. Undeveloped land (4) may see a tendency toward positive impacts, since some development would be allowed in undeveloped areas of low flood risk. Wildlife and the natural environment (7) may see a tendency toward positive effects.																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) strikes a balance between health and safety concerns (11) and housing provision (13). This is the recommended approach.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.																					
MITIGATION: Insofar as all development passes the exceptions test as outlined in the NPPF, the proposed approach requires no additional mitigation.																					

EM1: PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT 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

		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
EM1(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	X	0	X	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0
EM1(ii)	Provision based on Scenario 1: Labour Demand	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
EM1(iii)	Provision based on Scenario 2: Past Completion Rates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
EM1(iv)	Provision based on Scenario 3: Labour Supply + safety margin	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EM1(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to plan for economic growth and employment (18), bringing significant negative effects. Undeveloped land (4), landscape and townscape character (9) and housing provision (13) would see a tendency towards negative effects. Without a plan to allocate specific levels and types of employment space, undeveloped land could be improperly used, much needed housing land could be used for employment development or landscape and townscape character (9) could be negatively impacted by improperly sited employment uses. Failing to provide for a balance between employment and housing could lead to very high levels of employment development and increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (6, 8).

EM1(ii): Provision based on Scenario 1: Labour Demand

This option represents the first of three scenarios considered for planning employment space. This option would plan provision according to employment projections. This would result in less net employment space planned over the plan period. It fails to take into account changes as a result of the need for housing. Planning according to this scenario would fail to provide the necessary amount of space, but would still plan for a significant net increase. This would bring a tendency towards positive effects with regard to undeveloped land (4), landscape and townscape character (9), housing provision (13) and

		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>economic growth and employment (18).</p> <p>EM1(iii): Provision based on Scenario 2: Past Completion Rates This option would plan employment space according to past completion rates for the past 10 years. This is merely a reflection of previous ten years change and may be a result of policy issues or other unknown constraints. It does not provide an accurate picture of future need. Thus, this option would bring negative benefits with regard to economic growth and employment (18) by failing to provide the needed floorspace.</p> <p>EM1(iv): Provision based on Scenario 3: Labour Supply + safety margin This option plans employment floorspace according to labour supply, the most robust scenario which takes housing need into account. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to employment and economic growth (18). This would bring a tendency towards positive effects with regard to undeveloped land (4), landscape and townscape character (9) and housing provision (13) by seeking to strike a balance between land allocation for housing and allocation for economic growth.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (iv) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

EM2: LOCATION OF NEW EMPLOYMENT 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
EM2(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	XX	0	X	X	X	XX	X	X	0	0	XX	0	0	0	✓	0	0

		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
EM2(ii) ▼	Focus major office development in the centre and along the A33, other industrial/distribution/storage located along A33 or in core employment areas	0	0	0	✓✓	0	?✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
EM2(iii)	Option (ii) with additional core employment areas	0	0	0	?	0	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
EM2(iv)	Option ii with reduced amount of core employment areas	0	0	0	?	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0

COMMENTS:

EM2(i): No policy

The absence of a policy directing major employment development towards specific areas would bring significant negative effects pertaining to undeveloped land (4), landscape character (9) and sustainable transport (14). Moderate negative effects would occur with regard to pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), historic environment (10) and health (11). Many of these negative effects would be the result of employment land uses in and near residential areas, bringing increased HGV traffic, noise and poor air quality. This may affect nearby habitats (8). A positive effect may occur regarding economic growth and employment (18) as removing restrictions on the location of employment development may increase growth.

EM2(ii): Focus major office development in the centre and along the A33, other industrial/distribution/storage located along A33 or in core employment areas

This policy would drive employment development towards specific areas of town. It would bring significant positive impacts pertaining to use of undeveloped land (4) and sustainable transport (14). Moderate positive effects would occur relating to wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), health (11), and economic growth (18). A tendency towards positive effects may occur in relation to pollution (6) and the historic environment (10). Directing employment development towards the specific areas listed would protect other parts of town from the negative impacts of employment development.

EM2(iii): Option ii with additional core employment areas

This policy option focuses employment development in specific locations, but increases the amount of designated areas. It may bring significant positive effects with regard to economic growth (18) by increasing the number of sites available. Other effects exhibit a tendency towards negative impacts in relation to pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), historic environment (10), health (11), housing provision (13) and sustainable transport (14). The effect on use of undeveloped land (4) is unknown. This would depend on whether or not additional core employment areas were designated on previously undeveloped sites.

		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>EM2(iv): Option (ii) with reduced amount of core employment areas This policy option focuses employment development in specific locations, but decreases the amount of designated areas. Again, the effect on use of undeveloped land (4) is unknown, as well as impacts on the historic environment (10). A tendency towards negative effects would occur with regard to economic growth (18) as limiting sites could limit growth. A tendency for positive impacts exists in relation to pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), health (11), housing provision (13) and sustainable transport (14).</p> <p>Conclusion It is considered that option (ii) brings the most significant positive effects while still allowing for economic growth (18). This is the preferred option.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

EM3: LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT 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
EM3(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0

		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
EM3(ii)	High level of protection, no strategic release of employment land for housing	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
EM3(iii)	Less protection for employment land, release more land for housing	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?X	0	0	0	XX	0	0
EM3(iv) ▼	Presumption in favour of retention of employment land in Core Employment Areas with some strategic release	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EM3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would leave existing employment land vulnerable to release for housing. Although housing growth is needed within the Borough, a balance must be struck in order to provide employment opportunities for residents and economic growth. No guidance on this matter would result in significant negative effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18). A tendency toward positive effects may occur in relation to housing provision (13) if the lack of a policy resulted in large amounts of land becoming available for housing development. Effects on undeveloped land are unclear (4).

EM3(ii): High level of protection, no strategic release of employment land for housing

This option would go too far in protecting existing employment land. Some small employment areas may be suitable for release if they are surrounded by residential uses. Strategic release may also be appropriate where employment sites are well connected in terms of transport. Overprotection of these

		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>areas would drive more development to undeveloped land (4), limit housing provision (13) and discourage sustainable transport (14). Retaining all sites, though, may have positive effects for economic growth and employment (18).</p> <p><u>EM3(iii): Less protection for employment land, release more land for housing</u> This option would result in limited protection for employment land and allow for more areas to be released for housing. This would bring positive effects for housing provision (13), but a tendency toward negative effects in terms of undeveloped land (4) and sustainable transport (14) as it may drive employment uses further from residents towards the edges of the borough. Loss of this employment land would bring significant negative effects for employment and economic growth (18).</p> <p><u>EM3(iv): Presumption in favour of retention of employment land in Core Employment Areas with some strategic release</u> This option would strike a balance between much needed housing land and employment areas. Sites would only be released for housing development if they met certain specifications including sustainable transport connectivity (14) and landscape and townscape character (9). Land would not be released unless the type and size of employment use is available elsewhere in Reading according to the needs outlined in EM1. Employment uses may be retained and prevented from using undeveloped land (4) elsewhere, bringing a tendency toward positive effects. Thus, this option would bring positive effects with regard to landscape and townscape character (9), housing (13) and transport (14) with significant positive benefits with regard to economic growth and employment (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iv) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																			

EM4: MAINTAINING A VARIETY OF PREMISES

	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
EM4(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
EM4(ii)	Decrease storage and distribution space in the south of Basingstoke Rd, maintain start-up and grown-on space where possible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
EM4(iii) ▼	Retain storage and distribution space, increase start-up and grown-on where possible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

EM4(i): No policy

The sustainability effects of this policy are largely economic. The lack of a policy maintaining a variety of employment premises would bring moderate negative effects with regard to economic growth (18) because there would be no policy to ensure a range of types and sizes of units for different kinds of businesses. Additionally, failing to protect storage and distribution uses in the south of Basingstoke Rd may lead to loss of employment and hinder economic growth.

EM4(ii): Decrease storage and distribution space in the south of Basingstoke Rd, maintain start-up and grown-on space where possible

This option may increase housing provision (13) by making more land available for residential development, but it would harm economic growth and employment (18) by decreasing employment uses and failing to meet the increasing need for start-up and grown-on spaces.

EM4(iii): Retain storage and distribution space, increase start-up and grown-on where possible

This option's effects would be largely neutral with significant positive effects for economic growth and employment (18).

Conclusion

It is considered that option (iii) best protects storage and distribution space and increases start-up and grown-on space, thus providing for future economic growth and employment (18). This is the preferred option.

		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>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

H1: PROVISION OF 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
H1(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	XX	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
H1(ii)	Provide 658 dwellings per annum as concluded by the HELAA	✓X	0	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X

		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
H1(iii) ▼	Provide less than the 658 dwellings per annum recommended by the HELAA	✓X	0	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	?	?	0	0	X	?✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
H1(iv)	Provide 699 dwellings per annum as identified in the SHMA	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	0	?	0	?X
H1(v)	Provide significantly more than 699 homes each year (in order to further significantly boost housing and deliver higher levels of affordable housing)	✓X	X	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	X	0	X	X	0	0	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?	✓	X

COMMENTS:

H1(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to provide the amount of housing needed within the Borough. This would render the plan unsound and bring many negative effects. Effects on undeveloped land (4) are unclear. Townscape and landscape (9) could suffer if too many or too few homes were constructed within the Borough, since appropriate densities and mixed-uses contribute to an attractive environment. Sustainable transport (14) would also see negative effects if too many or too few houses were built to meet the required densities to support transport or overwhelm the transport system. Employment (18) would also be negatively affected if too few residential dwellings were available. This would constrain the labour supply. Housing provision (13) would see very significant negative effects.

H1(ii): Provide 658 dwellings per annum as concluded by the HELAA

		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 option considers the objectively assessed housing need resulting from the SHMA along with available sites in Reading. It seeks to strike a balance between housing need and land availability. Providing 658 homes per annum would bring positive effects with regard to housing provision (13). This would prevent overuse of undeveloped land (4) bringing a tendency towards positive effects. Additionally, transport (14) and economic growth (18) would see a tendency for positive effects. This level of housing provision would enable the appropriate labour supply and take place in locations served by sustainable transport. Providing this many dwellings will place stress on health and education infrastructure (15, 20). All development carries negative environmental effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), but these can largely be mitigated through accordance with other policies. Development may also have impacts on townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10), although this is largely dependent on design.</p> <p><u>H1(iii): Provide less than the 658 dwellings per annum concluded by the HELAA</u> Providing less housing than recommended by the HELAA would remove pressures on undeveloped land (4), the natural environment (7) and transport (14) bringing a tendency towards positive effects, but it would fail to provide the needed housing (13) and support the local economy (18). The negative effects of this option outweigh the positive effects. This is because the negative effects of housing provision can largely be mitigated. Housing delivery is the major priority of the plan and this option fails to meet that need.</p> <p><u>H1(iv): Provide 699 dwellings per annum as identified in the SHMA</u> This option aims to provide the number of dwellings recommended by the SHMA. Due to the constrained nature of land within the Borough, this would place strain on undeveloped land (4) and the natural environment (7), as well as services such as health (15) and education (20) and bring a tendency towards negative effects. If this policy pushed development out towards less well-connected areas of the borough, sustainable transport (14) would see a tendency towards negative effects, too. High density development in inappropriate locations would negatively affect townscape character (9). Effects to employment (18) are unclear, while housing provision (13) would see positive effects.</p> <p><u>H1 (v): Provide significantly more than 699 homes each year</u> Providing more than 699 homes a year would significantly boost housing provision and deliver higher levels of affordable housing. This option would see many of the same effects as option (iv), but they would be more pronounced. Undeveloped land (4), the natural environment (7), character (9), health facilities (15), transport (14) and education spaces (20) would see even greater negative effects as a result of strain. Effects on employment (18) are unclear. Employment space may be lost to residential development. In turn, housing provision (13) would see significant positive effects. Increasing the housing supply would bring more affordable housing. This would bring positive effects to inequality and deprivation (19). This option would likely require constructing homes within areas of high flood risk and would bring negative impacts with regard to climate change adaptation (2).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</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
There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options. MITIGATION: Negative effects as a result of housing must be carefully monitored and mitigated, particularly stress on healthcare and education infrastructure. The environmental costs of construction, effects on amenity and the historic environment, and the natural environment can be mitigated through accordance with other policies in the Local Plan.																					

H2: DENSITY AND MIX

		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
H2(i) *	No policy	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	XX	X	X	XX	0	0	0	0

		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
H2(ii) ▼	Continue current policy CS15	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	✓	?✓	?✓	✓	0	0	0	0
H2(iii)	Increase density guidelines, 50% of all dwellings 3-bed or more	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	✓	?✓	?✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0
H2(iv)	Increase density guidelines, 50% of 10 or more dwellings outside town centre 3-bed or more	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

H2(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to prescribe the densities necessary to meet the Borough's housing needs (13). This would have many negative consequences. First, it may encourage development outside the town centre and local centres. This would lead to more use of undeveloped land (4) and would discourage sustainable transport (14) by increasing travel times between residences and other uses. Poor sustainable transport connectivity is accompanied by other negative effects, such as increased CO₂ emissions (1), increased natural resource use (3), pollution (6), degradation of the natural environment (7), poor health outcomes (11) and decreased facility access (15). Use of undeveloped land could also push more development into areas prone to flooding, thus reducing climate change resiliency (2). Low densities can result in negative effects on landscape (9). Finally, failing to deliver much needed housing or the appropriate type, size and tenure can negatively affect deprived communities (19). Failing to provide a mix of dwellings may disproportionately affect individuals based on age, since residents of different ages have different dwelling size needs (16).

H2(ii): Continue current policy CS15

This option carries forward the current policy with prescribed densities, but at less ambitious levels than the preferred option. This would have positive effects, but these would not be as pronounced. This option would encourage development in town centre and local centres, bringing a tendency towards positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), character (9), health (11), sustainable transport (14) and facility access (15). Moderate positive effects would occur in relation 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
<p><u>H2(iii): Increase density guidelines, 50% of all dwellings 3-bed or more</u> This option aims to increase density and require larger dwellings suitable for families. This would bring a tendency towards many positive effects, much like option (ii), but may negatively affect the use of undeveloped land (4) since larger homes require more area. This is problematic due to the constrained nature of developable land within the Borough. Thus, this option would serve to house more families (13, 19), but would place strains on available land. It is considered that 3-bed dwellings are rarely achievable in the town centre.</p> <p><u>H2(iv): Increase density guidelines, 50% of 10 or more dwellings outside town centre 3-bed or more</u> This option seeks to strike a balance between increasing density and providing more +3-bed dwellings for family accommodation. This would bring the most pronounced positive effects and is the preferred option. In requiring a proportion of 3-bed dwellings only outside the town centre, undue pressure on undeveloped land is relieved (4). Significant positive effects would occur in relation to housing provision (13). Increased densities would bring positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), character (9), health (11), sustainable transport (14) and facility access (15). Provision of family dwellings outside the centre would serve working families and overcrowded areas of deprivation (19).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iv) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect with regard to age and disability has been identified, but not with the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

H3: AFFORDABLE 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

		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
H3(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0
H3(ii)	No affordable housing requirement for sites with less than 10 dwellings, 30% on sites of 10 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0
H3(iii) ▼	30% of affordable housing on sites of 10 or more, 20% of affordable on sites 5-9 and an equivalent contribution of 10% on sites of 1-4 (with viability considerations)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0

COMMENTS:

H3(i): No policy

This option would fail to provide for Reading's housing needs and would disproportionately affect individuals in deprived communities with a limited ability to afford housing. A lack of affordable housing can also lead to poor health outcomes, if individuals are forced to live in poor conditions due to high costs. A 'no policy' option would bring significant negative effects in relation to housing provision (13) and deprivation and inequality (19). A tendency towards negative effects may occur with regard to health (11).

H3(ii): No affordable housing requirement for sites with less than 10 dwellings, 30% on sites of 10 or more

This option would have some positive impact, but does not go far enough to ensure affordable housing. The SHMA emphasised the critical need for affordable housing within Reading, thus more ambitious measures are needed. Additionally, much of the residential development within the borough 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
<p>expected to take place on sites of 10 dwellings or less. This option would require no affordable housing contribution of these sites. This would bring some positive benefits with regard to health (11), housing (13) and inequality (19), but effects are not as pronounced.</p> <p>H3(iii): 30% of affordable housing on sites of 10 or more, 20% of affordable on sites 5-9 and an equivalent contribution of 10% on sites of 1-4 (with viability considerations)</p> <p>This option requires on-site provision or equivalent contribution of all new development with levels prescribed based on the number of dwellings. This would significantly increase the amount of affordable housing within the Borough. Any possible negative effects will be mitigated by viability considerations should this requirement result in undue strain on developers. This option would bring significant positive effects with regard to housing provision (13) and inequality (19) with positive effects with regard to health (11).</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues</p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues</p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

H4: STANDARDS FOR NEW 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
H4(ii) *	No policy	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0

		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
H4(iii) ▼	All new build achieve higher water efficiency standard and at least 19% improvement on building regulations TER; all new build accessible and adaptable, 5% of 20 or more dwellings for wheelchair user	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
H4(iv)	All dwellings offset 100% carbon emissions through on-site generation or planning contributions, all new build accessible and adaptable, 5% of 20 or more dwellings for wheelchair users	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓X	0	0	✓	0	?	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>H4(i): No policy</u> A 'no policy' option would rely entirely on the building regulations. This provides detailed guidance regarding energy, water and accessibility, but represents minimum requirements. Thus, this option would bring a tendency towards positive effects, but these are not as pronounced. This approach places fewer requirements on developers in an effort to boost housing supply, bringing positive effects with regard to housing provision (13). A tendency towards positive effects would occur in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), climate change (2), natural resource use (3), health (11), and equality (16). Failing to provide accessible and adaptable dwellings, as well as dwellings for wheelchair users would have disproportionate negative effects on individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p><u>H4(ii): All new build achieve higher water efficiency standard and at least 19% improvement on building regulations TER; all new build accessible and adaptable, 5% of 20 or more dwellings for wheelchair users</u> This option aims to maximise water and energy efficiency within the context of recent government guidance. It also aims to provide sufficient levels of accessible and adaptable housing for disabled or older residents according to the building regulations. This would bring significant positive effects in delivering high quality housing of a type appropriate to the Borough (13). Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), climate change (2), natural resource use (3), health (11), and equality (16).</p> <p><u>H4(iii): All dwellings offset 100% carbon emissions through on-site generation or planning contributions, all new build accessible and adaptable, 5% of 20 or more dwellings for wheelchair users</u> This option aims above government guidance and may place undue burden on developers or may be achievable in light of viability considerations (18). Economic effects are unknown at this time. It would bring the most significant positive effects in terms of CO₂ emissions (1), and positive effects with regard to climate change (2), natural resource use (3), health (11), and equality (16). In terms of housing provision (13), both negative and positive effects may occur. The quality of housing would increase, but less housing may be built if significant additional costs are placed on developers.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from the preferred option. Less ambitious requirements for adaptability and accessibility may have significant detrimental effects on individuals with disabilities or older residents. The preferred option seeks to mitigate these effects by providing more adaptable and accessible housing, as well as homes for wheelchair users.</p> <p>MITIGATION: It is unclear whether or not a Zero Carbon standard would prohibit economic growth or housing provision. All development will be subject to</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
viability assessment in order to mitigate these effects.																					

H5: ACCOMMODATION FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE

		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
H5(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	XX	0	0	0	0
H5(ii)	Provision of additional 253 residential care bedspaces for elderly people (as identified in the SHMA) with no criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	✓	X	X	✓	0	0	0	0

		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
H5(iii) ▼	Provision of additional 253 residential care bedspaces for elderly people (as identified in the SHMA) with criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0
H5(iv)	Criteria-based policy with no specific provision target identified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	XX	✓	✓	X	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

H5(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in some provision of residential care bedspaces for elderly people, but not to the extent that it would meet local need. Additionally, sites may locate in less desirable locations with poor transport connectivity or facility access. Thus, this option would bring negative effects with regard to providing housing of varied types (13), sustainable transport (14) and facility access (15) and significant negative effects with regard to equality (16) by neglecting the needs of older residents.

H5(ii): Provision of additional 253 residential care bedspaces for elderly people (as identified in the SHMA) with no criteria

This option would bring negative effects with regard to townscape character (9), sustainable transport (14) and facility access including healthcare (15). With no criteria, accommodation for vulnerable adults may isolate residents and negatively affect amenity. Positive effects would occur with regard to housing provision (13) by providing the number of bedspaces advised in the SHMA and equality (16) by preventing undue burden for individuals of a certain age or disability.

H5(iii): Provision of additional 253 residential care bedspaces for elderly people (as identified in the SHMA) with criteria

This option would help meet the number of needed bedspaces (13) while ensuring that accommodation is properly located to ensure sustainable transport (14), character (9) and facility access (15). Like option (i), this policy would ensure positive equality (16) effects by serving the needs of elderly residents or residents with disabilities.

		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>H5(iv): Criteria-based policy with no specific provision target identified</u> This option would bring positive effects with regard to townscape character (9), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and equality (16), but would bring significant negative effects by failing to meet specific needs with regard to housing provision (13). By failing to meet the needs of a vulnerable group, this policy would bring negative effects with regard to the equality objective (16).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it meets housing needs and ensures that accommodation is properly located.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> Failing to provide the needed amount of bedspaces for the elderly may have significant negative effects on groups of individuals with regard to age or disability.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

H6: PROTECTING THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

		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
H6(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	X	0

		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
H6(ii) ▼	No loss of residential accommodation unless there are exceptional circumstances	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

H6(i): No policy

Allowing loss of residential accommodation would bring significant negative effects with regard to housing provision (13), as fewer homes would be available for residents. Loss of residential accommodation may also affect affordability. This could bring negative effects in terms of inequality and deprivation (19).

H6(ii): No loss of residential accommodation unless there are exceptional circumstances

Protecting existing residential accommodation would bring positive housing provision (13) effects. It wouldn't necessarily improve inequality and deprivation (19), but it may prevent affordability from worsening if accompanied by new housing development.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is the preferred option because it helps in meeting residential accommodation needs, while option i would harm provision.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.

H7: RESIDENTIAL CONVERSIONS

	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
H7(i) *	No policy regulating HMOs	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0
H7(ii) ▼	Business as usual (use of concentration within a radius for determining applications within Article 4 areas)	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0
H7(iii)	Decrease the threshold to further restrict HMOs	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0

COMMENTS:

H7(i): No policy regulating HMOs

The lack of a policy regulating HMOs would bring significant negative effects with regard to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) as HMOs are often negatively affect amenity. Assuming that lack of regulation would increase the amount of HMOs, this could bring positive effects in terms of inequality and deprivation (19) as HMOs provide more affordable and flexibly let accommodations to transient populations and individuals. In terms of undeveloped land (4), a 'no policy' option may have a tendency for positive effects in the use of undeveloped land (4) since HMOs help to meet some housing need and reduce the amount of housing that needs to be built. Finally, this option would bring both negative and positive effects in terms of housing provision (13). On one hand, HMOs help to meet housing need for specific groups by provided affordable, flexibly let units. On the other, HMOs may take up larger homes that are needed to house families.

H7(ii): Business as usual (use of concentration within a radius for determining applications within Article 4 areas)

This option reflects a continuation of existing policies that regulate the number of HMOs in specific areas under Article 4. This method brings mixed effects. In terms of housing provision (13) it brings positive effects in seeking to strike a balance between family homes and HMOs. Additionally, it helps to provide an appropriate amount of HMOs, positively affecting inequality and deprivation (19). A tendency toward negative effects may occur in regard to undeveloped land (4) by addressing some housing need and landscape character (9) because the Council has the power to enact an Article 4 Direction in areas it feels are experiencing a decline in amenity. The historic environment sees mixed effects. In some cases, conservation areas can be negatively affected. In others, the Council is able to step in and prevent further decline.

H7(iii): Decrease the threshold to further restrict HMOs

		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 brings positive effects with regard to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) because it allows the Council to further restrict HMO development in areas that are experiencing a decline in amenity. It would bring negative effects in terms of housing provision (13). A tendency for negative effects may occur in relation to undeveloped land (4) and inequality and deprivation (19).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is the preferred option because it attempts to strike a balance between housing provision and amenity.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Negative effects on character and amenity must be carefully monitored. If necessary, the Council has the power to put an Article 4 restriction in place to prevent further HMO development.</p>																					

H8: HOUSE EXTENSIONS AND ANCILLARY ACCOMODATION

		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
H8(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H8(ii) ▼	Existing policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>H8(i): No policy Eliminating the existing policy regarding house extensions and ancillary accommodation would bring mixed sustainability effects. It may help to provide housing (13), but the quality of ancillary accommodation would be less regulated. In terms of townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10),</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>extensions and ancillary accommodation would rely on general design guidelines. These provide less detail and may have a tendency for negative effects.</p> <p>H8(ii): Existing policy The existing policy provides more specific design guidelines for extensions and ancillary accommodation. This would bring more positive effects in terms of townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). It would also allow for regulation of housing quality while helping to provide additional accommodation, bringing positive effects with regard to housing provision (13).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is the preferred option because it allows for extensions and ancillary accommodation while providing high quality and design standards.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

H9: PRIVATE AND COMMUNAL OUTDOOR SPACE

		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
H9(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?X	0	X	0	X	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0

		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
H9(ii)	Require specific minimum area based on housing size and type	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0
H9(iii) ▼	Recommend minimum area, state requirement as 'functional' minimum	0	0	0	?	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	?	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

H9(i): No policy

Eliminating a requirement for private and communal outdoor space would have a tendency towards negative sustainability effects. Landscape character (9), health (11) and recreation/leisure (17) objectives would see moderate negative effects. Effects on housing (13) are unclear. Failing to require outdoor space may make more land available for development. In regard to wildlife and the natural environment (7), a 'no policy' option may have a tendency for negative effects, since outdoor space can provide wildlife habitat and biodiversity value.

H9(ii): Require specific minimum area based on housing size and type

Requiring a specific minimum area based on housing size and type would bring largely positive sustainability effects, but may use too much undeveloped land (4). Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to landscape character (9), health (11) and recreation/leisure (17). A tendency towards negative impacts may occur with regard to undeveloped land (4) and housing provision (13) as more land would likely be required for outdoor space, making less available for housing. Wildlife and the natural environment (7) may see a tendency towards positive effects.

H9(iii): Recommend minimum area, state requirement as 'functional' minimum

This option represents 'business as usual' and carries over the policy stated in the SDPD. Like option (ii), moderate positive effects would occur with regard to landscape character (9), health (11) and recreation/leisure (17). Sustainability effects on undeveloped land (4) and housing provision (13) are unclear. A careful balance must be found between outdoor space and meeting our housing requirements. Wildlife and the natural environment (7) may see a tendency towards positive effects.

Conclusion

		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>Option (iii) is the preferred option because it seeks to strike a balance between meeting housing needs (13) by wisely using undeveloped land (4) and the need for private or communal outdoor space.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

H10: DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL GARDENS

		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
H10(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H10(ii)	Restrictive policy to prevent garden development	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H10(iii) ▼	Existing criteria-based policy	0	0	0	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p><u>H10(i): No policy</u> The sustainability effects of a 'no policy' option are unclear with regard to use of undeveloped land (4) and wildlife/natural environment (7). A tendency toward negative effects would occur in relation to landscape character (9) and housing provision (13). Without a specific policy, residential garden</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 rely on general design guidelines. These provide less detail and may have a tendency for negative effects.																					
<u>H10(ii): Restrictive policy to prevent garden development</u> A more restrictive policy preventing private residential garden development would bring positive effects with regard to wildlife/natural environment (7), landscape character (9) and use of undeveloped land (4) because it would preserve existing residential gardens. In turn, residential gardens provide some housing land supply. Thus, a restrictive policy would bring negative sustainability effects in housing provision (13).																					
<u>H10(iii): Existing criteria-based policy</u> The existing criteria-based policy allows for some residential gardens to be developed while mitigating possible negative effects from the outset. This option would bring positive sustainability effects with regard to landscape character (9) and housing provision (13). A tendency to positive impact exists for wildlife and the natural environment (7) since the criteria include biodiversity considerations. In terms of use of undeveloped land (4), impacts are both positive and negative.																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it seeks to strike a balance between meeting housing needs (13) and mitigating the possible negative effects of residential garden development such as habitat fragmentation, landscape character and use of undeveloped land.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: Accordance with the criteria listed in this policy should mitigate any negative effects. Garden development should be limited as to avoid overuse of undeveloped land.																					

H11: STUDENT ACCOMODATION

		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

		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
H11(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	X
H11(ii)	Locate student accommodation throughout the Borough	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	?✓
H11(iii)	Focus student accommodation close to the university and on campus if possible	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓

COMMENTS:

H11(i): No policy

This option would fail to provide guidance for student accommodation. This could lead to excessive student accommodation within the town centre. This would limit the number of sites available to meet general housing needs (13). It may also drive development outside the town centre on undeveloped land (4). Overprovision of student accommodation may negatively affect townscape character (9) by failing to provide an appropriate residential mix. Although overprovision of student accommodation in the town centre may cause negative effects, the Council acknowledges the need for some student housing in order to maximise access to education (20). Thus, this option would bring negative effects with regard to housing (13) and education (20) and a tendency towards negative effects in relation to undeveloped land use (4) and townscape character (9). Failing to address student accommodation may have disproportionate effects on individuals based on age (16), since student accommodation provides affordable and flexible housing for students, many who are young adults.

H11(ii): Locate student accommodation throughout the Borough

This option brings many of the same effects as a 'no policy' option, but does recognise the need for student accommodation. This brings a tendency towards positive effects with regard to education (20). Nevertheless, an overprovision of student accommodation may occur in areas where sites are better suited for general housing needs. This would bring negative effects with regard to housing (13) and a tendency towards negative effects in relation to undeveloped land (4) and townscape character (9).

H11(iii): Focus student accommodation close to the university and on campus if possible

This option strikes a balance between the need for student accommodation and the more pressing need for general housing. By acknowledging the need for some new provision of student accommodation and focussing this development on campus or as close to the university as possible, more sites in the town centre are made available for general housing needs. This would bring positive impacts with regard to use of undeveloped land (4), townscape

		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>character (9), housing (13) and education (20).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age has been identified, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

H12: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

		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
H12(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	0	0	X	X
H12(ii) ▼	Existing policy providing criteria for new sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>H12(i): No policy A 'no policy' option would fail to provide sites for gypsies and travellers (13). This may result in an increase in unauthorised encampments (7, 9) and place individuals at further risk of poor health (11), harm community cohesion (12), decrease facility access (15), increase deprivation (19) and limit education access (20). Failing to provide accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers would disproportionately affect individuals based on race or ethnicity (16).</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>H12(ii): Existing policy providing criteria for new sites Allowing for authorised pitches and sites would improve the living environment for gypsy and traveller families, reversing all of the negative effects in option (i). The natural environment (7) and townscape/landscape character (9) may see positive effects, but this will be largely dependent on design.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on race/ethnicity has been identified.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

H13: SUBURBAN RENEWAL AND REGENERATION

		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
H13(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0
H13(ii)	Guidelines for determining opportunities for regeneration when they arise	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>H13(i): No policy</u> Suburban renewal and regeneration, particularly of some of the Borough’s older housing estates, have the potential to provide additional housing, encourage economy growth, improve character, address crime and inequality and make good use of previously developed land. A ‘no policy’ option would fail to provide a framework for harnessing these benefits. This would bring negative effects with regard to housing provision (13) and a tendency toward negative effects in the use of undeveloped land (4), townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), economic growth (18) and inequality and deprivation (19).</p> <p><u>H13(ii): Guidelines for determining opportunities for regeneration when they arise</u> This option would not identify any specific sites for regeneration, but would provide a framework for considering applications if and when opportunities arise. These guidelines would acknowledge the ability of regeneration schemes to achieve many planning goals. This would bring positive effects with regard to the use of undeveloped land (4), landscape character (9), community cohesion (12), housing provision (13), economic growth (18) and inequality and deprivation (19).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites 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 from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

TR1: ACHIEVING THE TRANSPORT STRATEGY

		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
TR1(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	0	XX	X	0	0	?X	0	0

		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
TR1(ii) ▼	Continue current policy approach (Core Strategy CS20, CS22, CS23)	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

TR1(i): No policy
A ‘no policy’ option would result in planning permission granted to development proposals without a commitment to implement and improve sustainable transport or improve accessibility and safety. This would bring many negative sustainability effects, most significantly to sustainable transport (14). A tendency towards negative effects may occur in relation to employment and economic growth (18) since traffic congestion and lack of transport facilities can hinder economic growth and make it difficult for goods or workers to travel. Moderate negative effects would occur in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), amenity and character (9), health (11) and facility access (15). These negative effects accompany poor sustainable transport provision which can cause worsened air quality and increased travel times. Not having the policy in place could lead to increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (7, 8).

TR1(ii): Continue current policy approach (Core Strategy CS20, CS22, CS23)
This option combines three existing policy approaches into a single policy and would help to reverse many of the negative effects of a ‘no policy’ option. By requiring developments to implement sustainable transport, accessibility and safety measures, significant positive effects would occur in regard to sustainable transport (14). Air quality and travel times would improve, leading to positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), amenity and character (9), health (11) and facility access (15). A tendency towards positive effects would occur in relation to economic growth (18).

Conclusion
Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.

Habitat Regulations issues
There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.

Equality issues
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

TR2: MAJOR TRANSPORT PROJECTS

		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
TR2(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	?X	0	X	0	0	XX	?X	0	0	X	0	0
TR2(ii) ▼	Priority given to identified projects	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>TR2(i): No policy</u></p> <p>A ‘no policy’ option would fail to prioritise identified major transport projects. Failure to implement these projects would result in increased congestion and poor connectivity. This would bring many negative sustainability effects, most significantly to sustainable transport (14). A tendency towards negative effects may occur in relation to facility access (15) since traffic congestion and lack of transport facilities can hinder residents’ ability to reach healthcare or other essential services. Moderate negative effects would occur in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), health (11) and economic growth (18). These negative effects accompany poor sustainable transport provision which can cause worsened air quality, increased travel times and lessened ability of businesses to coordinate goods and services. Amenity and character (9) may see a tendency towards negative effects. Not having the policy in place could lead to increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (7, 8).</p>																					
<p><u>TR2(ii): Priority given to identified projects</u></p> <p>This option would aid in delivering major transport projects and would reverse many of the negative effects of a ‘no policy’ option. By prioritising transport projects aimed at reducing congestion, significant positive effects would occur in regard to sustainable transport (14). Air quality and travel times would improve, leading to positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), health (11) and economic growth (18). A tendency towards positive effects would occur in relation to amenity and character (9) and facility access (15).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</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>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

TR3: ACCESS, TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY-RELATED MATTERS

		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
TR3(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	?X	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR3(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (SDPD DM12)	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>TR3(i): No policy A 'no policy' option would result new or altered access onto the transport network without careful considerations of the effects on safety, congestion and the environment. This would cause negative effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and character (9) by worsening air quality and generating HGV traffic on unsuitable roads. A tendency toward negative effects would occur in relation to health (11), since proposals would not be required to consider the safety of pedestrians and cyclists and air quality may worsen. Significant negative effects would occur with regard to sustainable transport (14).</p> <p>TR3(ii): Continue current policy (SDPD DM12) Continuing with the current policy would help to reverse many of the negative effects of a 'no policy' option. It would require careful consideration of safety, congestion and the environment through transportation assessments. This would result in significant positive effects with regard to sustainable transport (14). Moderate positive effects on CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and character (9) by improving air quality and preventing HGV traffic on unsuitable roads. Health (11) would see a tendency towards positive effects since proposals would be required to consider the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</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>Conclusion Option (ii) is the preferred option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on internationally-designated wildlife sites from any of the policy options.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.</p>																					

TR4: CYCLE ROUTES AND FACILITIES

		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
TR4(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR4(ii)	No loss of existing routes and facilities	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
TR4(iii) ▼	Development should enhance and extend routes and facilities	✓✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>TR4(i): No policy A 'no policy' option would bring negative sustainability effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), pollution (6), health (11),</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
sustainable transport (14) and recreation/leisure (17).																					
<u>TR4(ii): No loss of existing routes and facilities</u> Ensuring the protection of existing cycling infrastructure would reverse the negative sustainability effects of a ‘no policy’ option, but only brings a tendency towards positive impacts on the relevant sustainability objectives. For example, protection of existing routes and facilities may help to reduce CO ₂ emissions (1), but not past current levels, as this option does not increase opportunities for sustainable transport (14).																					
<u>TR4(iii): Development should enhance and extend routes and facilities</u> This option reflects ‘business as usual’ and brings the most dramatic positive sustainability effects. By enhancing and extending cycling routes and facilities, significant positive impacts would occur with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), health (11) and sustainable transport (14) by encouraging a mode switch. This would reduce the number of cars on the road and improve air quality. Moderate positive effects would occur with regard to natural resource use (3) by reducing petrol consumption and recreation/leisure (17) since many residents use cycle routes for exercise.																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because it brings dramatic positive sustainability effects and no negative effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

TR5: CAR AND CYCLE PARKING

		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

		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
TR5(i) *	No policy	X	X	0	?X	0	X	X	X	?X	0	0	0	?X	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR5(ii) ▼	Existing SPD policy--maximum car parking standards applied depending on proximity to sustainable modes	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

TR5(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option concerning car and cycle parking would bring negative sustainability effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), climate change (2) and pollution (6). Significant negative effects would occur in terms of sustainable transport (14). A tendency toward negative effects would occur pertaining to undeveloped land (4), landscape character (9) and housing provision (13). These negative effects are likely because a 'no policy' option would result in overprovision of parking. This would encourage more people to drive rather than choose sustainable modes. Additionally, car parks can negatively affect landscape character and contribute to contaminated water runoff. Overprovision of car parking may decrease the amount of available land needed to meet housing needs. Failing to manage parking provision could lead to increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (7, 8).

TR5(ii): Existing SPD policy--maximum standards applied depending on proximity to sustainable modes

This option represents 'business as usual' and defers to the Parking Standards SPD. The SPD applies maximum parking standards depending on proximity to sustainable modes. This encourages sustainable transport use and limits the amount of land used for parking. This option would bring moderate positive effects with regard to landscape character (9) and significant positive effects with regard to sustainable transport (14). A tendency towards positive effects would occur in reducing CO₂ emissions (1), adapting for climate change (2), minimising the use of undeveloped land (4), reducing pollution (6) and providing housing (13).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

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
The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options. MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

RL1: NETWORK AND HIERARCHY OF CENTRES

		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
RL1(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	?X	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	?X	?X	0	0
RL1(ii) ▼	Business as usual—retain current boundaries	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0
RL1(iii)	Amended boundaries as proposed	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0
COMMENTS: RL1(i): No policy Without a policy and boundaries, national guidance and local plan policy RL2 could not be applied. This option would bring negative effects with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), recreation/leisure/culture (17) and economic growth (18) by failing to drive appropriate development to the right areas of the Borough. RL1(ii): Retain current boundaries The positive effects of option (ii) would in most cases be similar to option (iii), as the boundaries do not always differ to a significant degree, but would																					

		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>be less marked because the boundaries are generally more restricted.</p> <p>RL1(iii): Amended boundaries as proposed The boundaries as proposed in the new Local Plan are wider than the boundaries in the SDPD. The reason for this is to bring in more potentially developable land to seek to maximise the scope for additional facilities. Therefore, option (ii) would have a significant positive effect on the need to travel (13) by making sure that facilities (15, 17) are accessible. This will also mean positive effects on CO2 (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6), as well as encouraging walking and cycling (11). Such an option would also seek to ensure that the heart of the community is retained, enhancing community cohesion (12) and improving the situation for disadvantaged communities, e.g. by extending Whitley centre (18, 19). Maximising opportunities for development in centres reduces need for out-of-centre development, which could be on undeveloped land (4).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

RL2: SCALE AND LOCATION OF RETAIL, LEISURE AND CULTURE 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
RL2(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	0	0	XX	X	0	0

		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
RL2(ii)	Plan for 14,000 sq. m retail and 6,000 sq. m leisure and culture, direct to town centre in the first instance	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0
RL2(iii)	Plan for more development, allow more development outside of the town centre	X	0	X	XX	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	XX	0	0	✓	✓X	0	0
RL2(iv)	Plan for less development, direct to town centre in first instance	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	?✓	✓	✓✓	0	0	X	X	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL2(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option could result in too much or too little retail, leisure and culture development in locations outside the town centre. This would result in moderate negative effects in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), community cohesion (12), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14) and economic growth and employment (18). This option would have a significant negative impact regarding recreation, leisure and culture (17) particularly if it resulted in unmet need of such facilities. Not managing the location of development, or promoting out of town development, could lead to increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (8).

RL2(ii): Plan for 14,000 sq. m retail and 6,000 sq. m leisure and culture, direct to town centre in the first instance

Option (ii) plans for the amount of space recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study and based on growth projections to 2036. This approach would address the negative effects of a 'no policy' option. Since development would be directed towards the town centre in the first instance, a tendency to positive impact exists in terms of CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and wildlife and the natural environment (7). Moderate positive effects would occur with

		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
regard to natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), landscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13). The most significant positive impacts would occur in sustainable transport (14), recreation/leisure/culture (17) and economic growth and employment (18).																					
<u>RL2(iii): Plan for more development, allow more development outside of the town centre</u> This option would likely result in more development for retail and leisure, but in unsustainable locations. It would address the need for facilities (17) and support economic growth (18), but encourage the use of undeveloped land (4) and unsustainable transport (14). Moderate negative effects would occur in relation to CO ₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13). Promoting out of town development could lead to increased travel by car. This could have significant effects on those sites closest to major routes to Reading, in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration as well as air pollution and quality (8).																					
<u>RL2(iv): Plan for less development, direct to town centre in first instance</u> Planning for less retail, leisure and culture development would reverse many of the negative impacts caused by planning for more development and would bring a tendency towards or moderate positive effects in relation to CO ₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13). This option would bring significant positive effects with regard to sustainable transport (14) by locating uses in the town centre. Despite these positive effects, it would fail to ensure to meet recreation/leisure/culture needs (17) and harm economic growth and employment (18).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

RL3: VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF SMALLER CENTRES

	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
RL3(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	XX	?	XX	X	0	X	X	X	0
RL3(ii) ▼	Business as usual (different approaches for different centres)	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	?✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
RL3(iii)	Less restrictive approach (40% A1 for all centres)	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	?	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
RL3(iv)	More restrictive approach (60% 1A for all centres)	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	?X	?	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in fewer, loosely-defined local centres. It would fail to drive retail and commercial development to centres and fail to inform design. This would increase travel distances, neglect deprived communities served by local centres and decrease community cohesion. Negative effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4), pollution (6), townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), access to facilities (15), recreation/leisure/culture (17), economic growth (18) and inequality (19).

RL3(ii): Business as usual (different approaches for different centres)

All three options would support sustainable transport (14), thus reducing CO₂ emissions (1) and encouraging walking and cycling which would positively impact health (11). This may reduce pollution (6), bringing a tendency to positive effects. This particular option would bring more positive effects in relation to landscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and economic development and employment (18) by allowing different thresholds depending on the particular needs of specific centres. Ideally, this tailored approach would aid in housing provision (13) by striking a balance between residences and retail.

RL3(iii): Less restrictive approach (40% A1 for all centres)

This option would likely result in a loss of retail space for many local centres. It would still support sustainable transport (14), thus reducing CO₂ emissions (1) and encouraging good health (11). Like option (ii), it may reduce pollution (6). The positive effects of this option are less significant or entirely

		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
uncertain when compared to option (ii). It may fail to provide enough retail space to create the desired character of a small centre.																					
<u>RL3(iv): More restrictive approach (60% 1A for all centres)</u> This option is likely to be overly ambitious, resulting in a tendency toward negative effects with regard to community cohesion (12) as it may result in empty units. Other effects are similar to that of option (ii).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from any of the policy options.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

RL4: BETTING SHOPS AND PAYDAY LOAN COMPANIES

		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
RL4(i) *▼	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0

		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
RL4(ii)	No new shops within a 150m radius of existing shops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0
RL4(iii)	Less restrictive (50m radius)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

RL4(i): No policy

The 'no policy' option represents business as usual. Since the last local plan, local planning authorities have been given more control over regulating the locations of betting shops and pay-day loan companies. Without a new policy, this option would likely result in clustering of such shops and result in negative sustainability effects. With regard to townscape character (9), clustering of such shops would bring negative effects. Community cohesion (12) may also be negatively affected, as betting shops contribute to deprivation and inequality (19).

RL4(ii): No new shops within a 150m radius of existing shops

This option would reverse the negative effects of a 'no policy' option by ensuring that shops do not locate in clusters. This would improve townscape character (9) and community cohesion (12) and have significant positive effect in reducing deprivation and inequality between communities (19).

RL4(iii): Less restrictive (50m radius)

A less restrictive policy would likely allow for some limited cluster of betting and payday loan shops. This may improve townscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and reduce deprivation (19), but its effects would simply have a tendency towards positive impacts rather than the improvement shown in option (ii).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.

RL5: IMPACT OF MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES

		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
RL5(i) *	No policy	X	0	X	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	XX	0	0	X	X	0	0
RL5(ii) ▼	Policy containing 1000 sq. m threshold	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0
RL5(iii)	Policy containing 100 sq. m threshold	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL5(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option is likely to increase the amount of out-of-centre development. Omission of a policy would rely on the default threshold in government guidance, which is 2,500 sq. m, significantly larger than some of Reading's identified centres. This would therefore allow developments without consideration of impact and could result in significant out-of-centre development. This would likely significantly increase the need to travel by car (14), with consequent effects on CO₂ (1), resource use (3), pollution (6) and health (11). Development out-of-centre is also more likely to use undeveloped land (4). Increasing negative impacts on smaller centres may also negatively affect economic growth and employment (18) and accessibility of leisure and culture facilities (17).

RL5(ii): Policy containing 1000 sq. m threshold

This option addresses many of the negative effects that would occur under a 'no policy' option. By requiring consideration of adverse effects of development over 1000 sq. m, out-of-centre development may be deterred. This would help to decrease the need to travel by car (14) and its accompanying effects. It would also reduce the likelihood of use of undeveloped land (4) and decrease negative economic impact on small centres (18).

RL5(iii): Policy containing 100 sq. m threshold

This option would bring the same effects as option (ii), but would require more applicants to perform an assessment. Developments of this size are

		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
unlikely to bring the same magnitude of impacts as those over 1000 sq. m. The 100 sq. m threshold may be too restrictive without any tangible benefits.																					
<p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

RL6: PROTECTION OF LEISURE FACILITIES AND PUBLIC HOUSES

		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
RL6(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	?	?X	0	0	0	0	0	XX	X	?✓	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0

		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
RL6(ii)	Strong protection of individual facilities	✓X	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
RL6(iii)	Strong protection of overall amount of existing facilities	✓	0	0	?	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
RL6(iv) ▼	Strongest protection in existing centres	✓	0	0	?	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL6(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in the loss of leisure facilities and public houses to residential development, for which the highest pressures exist. Thus, the only positive impact of a 'no policy' option may be for housing delivery (13). The negative effects of losing such facilities far outweigh the benefits. This would bring significant negative effects in terms access to recreation, leisure and culture (17) and healthy lifestyles (11). Many of these facilities form the heart of communities and their loss would affect community cohesion (12). Finally, many residents would have further to travel to reach other facilities, often by car (1, 14). Demolishing facilities could generate waste (5), as well.

RL6(ii): Strong protection of individual facilities

This option would address many of the negative effects outlined above. Retention of all facilities in their current locations would bring significant positive effects in terms of access to recreation, leisure and culture (17) and healthy lifestyles (11). Effects on sustainable transport (14) are mixed. This would depend on how well-placed current facilities are. Leaving facilities in place would have more pronounced effects in terms of waste (5) and resource use (3).

RL6(iii): Strong protection of overall amount of existing facilities

This option would also address many of the negative effects of a 'no policy' option. Because it would allow facilities to be replaced elsewhere, positive effects on waste (5) and resource use (3) are not as pronounced. This flexibility would more positively impact sustainable transport (14) and its accompanying effects.

RL6(iv): Strongest protection in existing centres

		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 option protects facilities generally, but with a particular emphasis on those in existing centres and brings the most significant positive impacts. Like options (ii) and (iii), it addresses the negative effects of a 'no policy' option, but does more to increase community cohesion (12).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (iv) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach. Any effects on housing provision as a result of protecting facilities would be offset on other sites.</p>																					

OU1: NEW AND EXISTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES

		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
OU1(i) *▼	No policy	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	X	0
OU1(ii)	Co-location and intensification of existing sites in centres	?✓	0	?✓	✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p><u>OU1(i): No policy</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
The absence of a policy may result in dispersed community services and increased travel distance for residents. This would bring negative impacts with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), resource use (3), use of undeveloped land (4) if new facilities were constructed on greenfield, pollution (6), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), recreation/leisure/culture (17) and inequality and deprivation (19).																					
<u>OU1(ii): Co-location and intensification of existing sites in centres</u> This option addressed all of the negative effects listed above. A tendency toward positive effects would occur in relation to CO ₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3) and pollution (6) by decreasing travel times and the negative effects of travel by car. By retaining existing building stock and expanding facilities on-site, use of undeveloped land (4) would be reduced. Sustainable transport (14) would be encouraged by co-location, as well as facility access (15), healthy lifestyles (11), community cohesion (12) and recreation/culture/leisure access (17). Protecting and growing existing community facilities will also serve deprived communities and help to reduce inequality (19).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

OU2: HAZARDOUS INSTALLATIONS

		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
OU2(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	?X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
OU2(ii) ▼	Must not pose health and safety risks and potential risks must be safeguarded against	0	0	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

OU2(i): No policy
This option would provide less control in guiding hazardous installations to appropriate sites and would likely result in a tendency toward negative impacts in utilising brownfield land (4). These sites carry a risk that hazardous materials may become released into the environment following an accident. While these risks are to some extent minimised by other legislation (e.g. COMAH regulations), this option could result in sites being inappropriately located; and, in the unlikely event of an accident, other negative impacts may occur with respect to pollution (6), wildlife and the natural environment (7) and landscape character (9). Moderate negative impacts would occur with regard to human health (11).

OU2(ii): Must not pose health and safety risks and potential risks must be safeguarded against
This option would guide hazardous installations to appropriate sites and would result in positive impacts in terms of utilising brownfield land (4). Significant positive impacts would occur in respect to human health (10) and moderate positive impacts in respect to pollution (6), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9).

Conclusion
Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues
The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.

OU3: TELECOMMUNICATIONS 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
OU3(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
OU3(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (SDPD DM21)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>OU3(i): No policy</u> This option would ensure health and economic growth, but does not go far enough to contribute to the creation of cleaner environments by minimising visual clutter and preventing the addition of unnecessary street furniture. This would bring moderate negative impacts with regard to landscape or townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10).</p>																					
<p><u>OU3(ii): Continue current policy (SDPD DM21)</u> This option would have the most significant positive impacts on landscape or townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) since it encourages the use of concealment options. Provided that proposals meet existing international guidelines for public exposure, neither option should be associated with impacts on human health (11). Both options score positively in relation to supporting economic growth and employment (18) because both enable further communications development that would assist and grow local businesses.</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

OU4: ADVERTISEMENTS

		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
OU5(i) *	No policy	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OU5(ii) ▼	Continue existing policy (SDPD DM22)	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>OU5(i): No policy</u></p> <p>A ‘no policy’ option would most negatively affect amenity in terms of townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). The omission of detailed guidance regarding illumination may negatively impact resource use (3) if high levels are used at all times. Finally, detrimental effects to amenity or decreased visibility as a result of advertisements may negatively impact community cohesion or facilitate crime and vandalism (12).</p>																					
<p><u>OU5(ii): Continue existing policy (SDPD DM22)</u></p> <p>This policy would address the negative amenity impacts described above by maximising the contribution that advertisements make to a safe and clean environment and attractive buildings. By guiding luminance and illumination, this policy may reduce resource use (3). The most positive impacts would occur with regard to townscape character (9). Appropriate advertisements would prevent damage to the historic environment (10) and may improve community cohesion (12).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

OU5: SHOPFRONTS AND CASH MACHINES

		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
OU4(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OU4(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (SDPD DM23)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					
<p><u>OU4(i): No policy</u></p> <p>A ‘no policy’ option would rely on general cross-cutting strategies that deal with design. These policies do not specifically deal with shopfronts. Thus, the effect is uncertain. Relying on high level design policies would result in a tendency towards positive effects with relation to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Because this option would fail to deal with some issues in detail, like opaque shopfronts and illumination, effects concerning community cohesion (11) are uncertain.</p>																					
<p><u>OU4(ii): Continue current policy (SDPD DM23)</u></p> <p>The current policy provides more detail for shopfront design. This option seeks to ensure that shopfronts use colour, materials and design that are complimentary to the building and street. This would have significant positive impacts on townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). This option also attempts to address opaque shopfronts and illumination, bringing positive effects with regard to community cohesion (12).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

		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

CR1: DEFINITION OF CENTRAL READING

		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
CR1(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	X	0	0
CR1(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RCAAP RC6)	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR1(i): No policy

Omission of a policy clearly defining the Central Area boundary would fail to mark the edge of the town centre. This could lead to sprawl and inappropriate uses throughout the Borough. Without this boundary, the sequential test in paragraph 24 of the NPPF could not be applied. This would result in negative effects with regard to the use of undeveloped land (4), local character (9), the historic environment (10), housing provision (13), sustainable transport and economic growth (18).

CR1(ii): Continue current policy (RCAAP RC6)

This option would allow for the application of the sequential test and focus retain development, office development and other main town centre uses to specific areas. This would make best use of previously developed land (4), provide for housing and economic growth (13, 18) and encourage sustainable transport by clustering many uses in a highly accessible area (14). Guiding development within the boundaries is less likely to have negative impacts on the local character of surrounding suburbs or conservation areas (9, 10).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

		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 from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

CR2: DESIGN IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR2(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR2(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RC5 RCAAP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR2(iii)	Edited RC5 with added green infrastructure consideration	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>COMMENTS:</p> <p><u>CR2(i): No policy</u></p> <p>A 'no policy' option would rely on higher level cross-cutting design policies. These may ignore design considerations that are needed specifically for the town centre. Because an existing design policy would still apply to development in the town centre, negative impacts are unlikely, but positive impacts are not as significant. A tendency toward positive impacts would occur with regard to townscape character (9), historic character (10), community cohesion (12) and sustainable transport (14).</p> <p><u>CR2(ii): Continue current policy (RC5 RCAAP)</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
<p>The existing policy provides more guidance on those elements of design that are specific to the central area. Applications are required to demonstrate engaging frontages, enhanced ease of movement, a sense of place, high quality design and ability to enhance community safety. This would result in positive impacts on sustainability objectives 9, 10, 12 and 14 (townscape character, historic character, community cohesion and sustainable transport).</p> <p><u>CR2(iii): Edited RC5 with added green infrastructure consideration</u> This option is largely similar to the existing policy and would have the same positive impacts in terms of townscape character (9), historic character (10), crime (12) and sustainable transport (14). In addition, this option includes a consideration for green infrastructure such as roof gardens or green walls. This would bring additional benefits to objective 7 (wildlife and the natural environment) and result in more significant positive impacts with regard to townscape character (9).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

CR3: PUBLIC REALM IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR3(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	0	X	X	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0

		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
CR3(ii)	Continue with current policy (RC14 RCAAP) but defer open space protection to EN policies	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0
CR3(iii)	Edited RC14 with specific open space creation requirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓X	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would result in a lack of new civic spaces in the town centre, harm existing continuous public access to and along waterways and result in development that turns its back on waterways. This would result in negative effects regarding wildlife (7) as new public open space or civic space with tree planting could contribute to important habitat. Additionally, townscape and landscape character (9) would be harmed by a lack of civic space or development that ignores river assets. Health (11) would be harmed if a loss of public access resulting in less informal recreation or active transport participation, such as walking and cycling. Impacts on housing (13) are unclear. Finally, recreation, leisure and culture access (17) would see negative impacts.

CR3(ii): Continue with current policy (RC14 RCAAP) but defer open space protection to EN policies

This policy largely represents a continuation of existing policy, but removes a list of specific open space areas protected from development since these areas are protected by policy EN7. This policy requires that sites 1 ha and larger provide new civic space and all development contribute to the public realm. Additionally, development should enhance waterways and maintain and improve upon public access. This would increase the value of the public realm in the centre and improve townscape character (9), as well as maintain or improve habitat for wildlife and give residents increased access to the natural environment (7). Health (11) would see positive benefits as an improved public realm would encourage walking and cycling, as well as other outdoor leisure activities (17). Community cohesion (12) would improve as a result of improved civic areas and more "eyes on the street." The effects on housing provision (13) are mixed. Using valuable town centre land for civic space may decrease the amount of land available for housing, but civic squares may help to deliver high quality places for residents to live.

CR3(iii): Edited RC14 with specific open space creation requirement

The effects of this option are largely similar to that of option (ii) with a few changes. By requiring a specific requirement for open space, positive effects

		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>on leisure and recreation (17) would be more dramatic, but housing provision (13) would suffer as valuable housing land needed for residential development would become civic space. Community cohesion (12) effects would be mixed. More civic space could mean fewer residential dwellings, which can aid in community cohesion. Despite this, civic space in and of itself can bring its own cohesive effects.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

CR4: LEISURE, CULTURE AND TOURISM IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR4(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	?	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	0
CR4(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (RC7 RCAAP)	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0
CR4(iii)	New policy that prioritises specific leisure facilities	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>CR4(i): No policy</u></p> <p>A ‘no policy’ approach has the potential to result in more leisure uses outside the centre. Without this policy, there is less of a drive to ensure major leisure or cultural uses. This would result in negative effects in terms of recreation, leisure and culture (17) overall. Additionally, this may increase travel times for residents to reach facilities, negatively impacting facility access (15) and sustainable transport (14), with accompanying effects of increased CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and health (11). Finally, townscape character (9) may be compromised, as a variety of uses including leisure and culture help contribute to vibrant town centres and a sense of place. Community cohesion (12) effects are unclear.</p>																					
<p><u>CR4(ii): Continue with current policy (RC7 RCAAP)</u></p> <p>This policy helps to encourage a variety of leisure, culture and tourism facilities in the town centre. This would reduce travel times and encourage sustainable transport (14), bringing positive effects in terms of CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6) and health (11). Facility access (15) and townscape character (9) would improve, as well as community cohesion (12) since a robust leisure offer can increase “eyes on the street” at different times of the day. The most significant positive effects would occur with regard to leisure, culture and recreation (17).</p>																					
<p><u>CR4(iii): New policy that prioritises specific leisure facilities</u></p> <p>This policy would prioritise certain leisure uses in the town centre. It would result in many of the same positive sustainability effects as option (ii), but may unfairly prioritise certain uses over others. This would contribute to the same aims, but a prioritised leisure offer is likely to appeal to only a select part of the population. The positive effects with regard to objective 17 (leisure, culture and recreation) are less significant and access to services and facilities is less certain (15).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

CR5: DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR5(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0
CR5(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (RC8 RCAAP)	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0
CR5(iii)	Restrict total number of establishments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0
CR5(iv)	Restrict new establishments to existing clusters within the centre	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	?X	?X	0	0
CR5(v)	Allow limited amount of establishments outside the town centre	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X	?X	0	X	0	0	?X	?X	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR5(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to drive drinking establishments toward the town centre. Other cross-cutting policies would inform these developments, but specific considerations for drinking establishments would be absent. This would result in negative effects with regard to noise (6), townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion and crime (12), sustainable transport (14) and recreation/leisure (17). Drinking establishments may interfere with landscape or townscape character outside the town centre, increase anti-social behaviour and encourage car-use. This is especially dangerous considering the negative health and safety impacts of drink driving.

CR5(ii): Continue with current policy (RC8 RCAAP)

This policy would reverse the negative impacts of a 'no policy' option. It would drive drinking establishments towards the town centre, thus enabling sustainable transport (14), with positive impacts of health (11) and safety (12). Noise pollution (6) may see a tendency towards positive effects, since

		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>drinking establishments that would be outside the town centre would be concentrated in denser, commercially focussed areas. Townscape character (9) and leisure, recreation and culture (17) offering would see positive impacts since drinking establishments provide an important part of the night-time economy and “eyes on the street” at night.</p>																					
<p><u>CR5(iii): Restrict total number of establishments</u> Restricting the total number of establishments may reduce crime (12) and improve health (11), but negative impacts would occur with regard to leisure (17) and economic growth and employment (18). Drinking establishments help to provide a balanced economy and employment opportunity.</p>																					
<p><u>CR5(iv): Restrict new establishments to existing clusters within the centre</u> The effects of this option are largely similar to option (ii), but the positive effects are less significant. A tendency towards negative effects would occur with regard to crime (12) by concentrating large amounts of anti-social behaviour in smaller clusters. Negative effects may also occur with regard to leisure (17) and the economy (18) by limiting the units available for new drinking establishments. Drinking establishments are a major driver of economic activity in the town centre. Limiting their growth would limit the night-time economy.</p>																					
<p><u>CR5(v): Allow limited amount of establishments outside the town centre</u> This option fails to drive development to the town centre, resulting in many of the same negative effects of a ‘no policy’ option, but with less significant effects since the overall number of new establishments would be limited.</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

CR6: LIVING IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR6(i) *	No policy	?X	0	0	X	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X	X	XX	XX	?X	0	?X	0	0	0
CR6(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (RC9 RCAAP)	✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓	0	0	?X
CR6(iii)	More aspirational split of dwelling sizes	?	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	✓	0	?X	✓	✓X	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X
CR6(iv)	Less aspirational split of dwelling sizes	?	0	0	?X	0	?	0	0	?	0	?	?✓	?X	✓	✓X	0	✓	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR6(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to drive residential development towards the town centre. This would result in many negative impacts, the most significant being increased private car use (14) and failure to provide housing (13). This would result in accompanying negative effects such as and increased CO₂ emissions (1), greater pollution (6), less active transport and health (11) and worsened facility access (15) including leisure, culture and recreation (17). More undeveloped land (4) would be utilised for housing and the town centre would lack mixed-uses that contribute to vibrancy, townscape character (9) and community cohesion (12).

CR6(ii): Continue with current policy (RC9 RCAAP)

Encouraging residential development in the town centre is expected to reduce pressures for undeveloped land elsewhere (4). This policy would promote sustainable transport (14) and reduce CO₂ emissions (1), reduce pollution (6), encourage active transport and health (11) and improve facility access (15). Additionally, increased residential density in the town centre would result in community cohesion (12), townscape character (9) and help to ensure high quality housing of a variety of type and cost (13). Finally, residents would be located closer to leisure, culture and recreation offer (17). Locating more residents in the town centre will place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

CR6(iii): More aspirational split of dwelling sizes

		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 approach is similar to option (ii), but requires a more stringent split of dwellings sizes (for example, 15% achieving three or more bedrooms and a maximum of 20% being one-bed dwellings.) This option carries many of the same positive effects with regard to sustainable transport (14) and community cohesion (12), but may place undue burden on local facilities (15) with more families residing in the town centre, such as healthcare (11), leisure (17) and education (20). Effects on unused land (4), CO₂ emissions (1) and pollution (6) are unclear.</p> <p><u>CR6(iv): Less aspirational split of dwelling sizes</u> This approach carries less negative effects than option (iii), but still fails to provide the needed mix of housing (13). Less pressure would be placed on facilities since fewer families would reside in the town centre, but unused land (4) may be used for family residential development instead of well-connected sites in town.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the number of residents in the town centre is likely to place further stress on already strained education and healthcare infrastructure. These effects should be mitigated through on-site provision or appropriate planning contributions.</p>																					

CR7: PRIMARY FRONTAGES IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR7(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0

		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
CR7(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (RC10 RCAAP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
CR7(iii)	More aspirational, restrict changes of use more in the town centre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR7(i): No policy

A 'no policy' approach relies on national guidance and cross-cutting local design policies. This guidance is not very specific on the need for continuous active and visually interesting frontages in the town centre. The absence of such guidance is likely to result in negative impacts with regard to townscape character (9), crime and community cohesion as a result of decreased visibility (12) and economic growth and employment (18). Active frontages promote a vibrant town centre and their absence would result in decreased amenity and safety, as well as economic activity.

CR7(ii): Continue with current policy (RC10 RCAAP)

This option reverses the negative impacts of a 'no policy' option with regard to townscape character (9) and crime and community cohesion (12). It may not go far enough in preventing certain changes of use. This policy is therefore more relaxed than existing policies for smaller centres. Thus, it brings positive and negative effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18). Fewer restrictions on changes of use can help maintain diversity, but can also limit the amount of units available for needed uses.

CR7(iii): More aspirational, restrict changes of use more in the town centre

This option aims to retain positive impacts with regard to townscape character (9) and crime and community cohesion (12), while better controlling changes of use. This would help to strike a balance between diversity of units and density of desired uses to help encourage economic growth and employment (18).

Conclusion

Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

		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
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option. MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

CR8: SMALL SHOP UNITS IN CENTRAL READING

		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
CR8(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	X	0	0
CR8(ii) ▼	Continue with existing policy, strong language for inclusion of small shops (RC11 RCAAP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0
CR8(iii)	No strong requirement for major development to include provision for small shops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
COMMENTS: CR8(i): No policy A 'no policy' option would result in fewer units for small shops. Small shops provide and important part of a balanced local economy, increase foot traffic,																					

		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
	provide retail at a scale appropriate for pedestrians and give opportunity for small-scale leisure, culture and recreation. Ignoring these needs would result in negative impacts with regard to townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), recreation, leisure and culture (17) and economic growth and employment (18).																				
	<u>CR8(ii): Continue with existing policy, strong language for inclusion of small shops (RC11 RCAAP)</u> This approach requires that large retail development make provision for small shops and ensure that the negative effects of a ‘no policy’ option are fully reversed. This would increase walkability (14), cultural offer (17), street character (9) and community cohesion (12) while providing a balanced local economy (18).																				
	<u>CR8(iii): No strong requirement for major development to include provision for small shops</u> This option would make a weaker statement regarding provision of small shops. It would likely result in some provision, but not to the extent of option (ii). Thus, positive effects are much less significant.																				
	<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																				
	MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																				

CR9: TERRACED HOUSING IN CENTRAL READING

		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

		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
CR9(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	XX	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR9(ii)	Protection of waterside terraced housing only	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓X	0	✓X	X✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR9(iii) ▼	Continue with current policy (RCAAP RC12, protection of waterside terraced housing, Sackville St and Vachel Rd and Stanshawe Rd)	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR9(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to provide protection to some of Reading's most distinctive housing in the town centre. This would bring negative effects with regard to townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), and housing provision (13). The most significant negative impacts would occur with regard to heritage (10).

CR9(ii): Protection of waterside terraced housing only

This option would bring similar effects to that of option (iii), but impacts would be mixed with regard to heritage (10), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13) as this option would only protect a portion of terraced housing the in the town centre and leave other locations vulnerable. Both option (ii) and (iii) would result in negative impacts with regard to climate change, since waterside terraced housing is located in flood zones 2 and 3.

CR9(iii): Continue with current policy (RCAAP RC12, protection of waterside terraced housing, Sackville St and Vachel Rd and Stanshawe Rd)

This option would best protect terraced housing within the town centre. This would bring positive impacts with regard to townscape character (9), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13). Preservation of areas of terraced housing assists in maintaining a mix and variety of housing types in the centre and helps cater to different needs, such as those of small families. The most significant positive effects are on the historic environment (10). These sites provide a good visual clue to Reading's history. Protecting these traditional terraces help to preserve some of the Borough's historic features.

		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
Again, negative impacts with respect to flooding (2) must be mitigated.																					
<p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Because waterside terraced housing is located within flood zones, these effects must be mitigated by ensuring that relevant planning applications are accompanied by Flood Risk Assessments and that plans demonstrate flood risk is being appropriately managed in accordance with flooding policy EN17.</p>																					

CR10: TALL BUILDINGS

		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
CR10(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	XX	X	0	0	XX	X	X	0	0	X	0	?

		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
CR10(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RCAAP RC10)	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR10(iii)	Amend policy approach to include more scope for tall buildings	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	✓X	0	0	✓✓	0	?X
CR10(iv)	Amend to further limit scope for tall buildings	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	?	0	0	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?X	0	?

COMMENTS:

CR10(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option could result in proliferation of tall buildings in inappropriate locations. In turn, it could also neglect the potential of tall buildings in the town centre. These serve to signify the centre as a major mixed-use destination and provide a distinctive skyline. Tall buildings also serve to provide vital residential density and office space. Neglecting these needs would have various negative effects. The most significant negative effects would occur with regard to landscape character (9) and housing provision (13). A concentration of residential and office space in the town centre also serves to reduce travel times, promote sustainable transport and locate individuals close to vital services. Thus, moderate negative effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), undeveloped land (4), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18). Finally, a tall buildings policy would provide design guidance in a historically sensitive area of town. Without this guidance, a tendency towards negative effects may occur with regard to the historic environment (10).

CR10(ii): Continue current policy (RCAAP RC10)

The current policy provides guidance for tall buildings and concentrates this development in strategic locations. This serves to reverse many of the negative effects of a 'no policy' option, but does not go as far as an amended policy with more scope for tall buildings. Positive effects would occur in relation to undeveloped land (4), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18). A tendency towards positive effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), townscape and landscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Tall residential buildings may increase stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre, thus a tendency towards negative effects would occur in relation to education and facility access (15, 20).

CR10(iii): Amend policy approach to include more scope for tall buildings

This option is largely similar to the existing approach in option (ii), but some additional scope for tall buildings has been identified. This brings the same

		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
positive effects as option (ii), but these are more pronounced. The most significant positive benefit would occur in housing provision (13) and economic growth (18). Moderate positive effects would occur in relation to undeveloped land (4), sustainable transport (14) and facility access (15). A tendency towards positive effects would occur with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), character (9) and the historic environment (10). Again, increasing the amount of residences in the town centre will place stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20) and a tendency towards negative effects will occur.																					
<u>CR10(iv): Amend to further limit scope for tall buildings</u> This option will allow for some tall buildings, but will limit the amount identified within the current policy. This would bring positive effects with regard to landscape character (9), but would fail to accommodate the level of growth expected and would hinder sustainable transport. This would bring a tendency towards negative effects with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), undeveloped land (4), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for tall buildings will place additional stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre. School and surgery capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. This may be achieved through on-site provision or the appropriate planning contributions.																					

CR11: DEVELOPMENT IN THE STATION/RIVER MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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

		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
CR11(i) *	No policy	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	?X	?X	X	X	X	0	0	X	0	0
CR11(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RCAAP RC1)	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR11(iii)	Update policy to reflect need for more residential development	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR11(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to provide distinctive guidance for major development within the town centre. This could lead to effects such as increased development out of the town centre using undeveloped land and increasing travel by car, reduced residential density at important transport nodes and inappropriate design near heritage elements. This would bring a tendency towards negative effects with regard to health (11) and community cohesion (12). Moderate negative effects would occur in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), undeveloped land (4), townscape character (9), heritage (10), housing (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18).

CR11(ii): Continue current policy (RCAAP RC1)

Continuing the current policy would provide guidance for major development in the town centre near the station and river as a major mixed-use area. This would reverse many of the negative effects of a 'no policy' option, but would only bring a tendency towards positive benefits since many elements of RCAAP RC1 are in need of an update that takes account of completed or ongoing projects. Positive effects would occur with regard to sustainable transport (14) and economic growth (18). A tendency towards positive impacts would occur in relation to CO₂ emissions (1), undeveloped land (4), landscape and townscape character (9), the historic environment (10), health (11), community cohesion (12) and housing provision (13). Any increase in residential dwellings in the town centre is likely to place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

CR11(iii): Update policy to reflect need for more residential development

An updated policy would bring many of the same benefits as option (ii), but the effects would be more pronounced. Because this option includes specific dwelling targets, it would bring significant positive effects with regard to housing provision (13). Moderate positive effects would occur in relation to community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18). A tendency towards positive effects CO₂ emissions (1), undeveloped land (4), landscape and townscape character (9), heritage (10) and health (11). An increase in residential density in this area will likely increase pressure on school places and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20), bringing negative effects.

		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>Conclusion Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre. These effects can be mitigated through on-site provision or the appropriate planning contributions.</p>																					

CR11a: FRIAR ST AND STATION RD

		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
CR11a(i) ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X

		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
CR11a(ii) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0
CR11a(iii)	More limited identification of individual sites	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
CR11a(iv)	Allocate for residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	?X	?X	0	X
CR11a(v)	Allocate for offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR11a(i): Continue with current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste production (5) and pollution (6). The effect on townscape character would largely depend on design (10). The site incorporates, and is close to, a number of listed buildings. Therefore, there is a potential for negative impacts on the historic environment (10). These should be carefully mitigated. This site would provide a significant amount of housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but this could place a strain on already stretched healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Additionally, residents in the location may be exposed to poor air quality (11). The allocation includes leisure and town centre uses, so this would bring a significant positive effect on access to leisure (17), although its effects on services would be offset by the impact on healthcare (15). In terms of economic growth, development itself could bring positive effects (18).

CR11a(ii): Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retention of buildings and no redevelopment, although the performance of current building may not be optimal in the long term. This option would miss an important opportunity to use an accessible brownfield site for housing (4, 13, 14).

CR11a(iii): More limited identification of individual sites

This option is unlikely to make a significant difference to the outcome of continuing the current mixed use allocation. Any differences it makes are likely to be matters of detail and therefore the assessment is identical to option (i).

CR11a(iv): Allocate for residential

This option is largely similar to continuing the current mixed use allocation, but it may miss an important opportunity to provide town centre, retail and leisure uses (17, 18) on ground floors. In locating more residents in the town centre, this may place further stress on healthcare and education facilities

		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>(20).</p> <p>CR11a(v): Allocate for offices This option is similar to that of option (iv), but offices in this location may increase economic growth (18) and decrease pressure on nearby education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20). Most importantly, this option misses an important opportunity to provide housing (13).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (i) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of listed buildings or archaeological potential will need to be managed.. The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents should be mitigated through design, while environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

CR11b: GREYFRIARS RD CORNER

		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
CR11b(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	✓	?X	0	?	0	0	?	?✓	✓	0	X	✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0	✓

		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
CR11b(ii)	Mixed use with leisure and retail on ground floor, 90-140 dwellings	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	0	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓	?	0	?X
CR11b(iii)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	0	0	0	?✓	?X	0	?✓	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR11b(iv) ▼	Residential and office development (up to 60 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	?✓	X	0	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	?✓	✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR11b(i): Do not allocate

This option would still represent reasonably efficient development in a highly accessible area (4, 14), despite the fact that the site may be better suited to residential. By leaving the site in its current use, it is assumed that it will continue to have a positive economic impact (18). The impacts on nearby terraced housing and local character will remain as is, though there may be a missed opportunity to upgrade and improve the appearance or environmental standards of the building. The building at present makes no contribution to housing provision (13) and residential development would bring more positive sustainability effects.

CR11b(ii): Mixed use with leisure and retail on ground floor, 90-140 dwellings

This option would have positive implications for housing provision, accessibility and access to town centre uses (11, 13, 14, 17). This would place pressure on existing healthcare and education services (15, 20). This option also has the potential to generate negative impacts on amenity (9), if the height of the redevelopment surpassed that at present and towered over the adjoining terraced housing. This terraced housing in the centre contributes to historic character and is sensitive to surrounding development (10). Any redevelopment would bring negative effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3) and waste (5).

CR11b(iii): Office development

This option's effects are similar to those of option (ii), but miss an important opportunity to provide housing in the town centre in a previously developed, highly accessible location (13). This option may increase positive economic effects (18). Failing to provide housing in this location would not increase pressure on existing education and healthcare facilities (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>CR11b(iv): Residential and office development (up to 60 dwellings) This option would bring many of the same benefits as option (ii) since the site has excellent access to public transport and other services. This has the potential to significantly reduce reliance on cars (14). Like option (ii) there are also opportunities to create community cohesion (12). Again, additional demand would be placed on existing healthcare and education facilities (15, 20). Provided that the development is designed to accord with design policies, redevelopment should not impact the integrity of nearby terraced housing (10). This site does not provide as much housing as option (ii) (13).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of nearby terraced housing will need to be managed. The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

CR11c: STATION HILL AND FRIARS WALK

		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
CR11c(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	XX	X	X	0	0	0	XX	0	0

		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
CR11c(ii) ▼	Continue current allocation	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	✓X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
CR11c(iii)	Mixed use with greater emphasis on offices (more accurately reflects current permission)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	✓X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
CR11c(iv)	Allocate for offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR11c(v)	Allocate for residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓X	✓X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	✓	?X	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR11c(i): Do not allocate

In appraising this option, the demolition of the site must be borne in mind. Such an accessible and prominent site sitting vacant would have significant negative effects on the preservation of undeveloped land (4), townscape character (9), the nearby historic environment (10) and on the overall economic growth prospects (18). Finally, this option would fail to provide housing (13).

CR11c(ii): Continue current allocation

Any redevelopment would bring the same negative environmental effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6), with short-term costs offset by long-term benefits through sustainable design and construction. Development of this site at high density with a mix of uses would have significant positive effects on previously developed land (4), provision of housing and leisure (13, 17) and on economic growth (18). The development is in one of the most accessible locations in Reading and a major development on the site would significantly reduce the need to travel (14). The current situation is that the site is in the process of demolition. Therefore, development of the vacant site will have a significant positive impact on the townscape (9) and will bring natural surveillance to the new station south public space and interchange (12). The impact on the nearby listed buildings could be positive or negative depending on the quality of the design (10).

CR11c(iii): Mixed use with greater emphasis on offices (more accurately reflects current permission)

The effects of this option are identical to those of option (ii). Because the site is so large and incorporates so much office space and housing provision, any

		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
shift toward emphasising either use has minimal effects.																					
<p><u>CR11c(iv): Allocate for offices</u> The environmental effects of this option are similar to those of options (ii) and (iii), but many social effects differ. In terms of health (11), community cohesion (12), facility access (15), leisure (17) and education (20), effects would be neutral since office development would prevent residents living on the site. This option fails to provide housing (13), but has significant positive effects for economic development (18).</p>																					
<p><u>CR11c(v): Allocate for residential</u> Like option (iv), the environmental effects of this alternative are largely similar. Locating so many residents in the town centre would bring negative effects in relation to existing healthcare infrastructure (11, 15) and school places (20), as well as economic activity by failing to include any commercial space (18). However, this option would bring positive effects in creating community cohesion (12) and leisure (17), as well as providing a significant amount of housing (13).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of nearby terraced housing will need to be managed. The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																					

CR11d: BRUNEL ARCADE AND APEX PLAZA

		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

		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
CR11d(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	XX	0	0	0	X	0	0
CR11d(ii)	Mixed use scheme including residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓✓	0	X
CR11d(iii)	Retail and related uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0
CR11d(iv)	Office use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR11d(v)	Residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR11d(i): Do not allocate

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 make a particularly positive contribution to the townscape (9). Not developing this accessible brownfield site will have significant negative effects on undeveloped land and the need to travel (4, 14) and would also fail to provide housing (13) and send the wrong message for economic growth (18).

CR11d(ii): Mixed use scheme including residential

This option would involve efficient use of a very accessible, previously-developed site (4, 14), bringing significant positive effects. Redevelopment of this key site would also have a significant positive effect on the local economy (18), both directly through development for commercial use and indirectly by improving the first impression of Reading for visitors. It would also make a significant contribution to the provision of new housing (13). With any development there are associated environmental costs (1, 3, 5, 6), but sustainable building practices may bring benefits in the long term. A positive effect on townscape character (9) would be significant. Any impacts on adjacent listed buildings would require mitigation (10). In terms of health, the occupants of any residential development would be able to make many of their journeys on foot, therefore promoting healthy lifestyles (11). At the same time, though, they would be located in the Air Quality Management Area with potential noise effects (6, 11). There would be good access to many services (15), but increasing the amount of residents in town would place strain on town centre education and health services (15).

CR11d(iii): Retail and related uses

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

		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
		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 fewer effects on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).																			
		<p>CR11d(iv): Office use The appraisal for this option is similar to the retail option, but would have an opportunity to provide recreation, leisure or culture (17).</p> <p>CR11d(v): Residential The effects of this option are nearly identical to the mixed use option above, but without an employment generating use the impact on economic growth (18) would be less positive.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Impacts on the historic environment in terms of nearby listed buildings will need to be managed. The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution.</p>																			

CR11e: NORTH OF 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
CR11e(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR11e(ii) ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	?X	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
CR11e(iii)	Less emphasis on retail and leisure	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	✓	0	X
CR11e(iv)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR11e(v)	Residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	?✓	?✓	0	X
CR11e(vi)	Locate uses in accordance with flood risk	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X	0	✓✓	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR11e(i): Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of these buildings is unlikely to be optimal in the long term. This option would also miss an important opportunity to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14).

CR11e(ii): Continue current mixed use allocation

All types of redevelopment would carry the same environmental costs and benefits, with short-term costs being offset by long-term benefits (1, 3, 5, 6). Development of this accessible brownfield site at high density with a mix of uses would have a significant positive effect on previously developed land (4), provision of housing (13) and leisure (17), and on economic growth (18). The development is in a very accessible location and a major development will significantly reduce the need to travel by car. 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, but some new facilities could be provided on-site (15). Because the site is within the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, there are significant negative effects on the health of residents that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the floodplain.

CR11e(iii): Less emphasis on retail and leisure

While there is interest in some retail and leisure provision on site, the level of development envisaged in previous plans seems unlikely to be delivered. Therefore, effects in terms of provision of services (15), leisure (17) and contribution to the economy (18) are likely to be less positive. Other effects are the same as those for the current mixed use allocation.

		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>CR11e(iv): Office development</u> Office development carries many of the same effects as the mixed use allocation, but would fail to provide housing (13). This option would avoid negative effects on health (11), facilities (15) and education (20) since no residential development would take place. Additional office space provision would bring significant positive effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18).</p> <p><u>CR11e(v): Residential development</u> This alternative carries many of the same effects as other options, but succeeds in providing significant amounts of housing in a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). In contrast, flood risk (2) has the ability to harm health (11) and an increase in residents would place stress on already strained healthcare and education infrastructure (11, 15, 20).</p> <p><u>CR11e(vi): Locate uses in accordance with flood risk</u> This would see the layout of the site dictated by flood risk, with more vulnerable residential uses kept out of areas with the highest risk. Ultimately, this would be likely to result in less residential being delivered on the site. Therefore, it would make less of a contribution to housing (13) while having a more positive score for adaptation to climate change (2) and health (11). Other effects are largely the same as for the current allocation. Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Flood risk must be considered and managed properly in order to prevent impacts on human health or older, less mobile residents.</p>																					

CR11f: WEST OF CAVERSHAM RD

		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
CR11f(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR11f(ii)	Mixed use development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	?X	✓✓	✓✓	0	X
CR11f(iii)	Retail/Leisure development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0
CR11f(iv)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR11f(v)	Open space	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	?✓	0	✓X	0	XX	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
CR11f(vi)	Industrial/Warehouse development	✓X	0	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR11f(vii)	Low density residential	✓X	?X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?X	?✓	0	0	X
CR11f(viii)	Higher density residential	✓X	XX	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	?✓	0	0	XX

COMMENTS:

CR11f(i): Do not allocate

This option would fail to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14). Retaining the existing buildings may serve environmental objectives in the short-term by avoiding redevelopment, but the current environmental performance is unlikely to be sustainable in the long term (1, 3, 5, 6). Retention of the existing facility in this location does not serve amenity objectives or contribute to local character (9).

CR11f(ii): Mixed use development

All types of redevelopment would carry the same environmental costs and benefits, with short-term costs being offset by long-term benefits (1, 3, 5, 6). Development of this accessible brownfield site at high density with a mix of uses would have a significant positive effect on previously developed land (4), provision of housing (13) and leisure (17), and on economic growth (18). The development is in a very accessible location and a major development will

		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
	significantly reduce the need to travel by car. 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, but some new facilities could be provided on-site (15). Because the site is within the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, there are significant negative effects on the health of residents that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development in the floodplain.																				
	<u>CR11f(iii): Retail/leisure development</u> Retail and leisure development carries many of the same effects as the mixed use allocation, but would fail to provide housing (13). This option would avoid negative effects on health (11), facilities (15) and education (20) since no residential development would take place. Additional leisure and retail provision would bring significant positive effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18) and leisure/recreation (17).																				
	<u>CR11f(iv): Office development</u> Office development carries many of the same effects as the mixed use allocation, but would fail to provide housing (13). This option would avoid negative effects on health (11), facilities (15) and education (20) since no residential development would take place. Additional office space provision would bring significant positive effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18).																				
	<u>CR11f(v): Open space</u> Open space but would fail to provide housing (13) at a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 14). This option would avoid negative effects on health (11), facilities (15) and education (20) since no residential development would take place. Additional open space provision would bring significant positive effects with regard to local character (9), but the site may be polluted by poor air quality (11). Avoiding redevelopment would lessen negative environmental effects (1, 3, 5, 6) and provide an opportunity for leisure and recreation (17).																				
	<u>CR11f(vi): Industrial/Warehouse development</u> This appraisal is similar to that of office development, but may bring additional impacts with regard to health (11) and transport (14) if development results in noise, pollution or increased HGV traffic.																				
	<u>CR11f(vii): Low density residential</u> This alternative carries many of the same effects as other options, but succeeds in providing significant amounts of housing in a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). In contrast, flood risk (2) has the ability to harm health (11) and an increase in residents would place stress on already strained healthcare and education infrastructure (11, 15, 20). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.																				
	<u>CR11f(viii): Higher density residential</u> Higher density residential developed would have many of the same effects as low density residential. Negative effects with regard to flood risk (2) and health (11) would increase since more residents would be located within an area of flood risk. Additionally, because the site is surrounded by low rise residential and																				

		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
terraced housing, high density residential development would harm local character (9). Pressure on schools and healthcare would be even more pronounced (11, 15, 20).																					
<p>Conclusion Option (vii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>																					

CR11g: 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
CR11g(i) ▼	Continue current mixed use allocation	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	?X	✓	✓X	0	X

		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
CR11g(ii) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR11g(iii)	Mainly commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR11g(iv)	Mainly leisure development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	X	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0
CR11g(v)	Residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	X	?✓	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR11g(i): Continue current mixed use allocation

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits for all types of redevelopment (1, 3, 5, 6), with short-term costs offset by long-term benefits. Development of the site with a mix of uses in line with the allocation would have a significant positive effect on previously developed land (4) and provision of housing (13). A major development at this site would significantly reduce the need to travel by car (14). There would be positive effects on access to leisure, through new facilities and locating residents close to a recreation area (17). There would be some loss of employment floorspace, but the allocation could include some employment generating uses of its own (18). The site is adjacent to the Thames and could make a contribution to the landscape (9). More residents in the town centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, although some new services and facilities could be provided on-site. The site is located within the AQMA and could negatively affect residents' health (11). This would require mitigation. New leisure facilities could promote the use of the riverside and enhance healthy lifestyles. Finally, there is also a potential negative impact on flooding of the development (2).

CR11g(ii): Do not allocate

Retaining buildings would achieve positive environmental effects in the short term, although the performance of the buildings may not be optimal in the long term (1, 3, 5, 6). An accessible brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13, 14) and the current use would continue to detract from local character (9).

CR11g(iii): Mainly commercial development

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

CR11g(iv): 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

		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
access to leisure (17), and, in conjunction with the potential of the riverside areas, significantly enhance health through access to recreation areas (11).																					
<p>CR11g(v): Residential development Residential development would have many of the same effects as a mixed use option, but may place more residents in areas of flood risk (2), bringing negative effects. This option would also place more stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (20, 15) while failing to provide space for services on-site. Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (i) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment. Design can help to mitigate the effects of noise and poor air quality.</p>																					

CR11h: NAPIER RD 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
CR11h(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR11h(ii) ▼	Continue current allocation for landmark building	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	✓	0	X
CR11h(iii)	Residential with more than one tall building	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	XX	XX	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	✓	0	X
CR11h(iv)	Office development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	0	0	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR11h(v)	Retail/leisure development	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR11h(i): 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).

CR11h(ii): Continue current allocation for landmark building

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment with regard to 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 an accessible site in Central Reading, and a major development would therefore significantly reduce the need for travel (14). There would be positive effects on access to leisure, through introducing residents close to an area of recreation (11, 17). This 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 the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, as well as in a potentially noisy location, meaning there is a potentially significant negative effect on health (11) that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of the development in the floodplain. Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

CR11h(iii): 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

		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 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).																					
<u>CR11h(iv): Office development</u> This option would have similar effects to the other development options, including a significant positive effect on the need to travel by car (14) and undeveloped land (4). It will fail to provide housing (13), but would have less effect on health and education infrastructure (15, 20).																					
<u>CR11h(v): Retail/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>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.																					
MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment.																					

CR11i: NAPIER RD

		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

		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
CR11i(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	?X	✓	?✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR11i(ii) ▼	Residential development (200-250 dwellings)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	XX	✓	✓✓	✓	?X	?X	✓	0	0	X
CR11i(iii)	Mixed use office and residential	X	X	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	XX	✓	✓	✓	?X	?X	✓	?✓	0	X
CR11i(iv)	Office development	X	X	X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	0	X	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
CR11i(v)	Leisure development	X	X	X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	0	X	✓	?✓	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR11i(i): Do not allocate

This approach would have some environmental benefits as it would 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 opportunity to provide housing (13).

CR11i(ii): Residential development (200-250 dwellings)

As with any development taking place, there would be CO₂ emissions (1), energy use (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), 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 recreation use of meadows (17). Whilst there would be some 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, the AQMA and an area at risk of flooding. There are also few local health facilities and education capacity is limited (15, 20). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

		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>CR11i(iii): Mixed use office and residential</u> 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).</p> <p><u>CR11i(iv): Office development</u> Many of the effects would be the same as any other development, such as residential (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14). The development would be an efficient use of brownfield 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 planned near the station (18). The health benefits would potentially be positive as the development would encourage walking and cycling (11)</p> <p><u>CR11i(v): Leisure development</u> A leisure development would have many of the same positive effects as office development for a number of objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 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 the river. Leisure development would also provide jobs and add to the diversity of the central area (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and provides housing in an accessible location.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment. The design must avoid detrimental effects on the adjacent Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature and building heights should reduce from west to east across the site.</p>																					

CR12: WEST STIDE MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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
CR12(i) *	No policy	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	0
CR12(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RCAAP RC2)	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR12(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would rely on general cross-cutting policies. This would mitigate poor quality or inappropriate development, but would not go far enough to ensure a mix of uses, improved pedestrian and cycle permeability, safeguarded land for mass rapid transit, additional town squares and appropriate transitions to low and medium residential density. This would bring negative effects with regard to housing provision (13) by failing to ensure residential development in this area. A tendency towards negative effects may occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), character (9), heritage (10), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility (15), recreation and leisure (17) and economic growth (18).

CR12(ii): Continue current policy (RCAAP RC2)

This option continues the current policy RCAAP RC2. This carries forward specific guidance regarding residential mix, pedestrian and cycle permeability, land for mass rapid transport, additional open space and areas of transition. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to housing provision (13) and economic growth (18) by encouraging more residential development and a mix of uses including retail and leisure. A tendency towards positive effects may occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), townscape character (9), the historic environment (10), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and recreation/leisure (17). A tendency towards negative effects would occur with regard to education (20) as increasing residential development in this area would place pressure on school places in the area.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

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
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre. These effects should be carefully mitigated.																					

CR12a: 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
CR12a(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR12a(ii) ▼	Retail and residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	XX	?✓	✓✓	✓X	X	?X	0	✓	0	X
CR12a(iii)	Residential without major retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	XX	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	0	✓	0	X
CR12a(iv)	Commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR12a(i): 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).

CR12a(ii): 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 would therefore reduce the need to travel by car (14), although an edge of centre retail development would attract trips by car. The development would be likely to make

		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
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 the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, 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 floodplain. Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.																					
<u>CR12a(iii): Residential without major retail</u> 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).																					
<u>CR12a(iv): Commercial 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>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.																					
MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment.																					

CR12b: GREAT KNOLLYS ST AND WELDALE ST

	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
CR12b(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR12b(ii) ▼	Primarily residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	XX	0	X
CR12b(iii)	Mix uses according to flood risk	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	X	0	✓	✓✓	X	0	0	XX	0	X
CR12b(iv)	Mixed use with commercial emphasis	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓	✓X	?X	0	0	✓X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR12b(i): 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).

CR12b(ii): Primarily residential development

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of development on CO₂ emissions (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 by car (14). The development is likely to make an improvement to the local townscape (9), but there are listed building nearby. Thus, 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 the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, 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) on the development of the floodplain. There are a number of small business units on site, so a loss of those units is a potentially significant negative effect on the local economy (18).

CR12b(iii): Mix uses according to flood risk

This would see the layout of the site essentially being dictated by flood risk, with more vulnerable residential uses being kept out of the areas of highest flood risk. Ultimately, this would be likely to result in less residential development 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).

CR12b(iv): 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

		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>business units, would at least bring more employment generating uses on to the site (18). However, as something of a fringe location, commercial development here might also increase the amount of journeys by car (14).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Development should take account of mitigation required as a result of a Flood Risk Assessment. Loss of small business units could be mitigated by replacement, preferably on-site. Any noise or poor air quality effects can be mitigated through design.</p>																					

CR12c: CHATHAM ST, EATON PLACE AND OXFORD RD

		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
CR12c(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR12c(ii)	Mixed use extension to the centre	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	✓	0	X
CR12c (iii) ▼	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	?✓	0	0	X
CR12c (iv)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	✓	?	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR12c(i): Do not allocate

Because most of the Chatham Street development has now been completed, 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.

CR12c(ii): Mixed use extension to the centre

There would be the same environmental costs and benefits as for all types of redevelopment on CO₂ emissions (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 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 by car (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, but too large a development with town centre uses may extend the town centre too far west (9, 10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. This site is within the Air Quality Management Area, meaning a potential effect on health (11) that would require mitigation.

CR12c(iii) Residential development (180-260 dwellings)

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but would provide significant positive effects with regard to housing (13). In addition, this approach is more sensitive to nearby heritage assets and local character (9, 10).

CR12c(iv) Office development

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but would remove pressures on schools and healthcare by not locating more residents near the town centre (15, 20). Like option (iii), this alternative would be more sensitive to surrounding residential uses and historic assets (9, 10).

Conclusion

Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

		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
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Any noise or poor air quality effects can be mitigated through design.																					

CR12d: BROAD ST 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
CR12d(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR12d(ii) ▼	Mixed use with retail and leisure on ground floor	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
CR12d(iii)	Retain mall & development on top	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	X	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
CR12d(iv)	Mixed use with greater office emphasis	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	X	✓✓	✓X	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0
COMMENTS: CR12d(i): Do not allocate The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual																					

		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>buildings 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).</p> <p><u>CR12d(ii): Mixed use with retail and leisure on ground floor</u> 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 development land (4) and 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. This 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), as well as new services and facilities (15).</p> <p><u>CR12d(iii): Retain mall and development on top</u> 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).</p> <p><u>CR12d(iv): Mixed use with greater office emphasis</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Any noise or poor air quality effects can be mitigated through design. If redevelopment involves retention of the mall, it will only be acceptable if existing frontages are improved.</p>																				

CR12e: HOSIER ST

		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
CR12e(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	XX	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
CR12e(ii) ▼	Mixed use development around civic core	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	0	X
CR12e(iii)	Mixed use with residential focus	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	X	✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	✓✓	0	0	X
CR12e(iv)	Retail-led mixed use	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
CR12e(v)	Open space	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?	XX	?X	0	0	✓	0	0	0
CR12e(vi)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	?	XX	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR12e(vii)	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	X	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	✓✓	0	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR12e(i): 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).

CR12e(ii): 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

		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>new civic hub promotes community cohesion (12). The development would be likely to make an improvement to the local townscape, as the current position is that the Civic Offices have been demolished and the site is vacant (9). 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 the 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).</p> <p><u>CR12e(iii): Mixed use with residential focus</u> This would have many of the same effects as the existing allocation, but may be considered more appropriate since the old civic offices have now been demolished.</p> <p><u>CR12e(iv): Retail-led mixed use</u> 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).</p> <p><u>CR12e(v): Open space</u> This option would fail to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but it would improve amenity (9). An open space would provide some opportunity for leisure, but would not improve leisure access to the same extent as locating residents near town centre leisure uses (17).</p> <p><u>CR12e(vi): Office development</u> This option would have many of the same effects as a mixed use development, but would fail to provide housing (13). Economic effects may be more positive, though, since office space may attract businesses to the town centre (18).</p> <p><u>CR12e(vii): Residential development</u> This option would have many of the same effects as a mixed use development, but would not provide ground floor town centre uses such as retail and leisure (17, 18). Locating residents in the town centre would place more pressure on education and healthcare facilities that are already under strain (15, 20).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</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
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: The environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Effects on health and education infrastructure could be mitigated either by on-site provision or off-site contribution. Any noise or poor air quality effects can be mitigated through design.																					

CR13: EAST SIDE MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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
CR13(i) *	No policy	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	0
CR13(ii) ▼	Continue current policy (RCAAP RC3)	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	0	?X
COMMENTS: <u>CR13(i): No policy</u> A 'no policy' option would rely on general cross-cutting policies. This would prevent poor quality or inappropriate development, but would not go far enough to ensure development at higher density, a new community at the eastern fringes, greater pedestrian and cycle permeability, land for mass rapid transit, preservation of historic features, additional areas of open space and improved access along the River Kennet. This would bring negative effects with regard to housing provision (13) by failing to ensure dense residential development in this area. A tendency toward negative effects may occur with regard to CO ₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), character (9), heritage (10), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15), recreation and leisure (17) and economic growth (18).																					
<u>CR13(ii): Continue current policy (RCAAP RC3)</u> This option continues the current policy RCAAP RC2. This carries forward specific guidance regarding development at higher density, a new community at the eastern fringes, greater pedestrian and cycle permeability, land for mass rapid transit, preservation of historic features, additional areas of open space and improved access along the River Kennet. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to housing provision (13) and economic growth																					

		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>(18) by encouraging more residential development and a mix of uses including retail and leisure. A tendency toward positive effects may occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), townscape character (9), the historic environment (10), health (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and recreation/leisure (17). A tendency toward negative effects would occur with regard to education (20) as increasing residential development in this area would place pressure on school places in the area.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre. These must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects.</p>																					

CR13a: 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
CR13a(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓	✓	0	0	?X	XX	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	X	0	0

		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
CR13a(ii)	Retain building with residential use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	✓	X	?	?✓	✓	0	X
CR13a(iii)	Retain building with culture/arts use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0
CR13a(iv)	Retain building with hotel use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0
CR13a(v)	Retain building with office use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR13a(vi)	Convert building and allow significant surrounding development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓X	✓X	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR13a(i): 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 of 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.

CR13a(ii): Retain building with residential use

In terms of pollution (6) and waste (5), retaining an existing building has positive environmental effects, but in terms of CO₂ (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 the Air Quality Management Area, meaning that there is a potential negative impact on health (11) that would require mitigation.

		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>CR13a(iii): Retain building with culture/arts use</u> This option would have similar effects as option (ii), but it would fail to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14). The benefits to cultural objectives would be significant (17) and help to create a cohesive visitor destination within the Abbey Quarter.</p> <p><u>CR13a(iv): Retain building with hotel use</u> Again, this option would bring the same negative environmental effects as any redevelopment and would fail to provide housing at an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). It may serve culture and leisure (17), as well as economic development (18) by providing unique accommodation within the heritage quarter.</p> <p><u>CR13a(v): Retain building with office use</u> This option would bring the same negative effects as any redevelopment and fail to provide housing (13). Increasing office floorspace in the town centre would bring significant positive economic effects (18).</p> <p><u>CR13a(vi): Convert building and allow significant surrounding development</u> This option would have largely the same effects as option (ii) as it would involve retention of the building, but a significant amount of development on surrounding land would carry 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. Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Options (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) are considered to be the best options because they bring the most positive sustainability effects and limit negative effects to historic significance.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The biggest impacts requiring mitigation are 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</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
effects of noise and poor air quality 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. 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.																					

CR13b: 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
CR13b(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR13b(ii) ▼	Residential development with potential retained and expanded retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
CR13b(iii)	Residential without additional retail	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
CR13b(iv)	Mixed use located according to flood risk	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	✓	0	X
CR13b(v)	Allocate for offices	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR13b(vi)	Allocate for open space	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR13b(i): Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual building 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).

CR13b(ii): Residential development with potential retained and expanded retail

The effects on 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 the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, meaning there is a potentially

		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 on health of any residents (11) that would require mitigation. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2).</p> <p>CR13b(iii): Residential without additional retail Many of the effects would be the same as option (ii), 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 car-oriented.</p> <p>CR13b(iv): Mixed use located 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).</p> <p>CR13b(v): Allocate for offices This option would bring the same negative effects as any redevelopment and fail to provide housing (13). Increasing office floorspace in the town centre would bring significant positive economic effects (18).</p> <p>CR13b(vi): Allocate for open space This option would fail to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but it would improve amenity (9). An open space would provide some opportunity for leisure, but would not improve leisure access to the same extent as locating residents near town centre leisure uses (17).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places and healthcare infrastructure in the town centre. These must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Any negative environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated through compliance with design and construction policies.</p>																					

CR13c: KENAVON DR 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
CR13c(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR13c(ii) ▼	Mainly residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	?X	0	X
CR13c(iii)	Commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR13c(iv)	Mixed-use	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓	X	?X	?✓	✓	0	X
CR13c(iv)	Open space	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	?✓	?X	✓X	0	0	✓	X	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR13c(i): Do not allocate

The effects on environmental objectives would be positive in the short term through retaining buildings, although the performance of the individual building 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).

CR13c(ii): Mainly residential development

There would be the same environment 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). This 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 effects on those assets that require 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 floodplain, 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 floodplain. There would be a loss of employment floorspace (18). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard 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
equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.																					
<u>CR13c(iii): Commercial development</u> 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 (14). The effects associated with new residents (11, 15, 17, 20) would be absent from this option.																					
<u>CR13c(iv): Mixed-use</u> This option brings many of the same effects as residential development, but like option (iii) may be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car (14). Depending on the amount of floorspace allocated for non-residential uses, this option could reduce the amount of housing provided (13). Effects associated with new residents would remain (11, 15, 17, 20).																					
<u>CR13c(v): Open space</u> This option would fail to provide housing on an accessible brownfield site (4, 13, 14), but it would improve amenity (9). An open space would provide some opportunity for leisure, but would not improve leisure access to the same extent as locating residents near town centre leisure uses (17).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.																					
MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Any loss of employment floorspace should be made up elsewhere. The environmental effects of redevelopment can be mitigated through sustainable design and construction practices.																					

CR13d: GAS HOLDER

	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
CR13d(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR13d(ii) ▼	Allocate for residential development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	?✓	?✓	0	X
CR13d(iii)	Allocate for commercial development	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓	0	✓	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR13d(iv)	Open space	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
CR13d(v)	Mixed use	✓X	X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	0	✓✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

CR13d(i): Do not allocate

This option would fail to make use of a previously developed 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).

CR13d(ii): Allocate for 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 would 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 the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, 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 to the Thameside areas for informal recreation (11, 17). In addition, development of the site will remove a potential hazard from nearby residents. There is also a potential negative impact on flooding (2) of development of the floodplain. The site is prominent on entry to Reading by train, and a beneficial development might therefore have positive economic effects (18). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

CR13d(iii): Allocate for 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 (14). The effects associated with new residents would be absent from this option.

		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>CR13d(iv): Open space</u> This option would fail to provide housing on a brownfield site (4, 13), but it would improve amenity (9). An open space would provide some opportunity for leisure uses (17). Pressures caused by new residents would be eliminated (11, 15, 20).</p> <p><u>CR13d(v): Mixed use</u> This option brings many of the same effects as residential development, but like option (iii) may be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car (14). Depending on the amount of floorspace allocated for non-residential uses, this option could reduce the amount of housing provided (13). Effects associated with new residents would remain (11, 15, 17, 20).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Any contamination should be subject to remediation. Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Environmental impacts of redevelopment can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. 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>																					

CR14a: CENTRAL SWIMMING POOL, BATTLE ST

		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

		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
CR14a(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	X	✓X	?X	?X	X	✓X	0	✓	0	0	0
CR14a(ii)	Allocate for residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	0	0	0	0	X
CR14a(iii)	Mixed use	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	?✓	✓	✓	X	0	?✓	?✓	0	X
CR14a(iv)	Commercial	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CR14a(v)	Open space	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0
CR14a(vi)	Allocate for leisure use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14a(i): Do not allocate

Not allocating this site would fail to provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). Both positive and negative effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6) since any redevelopment carries environmental effects, but these effects would likely be countered by improved environmental performance in the long term. Because the site is currently in use as a swimming pool, negative effects may occur if this leisure use were discontinued (17), but the facilities would likely close in the near future regardless as the building is not fit for purpose and maintenance costs are high. The current building does not contribute to townscape character (9) or the nearby historic environment (10). Allocating this site and providing the pool elsewhere could help to serve important health goals (11) and improve facility access (15).

CR14a(ii): Allocate for residential

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 would 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, 10). More residents in the centre would place additional pressure on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure. The site is within the Air Quality Management Area and the floodplain, 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. Removal of the swimming pool may harm healthy lifestyle objectives (11), but re-provision of the pool on a new site will bring benefits. Cleaning up this site may serve community cohesion (12), as well.

		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>CR14a(iii): Mixed use</u> This option brings many of the same effects as residential development, but like option (iv) may be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car (14). Depending on the amount of floorspace allocated for non-residential uses, this option could reduce the amount of housing provided (13). Effects associated with new residents would remain (11, 15, 17, 20).</p> <p><u>CR14a(iv): Commercial</u> 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 would be absent from this option.</p> <p><u>CR14a(v): Open space</u> This option would fail to provide housing on a brownfield site (4, 13), but it would improve amenity (9). An open space would provide some opportunity for leisure uses (17). Pressures caused by new residents would be eliminated (11, 15, 20).</p> <p><u>CR14a(vi): Allocate for leisure use</u> The effects of this option are largely similar to option (iv) in that it would remove negative effects associated with new residents. Unlike option (iv), allocation for leisure use would bring significant positive effects in relation to recreation and leisure (17).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Additional healthcare capacity may also be required. Development should avoid negative effects on the nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings. Noise and air quality impacts on residents should be mitigated through design. New development should avoid overlooking of existing residential properties.</p>																					

CR14b: FORMER READING FAMILY CENTRE, NORTH ST

		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
CR14b(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	✓X	0	0	0	X	0	X
CR14b(ii) ▼	Residential development (15-25 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?	✓	✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
CR14b(iii)	Higher density residential development (over 40 dwellings)	✓X	0	?✓	✓	?X	?X	0	0	X	0	?X	?	✓✓	✓	?✓	0	✓	?✓	0	X
CR14b(iv)	Commercial development	✓X	0	?✓	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14b(v)	Mixed use	✓X	0	?✓	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?	?✓	✓	?✓	0	✓	✓	0	0
CR14b(vi)	Continuation of education use	✓X	0	?	?X	0	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

CR14b(i): 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 (18). Thus there is a negative economic impact associated. There is also a lost opportunity for redevelopment (including for housing uses, 13), in terms of the site's accessibility to public transport (14) 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 (9), and is possibly unsafe after dark (12).

CR14b(ii): Residential development (15-25 dwellings)

This allocation seeks housing within reasonable close proximity of Reading Station and the transport interchange (13, 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

		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
	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, 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 (18). New development will not have an impact on waste generation, given that the site has no permanent structures (5).																				
	<u>CR14b(iii): Higher density residential development (over 40 dwellings)</u> This appraisal would be largely similar to option (ii), 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).																				
	<u>CR14b(iv): Commercial development</u> 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 (14). The effects associated with new residents would be absent from this option (11, 15, 17, 20).																				
	<u>CR14b(v): Mixed use</u> This option brings many of the same effects as residential development, but like option (iv) may be less likely to reduce the need to travel by car (14). Depending on the amount of floorspace allocated for non-residential uses, this option could reduce the amount of housing provided (13). Effects associated with new residents would remain (11, 15, 17, 20).																				
	<u>CR14b(vi): Continuation of education use</u> 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 (3, 9).																				
	<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																				

		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
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.																					

CR14c: 17-23 QUEEN VICTORIA ST

		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
CR14c(i) *	Do not allocate	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	?	0	0	?X	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
CR14c(ii)	Ground floor town centre uses and residential on upper floors	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	✓✓	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	?X
CR14c(iii)	Residential only	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	✓✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	?X
CR14c(iv)	Office development	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14c(i): Do not allocate

This site is currently in use and is a listed building. Choosing not to allocate the site would not yield any significant negative sustainability effects, but it would fail to provide housing in an accessible town centre location (13, 14). Redevelopment may also miss an opportunity to improve townscape character (9) and make a contribution to the historic environment (10) by caring for a listed building. Negative environmental effects would be avoided in any option, since none of the proposals involve complete redevelopment and it is likely that much of the building will be retained.

CR14c(ii): Ground floor town centre uses and residential on upper floors

		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>A change of use for the upper floors to residential would provide housing in a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). There may be harmful effects in terms of pollution (6) and health (11) by locating residents in an area of poor air quality. This would require mitigation. Additionally, locating more residents in the town centre would place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Retail/office uses on the ground floor would ensure commercial uses and result in economic benefits (18). Redevelopment from offices to residential may provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10).</p>																					
<p><u>CR14c(iii): Residential only</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (ii), but would remove any potential for economic benefits (18) through town centre ground floor commercial use.</p>																					
<p><u>CR14c(iv): Office development</u> This option is similar to that of option (i), but may provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). It would yield more pronounced benefits in terms of economic activity (18) and need to travel by car (14) by providing more office space in a highly accessible town centre location.</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p>																					
<p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Additional healthcare capacity may also be required. Development should avoid negative effects on the nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings. Noise and air quality impacts on residents should be mitigated through design.</p>																					

CR14d: 173-175 FRIAR ST AND 27-32 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
CR14d(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR14d(ii)	Residential	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	?X
CR14d(iii)	Offices	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14d(iv)	Retail	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14d(v)	Leisure	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0
CR14d(vi)	Offices with ground floor retail uses	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14d(vii)	Residential with ground floor retail/offices	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
CR14d(viii)	Leisure with ground floor retail	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14d(i): Do not allocate

This option would fail to make use of a previously developed potential residential site (13, 14) and would retain a site that detracts from the local character of the area (9, 10).

CR14d(ii): Residential

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 townscape (9) and heritage assets (10), whereas not allocating the site would lead to continued vacancy. Bringing residents into an area of comparatively poor air quality (11) is a potential negative effect, along with putting strain on town centre education (20) and healthcare infrastructure (15). This option would provide housing in a highly accessible location (13, 14) and locate residents closer to town centre leisure uses (17).

CR14d(iii): Offices

		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 option is largely similar to option (ii), but it would remove pressures on education (20) and healthcare facilities (15) and may encourage economic development (18) by providing additional town centre commercial floorspace. Preventing residents in this location would also lessen the need to mitigate poor air quality (11).</p> <p><u>CR14d(iv): Retail</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (iii).</p> <p><u>CR14d(v): Leisure</u> This option’s appraisal is identical to (iii) and (iv) with the exception of leisure. Allocation for leisure space would bring significant positive benefits with regard to objective 17 (recreation, leisure and culture).</p> <p><u>CR14d(vi): Offices with ground floor retail uses</u> This option is identical to allocation for all offices or all retail.</p> <p><u>CR14d(vii): Residential with ground floor retail/offices</u> This option would allow for some commercial uses on the ground floor while providing housing. This would bring largely the same effects as an entirely residential allocation, including air quality, healthcare facility and education effects in need of mitigation (11, 15, 20). Unlike option (ii), this option would provide some opportunity for economic growth and employment (18).</p> <p><u>CR14d(viii) Leisure with ground floor retail</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (v).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (vii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Mitigation of the effects of new town centre residential development on infrastructure (education and healthcare) would need to be mitigated, as well as the effects of air quality on residents.</p>																					

CR14e: 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
CR14e(i)	Do not allocate *	✓X	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	XX	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
CR14e(ii)	Retail and related uses on ground floor with residential/offices on upper floors (up to 70 dwellings) ▼	✓X	0	?X	?✓	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	?✓	✓	✓X	0	✓	?✓	0	?X
CR14e(iii)	Retail/residential on ground floor and business above	✓X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓	✓	0	0
CR14e(iv)	Offices only	✓X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14e(v)	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:

CR14e(i): Do not allocate

This site is currently in active use and the site would likely 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

		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
	creation of a lasting public space (9), and on the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings (10). With regard to other objectives, this option is likely to have neutral effects overall.																				
	<p><u>CR14e(ii): Retail and related uses on ground floor with residential and/or offices on upper floors (up to 70 dwellings)</u></p> <p>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 of this site. Development will only be permitted if it enhances 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, to 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 (6), or an impact on existing primary education facilities and health facilities, which are near capacity (15, 20).</p> <p><u>CR14e(iii): Retail/residential on ground floor and business above</u></p> <p>The effects would be in many cases identical to the existing allocation. Therefore, the same negative effects of 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 a similar use to the existing uses, and would include no housing, so most of the other effects would be neutral.</p> <p><u>CR14e(iv): Offices only</u></p> <p>This appraisal is similar to that of option (iii), but it would lack night-time activity that is needed to provide ‘eyes on the street.’ This could harm community cohesion or result in crime (12).</p> <p><u>CR14e(v): 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 (6) may be an issue, which would be an effect requiring mitigation (11). More residential</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 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).																				
	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 creating of a lasting public space (9), which would also detract from the use of the area for informal recreation (17).																				
	<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																				
	MITIGATION: The allocation could result in residential development in an area where there is likely to be noise disturbance. This will require mitigation through design. 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. These impacts must be mitigated. 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 Sustainable Construction and Design policies.																				

CR14f: 1-5 KING ST

		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
CR14f(i) *	Do not allocate	?✓	0	?✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0

		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
CR14f(ii)	Ground floor town centre uses and upper floors residential	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
CR14f(iii)	Offices	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14f(iv)	Residential	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?X
CR14f(v)	Ground floor retail uses and upper floors offices	?✓	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14f(i): Do not allocate

This site is currently not in use and is a listed building. Choosing not to allocate the site would not yield any significant negative sustainability effects, but it would fail to provide housing in an accessible town centre location (4, 13). Redevelopment may also miss an opportunity to improve townscape character (9) and make a contribution to the historic environment (10) by caring for a listed building. Negative environmental effects would be avoided in any option, since none of the proposals involve complete redevelopment and it is likely that much of the building will be retained. A vacant building in this location may negatively affect economic growth (18). A vacant building may also attract crime or vandalism and reduce community cohesion (12).

CR14f(ii): Ground floor town centre uses and residential on upper floors

A change of use for the upper floors to residential would provide housing in a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). There may be harmful effects in terms of pollution (6) and health (11) by locating residents in an area of poor air quality. This would require mitigation. Additionally, locating more residents in the town centre would place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Retail/office uses on the ground floor would ensure commercial uses and result in economic benefits (18). Redevelopment from offices to residential would provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Bringing the site back into use would decrease crime (12), locate residents close to leisure uses (17) and encourage economic growth (18).

CR14f(iii): Offices

This option is similar to that of option (ii), but it would fail to contribute to much needed housing (13). It would yield more pronounced benefits in terms of economic activity (18) and remove pressures caused by residents on healthcare (15) and education (20) infrastructure, as well as prevent negative effects

		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>associated with air pollution (6, 11).</p> <p>CR14f(iv): Residential This appraisal is identical to that of option (ii), but would remove any potential for economic benefits (18) through town centre ground floor commercial use.</p> <p>CR14f(v): Ground floor retail and upper floors office This appraisal is identical to that of option (iii).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Additional healthcare capacity may also be required. Development should avoid negative effects on the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Noise and air quality impacts on residents should be mitigated through design.</p>																					

CR14g: THE ORACLE EXTENSION, BRIDGE ST AND LETCOMBE ST

		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
CR14g(i) *	Do not allocate	X✓	0	✓X	0	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR14g(ii) ▼	Development for retail, with use of site at Letcombe St for public car park	X✓	X	X✓	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	X✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	?X	?✓	0	0
CR14g(iii)	Residential development (approximately 200 dwellings)	X✓	XX	X✓	?✓	?X	X	0	0	0	?X	?X	?✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X
CR14g(iv)	Office development	X✓	X	X✓	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	X✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14g(v)	Ground floor retail use and upper floors residential	X✓	X	X✓	?✓	?X	?X	0	0	0	?X	?X	?✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?X	?✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR14g(i): Do not allocate

This alternative would mean leaving the site in its current state, and since it is in 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.

CR14g(ii): Development for retail, with use of site at Letcombe St for public 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

		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>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.</p> <p><u>CR14g(iii): Residential development (approximately 200 dwellings)</u> 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 development would also then be 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.</p> <p><u>CR14g(iv): Office development</u> This appraisal is largely similar to that of option (ii), but may result in more pronounced benefits to economic development by providing office space in an accessible brownfield location. Office development may be less likely to result in reduced need to travel by car (14) since use of this location for uses other than retail could drive retail development to less accessible out of town locations.</p> <p><u>CR14g(v): Ground floor retail use and upper floors residential</u> This appraisal is similar to that of option (iii), but since it includes some scope for commercial use, it yields a tendency towards positive economic benefits (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: This site is in a zone of flood risk, and a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at the 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 state. Impacts on the</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
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 through 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.																					

CR14h: CENTRAL CLUB, LONDON ST

		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
CR14h(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	✓X	?X	✓	X	0	0	X	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR14h(ii)	Residential (5-15 dwellings)	X✓	XX	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X
CR14h(iii)	Higher density residential development (approximately 30 dwellings or more)	X✓	XX	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	XX	?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	X	0	?X	0	?X
CR14h(iv)	Offices	X✓	X	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14h(v)	Ground floor retail and upper floors residential	X✓	X	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	?X	0	?✓	0	?X
CR14h(vi)	Ground floor retail and upper floors offices	X✓	X	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR14h(vii)	Retail	X✓	X	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14h(i): Do not allocate

This would leave the building in reasonably active use, meaning conservation on resources (3) and minimisation of waste (5). Its location is relatively distant from the station and 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).

CR14h(ii): Residential (15-30 dwellings)

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

		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
	primary education capacity and healthcare, requiring mitigation (15, 20). 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 effects for CO ₂ 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. This site is on a prominent corner, and currently makes no particular positive contribution to it, so there is a 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). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.																				
	<u>CR14h(iii): Higher density residential development (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 conservation area, and particularly the adjacent listed building (10).																				
	<u>CR14h(iv): Offices</u> The effects of this option are similar to those of option (ii) with a few notable exceptions. First, this site would fail to provide housing (13). Because this option would not increase the amount of residents in the town centre, any additional pressures on healthcare (15) and education (20) would be avoided. Negative effects with regard to climate change (2) and health (11) would be less pronounced, since no residents would be located within the flood zone. Finally, office space would yield positive economic development effects (18).																				
	<u>CR14h(v): Ground floor retail and upper floors residential</u> This option would yield similar sustainability effects to option (ii) but would provide scope for some commercial activity and thus positive economic effects (18).																				
	<u>CR14h(vi): Ground floor retail and upper floors offices</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (iv).																				
	<u>CR14h(vii): Retail</u> This appraisal is identical to that of options (iv) and (vi).																				
	Conclusion																				

		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
Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</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. 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. 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 the application stage to examine possible methods for 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>																					

CR14i: ENTERPRISE HOUSE 89-97 LONDON ST

		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
CR14i(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	✓X	?X	✓	X	0	0	X	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR14i(ii)	Residential (8-12 dwellings)	X✓	0	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
CR14i(iii)	Higher density residential (at least 20 dwellings)	X✓	0	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	XX	?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
CR14i(iv)	Mixed use (ground floor retail and office and upper residential)	X✓	0	X✓	✓	X✓	X✓	0	0	?✓	?X	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR14i(i): Do not allocate

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). If the site becomes out of use, it would represent a wasted opportunity to develop a brownfield site (4). It would also increasingly detract from the character of the town (9), and will also increasingly detract from the conservation area in which it is situated and the adjacent listed building (10).

CR14i(ii): Residential (8-12 dwellings)

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. 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 (15, 20). 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 effects 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. There is a 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).

CR14i(iii): Higher density residential (at least 20 dwellings)

This alternative would mean developing the site for a higher density of residential, going higher than its current height. 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

		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>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 conservation area, and particularly the adjacent listed buildings (10).</p> <p>CR14i(iv): Mixed use (ground floor retail and office and upper floors residential) This option would yield similar sustainability effects to option (ii) but would provide scope for some commercial activity and thus positive economic effects (18).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. 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. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction. The impact on the conservation area and listed buildings would need to be mitigated through careful design and strict application of design policies.</p>																					

CR14j: CORNER OF CROWN ST AND SOUTHAMPTON ST

		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
CR14j(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	?X	?	0	XX	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0

		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
CR14j(ii) ▼	Residential development (10-20 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	?✓	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR14j(iii)	Higher residential development (approximately 35 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	0	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR14j(iv)	Mixed use (ground floor retail/office and upper floors residential)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	0	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR14j(v)	Offices	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR14j(i): 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, this 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 and may therefore discourage investment in the area (18).

CR14j(ii): Residential development (10-20 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 the 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 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 the right economic message (18) and it will also prevent the anti-

		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
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 CO ₂ emissions (1), energy use (3) and pollution (6). Only three areas were identified where there might be a negative effect requiring mitigation. 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 sites may sometimes have, but this could be identified and mitigated at the application stage. There may also be pressure placed on education and healthcare facilities (15, 20).																					
<u>CR14j(iii): Higher residential development (approximately 35 dwellings or more)</u> 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 and facilities, more people may be exposed to low air quality. The main differences are in terms of the objectives that relate to design. 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).																					
<u>CR14j(iv): Mixed use (ground floor retail/office and upper floors residential)</u> This option would yield similar sustainability effects to option (iii) but would provide scope for some commercial activity and thus positive economic effects (18).																					
<u>CR14j(v): Offices</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (iv), but it would remove pressures caused by new residents on poor air quality, healthcare and education (11, 15, 20) and would fail to provide housing (13).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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. 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. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on																					

		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
Sustainable Design and Construction. At application stage, an investigation into the biodiversity merit of the site would highlight any issues or need for mitigation.																					

CR14k: CORNER OF CROWN ST AND SILVER ST

		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
CR14k(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	XX	0	?X	?	0	XX	XX	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0
CR14k(ii) ▼	Residential development (30-70 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	✓	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR14k(iii)	Higher density residential development (approx. 100 dwellings or more)	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	X	XX	X✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
CR14k(iv)	Mixed use (retail/office on ground floor and residential on upper floors)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	✓	X✓	✓	✓	✓X	?X	0	0	✓✓	0	?X
CR14k(v)	Offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	?✓	✓X	?	0	✓✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓X	?X	0	0	✓✓	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>CR14k(i): Do not allocate</u> 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 and may discourage investment in the area (18).</p> <p><u>CR14k(ii): Residential development (30-70 dwellings)</u> 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 a significant positive effect on the supply of housing (13). Because the site is on a very prominent corner, there is an opportunity to make a significant positive contribution to making the area cleaner, greener and safer (9). This 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 anti-social behaviour (12). Using a site in the central area for housing means that people do not need to travel by car as much (14). This brings positive effects in terms of energy use (3) and pollution (6). Only two areas were identified where negative effects would require mitigation. Firstly, the site is in an area of low air quality (6, 11). These 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).</p> <p><u>CR14k(iii): Higher density residential development (approx. 100 dwellings or more)</u> 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 poor 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><u>CR14k(iv): Mixed use (retail/office on ground floor and residential on upper floors)</u> 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 the supply of housing (13), although neither of these effects is 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</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
		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).																			
		<p>CR14k(v): Offices This appraisal is identical to that of option (iv), but it would remove pressures caused by new residents on poor air quality, healthcare and education (11, 15, 20) and would fail to provide housing (13).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. 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. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction. The impact on the conservation area and listed buildings would need to be mitigated through careful design and strict application of design policies. At application stage, an investigation into the biodiversity merit of the site would highlight any issues or need for mitigation.</p>																			

CR14I: 187-189 KINGS RD

		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
CR14I(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CR14I(ii)	Change of use (offices to residential or student accommodation)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	?X	0	?X
CR14I(iii)	Mixed use (office/retail on ground floor and residences above)	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	?X	0	0	?X	?X	?X	0	✓	✓X	?X	0	?✓	✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR14I(i): Do not allocate

This site is currently in use and is a listed building. Choosing not to allocate the site would not yield any significant negative sustainability effects, but it would fail to provide housing in an accessible location (13). Redevelopment may also miss an opportunity to improve townscape character (9) and make a contribution to the historic environment (10) by caring for a listed building. Negative environmental effects would be avoided in any option, since none of the proposals involve complete redevelopment and it is likely that much of the building will be retained.

CR14I(ii): Changes of use (offices to residential or student accommodation)

Change of use from offices to residential (possibly including student accommodation) would bring some negative environmental effects (1, 3, 5) as a result of internal conversions, but these may be outweighed by better environmental performance in the long term. It would bring significant positive benefits in terms of providing housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). It may also locate residents near leisure uses (17) and provide an opportunity for enhancement and care of the listed building, improving townscape character (9, 10). Location residents in the Air Quality Management Area would bring health effects in need of mitigation (11) and would place stress on education and healthcare facilities (20, 15). Any loss of office space may have negative economic effects (18).

CR14I(iii): Mixed use (office/retail on ground floor and residences above)

This alternative would also bring some negative environmental effects as a result of internal conversions, but these may be outweighed by better environmental performance in the long term (1, 3, 5). It would also provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). This option is less suited for a listed building, particularly if retail use is established, as the building is better suited for residences or offices (9, 10). Retaining some office space would bring positive economic effects (18), but locating residents in the AQMA would bring health effects and would place stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (11, 15, 20). Finally, retail may result in more car use than residences (14).

Conclusion

		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
Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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. 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. Impacts on resource use can be mitigated through compliance with the Council's policies on Sustainable Design and Construction. The impact on the listed building would need to be mitigated through careful design and strict application of design policies.																					

CR14m: CAVERSHAM LOCK ISLAND AND CAVERSHAM WEIR, 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
CR14m(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0

		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
CR14m(ii) ▼	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
CR14m(iii)	Residential development	✓X	XX	?X	?✓	XX	X	XX	0	?	0	?X	?X	✓✓	X	0	0	?✓	?	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CR14m(i): Do not allocate

This approach sees Caversham Lock Island continue in its current state, allowing it to make visual contributions to the local area (7, 9) 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 (18), 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.

CR14m(ii): Development for water-compatible leisure or tourism uses, including some operational development

This option recognises the potential for enhanced pedestrian access. If achieved, pedestrian accessibility to the island should be improved, once Crossrail 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 quality and noise related impacts (11, 14, 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, 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).

CR14m(iii): Residential development

Developing the site for residential use 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 car parking in nearby areas as a result. Timely and convenient access to necessary 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>will be very difficult (and energy inefficient), though residents may benefit from access to nearby water-based leisure opportunities (including open spaces for recreation). The site is isolated from other residential areas, so it may be difficult to foster a sense of community on the island, and safety must be an issue (12). Further residential development places strain on existing healthcare and education facilities in the centre that are already under pressure (15, 20).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 car parking will be required in an appropriate, yet convenient location nearby, if vehicular access to the island is prohibited. 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>																					

CR15: THE READING ABBEY QUARTER

		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
CR15(i) *▼	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	X	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X	?X	0	0

		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
CR15(ii)	Detailed policy to protect the Reading Abbey Quarter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
CR15(iii)	Policy to enhance the Reading Abbey Quarter as a high-quality visitor destination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR15(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option represents a continuation of a 'business as usual' approach. Although Reading Abbey would be provided some protection by historic preservation policies, a 'no policy' option would fail to provide detail regarding the preferred future of the site. This option would provide minimal protection. This would bring a tendency towards negative effects in relation to townscape character (9), the historic environment (10), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), recreation and leisure (17) and economic growth (18).

CR15(ii): Policy to protect the Reading Abbey Quarter

This option would provide additional detail in order to protect the Abbey itself and the surrounding area, but would not aim to develop the Quarter into a high-quality destination. This option would require development to avoid negative effects on the Abbey and surrounding area and provide some framework for visitors, but would not create a cohesive heritage quarter. This would bring positive effects with regard to the historic environment (10) and a tendency towards positive effects in relation to townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), recreation and leisure (17) and economic growth (18).

CR15(iii): Policy to enhance the Reading Abbey Quarter as a high-quality visitor destination

This option would provide a proactive strategy for developing the Abbey Quarter as a high-quality destination. It details the framing of the Abbey as Reading's most significant asset, a coordinated approach for management, interpretation for the public, strengthened active and public transport links and an emphasis on tourism and further investment. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to the historic environment (10) and moderate positive effects in relation to townscape character (9), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), recreation and leisure (17) and economic growth (18). Creating a cohesive heritage destination would serve to create a sense of place and increase community pride in local heritage assets.

Conclusion

		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
Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

SR1: ISLAND ROAD MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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
SR1(i) *▼	No policy	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	0	0

		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
SR1(ii)	New policy identifying Island Road as major opportunity area for new business space	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
SR1(iii)	Policy identifying Island Road as opportunity area for specific major residential development	?	X	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	0	X	0	✓✓	?	0	0	0	X	0	0

COMMENTS:

SR1(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would fail to plan for an appropriate level of commercial development. Development may still occur on this site, but the Local Plan would lack a policy articulating a particular vision for its use. This would bring negative effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), sustainable transport (14) and economic growth/employment (18).

SR1(ii): New policy identifying Island Road as major opportunity area for new business space

This policy would plan for approximately 120,000 to 150,000 sq. m of new business space, mainly industrial and warehouse with some supporting office uses. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to economic development and employment (18) by providing additional commercial space and subsequent employment opportunities. This policy provides requirements for commercial development to mitigate noise disturbance, protect the Kennet Meadows major landscape feature, avoid negative impacts on drainage and flood risk, enhance transport links, safeguard land for mass rapid transport and provide employment skills and training measures. These requirements would bring a tendency towards positive effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9) and sustainable transport (14).

SR1(iii): Policy identifying Island Road as opportunity area for specific major residential development

This option would identify Island Road for major residential development. This would bring significant positive effects with regard to housing provision (13), but negative and uncertain effects in relation to human health, flood risk, economic development and pollution. Much of the site consists of former landfill and other areas are within Flood Zone 2. For these reasons, negative effects would occur in relation to adaptation to climate change (2) and health

		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>(11). Additionally, residential development would eliminate the opportunity to provide commercial uses. This would bring negative effects with regard to economic growth and employment (18). Effects on CO₂ emissions (1), pollution (6), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9) and sustainable transport (14) are unclear.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.</p>																					

SR1a: FORMER LAND FILL, ISLAND RD

		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
SR1a(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
SR1a(ii)	Employment development (B1c/B2/B8)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	0	X	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
SR1a(iii)	Residential development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	X	0	XX	0	✓✓	?X	XX	0	0	0	0	X
SR1a(iv)	Leisure development	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	X	0	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	✓X	✓	?✓	0
SR1a(v)	Offices	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	0	X	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

SR1a(i): Do not allocate

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

SR1a(ii): 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 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 impacts on 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 (18), and helps to bring balance to the economy, though a different sector from the knowledge based sectors for which Reading is known (18). In addition, this will have a significant positive effect on reducing deprivation through provision of a significant number 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).

SR1a(iii): 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). Increasing residential development in this area may increase pressure on nearby recreation sites (8).

		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>SR1a(iv): Leisure development</u> Many of the effects would be similar to the employment development option, although those related to economic growth (18) and deprivation are less pronounced (19). 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 health lifestyles (11). A large leisure development could increase traffic and impact nearby sites (8).																					
<u>SR1a(v): Offices</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (ii), but positive effects with regard to reducing deprivation would be less pronounced (19) since less low-skilled and more high-skilled jobs would be provided with office development.																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on any 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 occur 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.																					

SR1b: NORTH OF ISLAND RD

		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

		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
SR1b(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR1b(ii)	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0
SR1b(iii)	Leisure development	X	0	X	✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	?✓	0	?X	?X	0	0	✓✓	✓	?✓	0
SR1b(iv)	Residential development (60-100 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	X	0	?X	0	X	0	✓✓	?X	XX	0	0	0	0	X
SR1b(v)	Offices	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	0	X	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

SR1b(i): Do not allocate

As this 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).

SR1b(ii): 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 landscape character (9). Development would make a good use of a sizeable previously developed site that has laid 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).

SR1b(iii): Leisure development

Many of the effects would be shared with (ii), 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).

SR1b(iv): Residential development (60-100 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>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, 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 centre or facilities, and indeed from other residential properties. There would additionally be more pressure on education and healthcare services (15, 20)</p> <p><u>SR1b(v): Offices</u> This appraisal is identical to that of option (ii), but positive effects with regard to reducing deprivation would be less pronounced (19) since less low-skilled and more high-skilled jobs would be provided with office development.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on any adjacent residential at Green Park from an employment development should be mitigated. 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. 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>																					

SR1c: ISLAND RD A33 FRONTAGE

		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

		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
SR1c(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
SR1c(ii)	Mixed commercial uses, excluding residential	X	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
SR1c(iii)	Retail development	XX	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	X	✓	0	0	0	0	XX	?X	0	0	XX	X	0
SR1c(iv)	Leisure development	XX	X	X	✓	X	X	?X	X	✓	0	✓	0	0	XX	?X	0	✓✓	?X	?X	0
SR1c(v)	Residential development (270-506 dwellings)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	XX	?X	X	✓	0	XX	0	✓X	X	X	X	?✓	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

SR1c(i): 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 of the town (18).

SR1c(ii): 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 to the site, and this would need to be investigated further (7). This 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).

SR1c(iii): Retail development

Some of the effects would be the same as for (ii) (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). Increased traffic could affect nearby sites for outdoor recreation (8).

		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>SR1c(iv): Leisure development</u> Many of the effects are the same as 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 a type that complemented, rather than competed with, the town centre this would mean a significant positive effect on leisure (17), which could also mean positive impacts for health (11). Increased traffic could affect nearby sites for outdoor recreation (8).</p> <p><u>SR1c(v): Residential development (270-506 dwellings)</u> 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). Increasing the amount of residents in this area could put pressure on nearby sites for outdoor recreation (8).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. Effects on any adjacent residential at Green Park from an employment development could should be mitigated. 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. 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. A Mass Rapid Transit route through the site will help to mitigate any transport effects.</p>																					

SR2: LAND NORTH OF MANOR FARM ROAD MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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
SR2(i) *	No policy, do not allocate	?✓	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	0	?X	?X	X	?X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0
SR2(ii) ▼	Continue current policy SA2c (SDPD) allocation for housing	?X	?✓	?X	✓	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	?✓	?X
SR2(iii)	Designate as core employment area	?✓	0	?✓	?X	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	X	0	0	0	0	✓	?X	0
SR2(iv)	New policy allocating for increased residential density	?X	?✓	?X	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?X	✓	?X

COMMENTS:

SR2(i): No policy, do not allocate

A 'no policy' option would likely result in a continuation of its current use, a large grouping of employment premises, as number of which are vacant. This would have many negative effects. Whilst not developing would have a positive impact in terms of minimising CO2 emissions (1) and the use of natural resources (3) and waste generation (5), the current buildings are an inefficient use of a valuable brownfield site (4). Additionally, the current vacant buildings detract from the character of the area (9). The current use misses an opportunity to provide housing (13), address surface water runoff for climate change adaptation (2) and reduce the need to travel (14).

SR2(ii): Continue current policy SA2c (SDPD) allocation for housing

Redeveloping the site is likely to have negative impacts on resource use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6) resulting from demolition and construction. Additionally, it may negatively affect school capacity (20) and employment opportunities (18), although many of the current employment uses are vacant.

		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>Positive effects would occur in terms of using brownfield land (4). Developing at the density recommended in SA2c (SDPD) may help to address surface water concerns (2), improve local character (9), create community cohesion (12), provide housing (13), locate residents toward facilities (15) and address inequality (19). SA2c may encourage sustainable transport (14) and associated health benefits (11). In contrast, locating residents in this area may place additional stress on school places (20).</p> <p><u>SR2(iii): Designate as core employment area</u> This option brings largely the same effects as option (i). Current uses would be continued and protected, making it less likely that housing would be provided in the future. This would bring more pronounced negative effects with regard to housing provision (13), but it would protect employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>SR2(iv): New policy allocating for increased residential density</u> This option would result in similar effects to option (ii), but positive benefits in terms of housing provision (13) would be more pronounced, since an updated policy prescribes many more dwellings. The environmental effects of redevelopment (1,5,6) must be carefully mitigated, as well as school places (20) and employment opportunities (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iv) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Pressure on schools and healthcare providers need to be carefully mitigated, as well as the environmental effects of redevelopment. Any loss of employment land must be provided for in other areas.</p>																					

SR3: SOUTH OF ELGAR ROAD MAJOR OPPORTUNITY 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

		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
SR3(i) *	No policy, do not allocate	?✓	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	0	?X	0	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	0
SR3(ii) ▼	Designate as a core employment area	?✓	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	0	?X	0	?X	0	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	?X	?✓	?X	0
SR3(iii)	New policy encouraging residential development	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	?X	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?	?✓	?X

COMMENTS:

SR3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely result in a continuation of its current use, a grouping of a few small employers and a large retail space, as number of which have been vacant in recent years. This would have many negative effects. Whilst not developing would have a positive impact in terms of minimising CO2 emissions (1) and the use of natural resources (3) and waste generation (5), the current buildings are an inefficient use of a valuable brownfield site (4). Additionally, the current vacant buildings detract from the character of the area (9). The current use misses an opportunity to provide housing (13), address surface water runoff for climate change adaptation (2), enhance open space for recreation (17) and reduce the need to travel (14).

SR3(ii): Designated as a core employment area

This option brings largely the same effects as option (i). Current uses would be continued and protected, making it less likely that housing would be provided in the future. This would bring more pronounced negative effects with regard to housing provision (13), but it would protect employment uses (18).

SR3(iii): New policy encouraging residential development

A new policy encouraging residential development would address surface water (2), make good use of valuable brownfield land (4), enhance green links to Waterloo Meadows (7), improve local character (9), encourage healthy life styles (11), create community cohesion (12), encourage sustainable transport (14), locate residents near facilities (15), enhance informal recreation spaces (17) and help to address inequality by providing housing, including affordable (19). Significant positive benefits would occur with regard to housing provision (13). The environmental effects of redevelopment (1,3,5) must be carefully mitigated, as well as pressure on school places (20).

Conclusion

Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

		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
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Pressure on schools and healthcare providers need to be carefully mitigated, as well as the environmental effects of redevelopment. Any loss of employment or retail space will be provided in other areas.																					

SR4: OTHER SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH READING

SR4a: PULLEYN PARK, ROSE KILN LN

		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
SR4a(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
SR4a(ii)	Allocate for residential	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	?✓	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X
SR4a(iii)	Open space	✓X	0	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	✓	0	✓	0	?✓	0	?X	?X	0	0	✓	0	0	0
SR4a(iv)	Retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	0	0	0	?X	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
SR4a(v)	Offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	0	0	0	?X	✓X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
SR4a(vi)	Leisure use	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	0	0	0	?X	✓X	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>SR4a(i): Do not allocate</u></p> <p>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 providing much needed housing (4, 13). Currently, the use does not contribute to the local character of the area (9). Not allocating the site may ensure that current employment uses are continued (18).</p> <p><u>SR4a(ii): Allocate for residential</u></p> <p>The site is currently in use as a builder’s yard and car dealership. Any redevelopment would bring some environmental costs, but these would likely be outweighed by improved performance of new buildings (1, 3, 5, 6). It would provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). Residential development would pose some negative health effects, since the site is in an area at risk of flooding and within the Air Quality Management Area (2, 11). Residents may also place stress on already strained health and education infrastructure (15, 20). Development may provide an opportunity for an improved natural buffer between the site and the Kennet (7) and new development could contribute to improved townscape and landscape character (9). Finally, loss of any employment uses should be carefully monitored and provided elsewhere (18). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p><u>SR4a(iii): Open space</u></p> <p>This option would bring some environmental effects as a result of demolition of the current buildings, but no further effects from reconstruction (1, 3, 5, 6). It would fail to provide housing (13) on a brownfield site (4), but a new open space would contribute positively to wildlife and the natural environment (7), as well as contribute to the character of the area (9). It may provide an additional option for informal leisure and recreation (17) which could lead to healthy lifestyles (11). The A33 is a busy road that acts as a barrier to the site and may result in less sustainable travel to the site, likely by car (14).</p> <p><u>SR4a(iv): Retail</u></p> <p>The effects of this option are similar to that of option (ii) in terms of environmental effects (1, 3, 5, 6) and it would use a brownfield site (4). Unlike option (ii), this alternative would avoid placing residents within the AQMA or flood zone (2, 11) and remove pressures on schools and healthcare facilities (15, 20). It would fail to provide housing (13) and may encourage travel by car (14). A redevelopment may provide an opportunity to improve wildlife habitat and local character, but this would be dependent on design (7, 9). Too much noise or other disturbance would be detrimental to wildlife. Retail would provide opportunity for economic development and employment (18).</p> <p><u>SR4a(iii): Offices</u></p> <p>This appraisal is identical to that of option (iv).</p> <p><u>SR4a(iv): Leisure use</u></p> <p>This appraisal is similar to that of options (iv) and (v), but would bring significant positive effects with regard to leisure and recreation (17).</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>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. 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. Development must also take account of any flood risk issues and encourage biodiversity while preventing harm to the natural environment. This should include a landscaped buffer along the Kennet and a buffer between residences and commercial activity to the south of the site. Any loss of employment uses should be carefully monitored and provided for elsewhere. Homes should avoid overlooking onto back gardens on Elgar Road.</p>																					

SR4b: REAR OF 3-29 NEWCASTLE RD

		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
SR4b(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
SR4b(ii)	Allocate for residential (15-30 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	?✓	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
SR4b(iii)	Higher density residential (more than 40 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?X	0	?✓	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
SR4b(iv)	Open space	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	?✓	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

SR4b(i): Do not allocate

The site currently comprises portions of residential back gardens along the edge of Cintra Park. Not allocating this site would protect local character (9), but would fail to provide much needed housing (13).

SR4b(ii): Residential development (15-30 dwellings)

Any redevelopment would bring some environmental costs, but these would likely be outweighed by improved performance of new buildings (1, 3, 5, 6). It would provide housing in an accessible location (13, 14), but not on previously developed land (4). Residential development may encourage healthy lifestyles since the site is located in close proximity to Cintra Park (11), but residents may also place stress on already strained health and education infrastructure (15, 20). Development may provide an opportunity for an improved wildlife habitat (7) and contribute to improved townscape and landscape character (9), but this would be entirely dependent on design.

SR4b(iii): Higher density residential development (more than 40 dwellings)

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but is more likely to harm local character (9) and the natural environment (7), since building more dwellings would likely require increased height and footprint.

SR4b(iv): Open space

This option would extend the boundaries of Cintra Park and serve local character (9) and the natural environment (7), but would fail to provide housing (13).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

		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
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. Development must also take account of biodiversity while preventing harm to the natural environment. Development should prevent overlooking towards Newcastle Rd.																					

SR4c: 169-173 BASINGSTOKE RD

		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
SR4c(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
SR4c(ii)	Residential (50-80 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
SR4c(iii)	Higher density residential (more than 100 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	?X	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
SR4c(iv)	Retail or other commercial use (offices, industrial or warehouse)	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
COMMENTS:																					

		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>SR4c(i): Do not allocate</u></p> <p>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 providing much needed housing (4, 13). Currently, the use does not contribute to the local character of the area (9). Not allocating the site may ensure that current employment uses are continued (18). Because there is partial vacancy on the site, it may encourage anti-social behaviour and crime (12).</p>																					
<p><u>SR4c(ii): Residential (50-80 dwellings)</u></p> <p>Any redevelopment would bring some environmental costs, but these would likely be outweighed by improved performance of new buildings (1, 3, 5, 6). It would provide housing in an accessible location (13, 14) on previously developed land (4). Residential development would place stress on already strained health and education infrastructure (15, 20). Development may provide an opportunity to contribute to improved townscape and landscape character (9), but this would be entirely dependent on design. Effects of poor air quality would need to be mitigated, since the site is located within the AQMA and will affect resident health (11). Any loss of employment space should be made up for elsewhere (18).</p>																					
<p><u>SR4c(iii): Higher density residential (more than 100 dwellings)</u></p> <p>This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but is more likely to harm local character (9) since building more dwellings would likely require increased height and footprint.</p>																					
<p><u>SR4c(iv): Retail or other commercial use (offices, industrial or warehouse)</u></p> <p>The effects of this option are similar to that of option (ii) in terms of environmental effects (1, 3, 5, 6) and would use a brownfield site (4). Unlike option (ii), this alternative would avoid placing residents within the AQMA (11) and remove pressures on schools and healthcare facilities (15, 20). It would fail to provide housing (13) and may encourage travel by car (14). A redevelopment may provide an opportunity to improve local character, but this would be dependent on design (9). Retail would provide opportunity for economic development and employment (18).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. Any development would have to have</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
stringent measures in place for dealing with contamination, and this will likely be one of the first issues to address if the site is identified. Any loss of employment uses should be carefully monitored and provided for elsewhere. Homes should avoid overlooking. Effects of air pollution and noise on residents should be mitigated.																					

SR4d: 16-18 BENNET RD

		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
SR4d(i)	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR4d(ii) *▼	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?✓	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0
SR4d(iii)	Other commercial uses	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?✓	0	0	0	✓	?✓	0
SR4d(iv)	Residential uses	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	XX	0	X	?✓	0	X	0	XX	0	?X

COMMENTS:

SR4d(i): 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).

SR4d(ii): 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 concentration of unemployment and low skills (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>SR4d(iii): 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.</p> <p>SR4d(iv): 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 floodplain, 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.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. 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. Development must also take account of any flood risk issues.</p>																					

SR4e: 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

		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
SR4e(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR4e(ii)	Employment development (B1/B2/B8)	X	X	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	?X	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0
SR4e(iii)	Non-residential development e.g. hotel	X	X	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	?X	X	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	✓	?✓	0
SR4e(iv) ▼	Residential development or mixed use	X	X	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	?X	XX	?✓	✓X	0	X	0	0	✓	0	X

COMMENTS:

SR4e(i): 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).

SR4e(ii): 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).

SR4e(iii): Non-residential development e.g. hotel

Many of the effects of this option 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 floodplain, affected by potential noise, poor air quality and contamination, could have a negative effect on health and well-being (11).

SR4e(iv): Residential development or mixed use

A residential development would share many of the effects already outlined. It could make a contribution to housing provision (13), but given 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>surrounding uses and environment, is unlikely to represent high quality accommodation. The effects of flooding, air quality, potential contamination and noise on residents would 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).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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 to CIL, or in certain cases S106. 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. Development must also take account of any flood risk issues. Development should enhance the setting of the nearby listed building.</p>																					

SR4f: LAND SOUTH WEST OF JUNCTION 11 OF THE M4

		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
SR4f(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
SR4f(ii)	Allocate for undetermined uses associated with major development in Grazeley	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

SR4f(i): Do not allocate

Because little is known at this time, the assessment yields almost no effects. Not allocating the site would fail to provide an opportunity for housing (13).

SR4f(ii): Allocate for undetermined uses associated with major development in Grazeley

Again, very little is known at this time. Allocating this site for inclusion by any major development in Grazeley could bring positive effects with regard to housing (13), but may harm landscape character (9), since the site is previously undeveloped (4). Effects on nearby sites will be dependent on the Grazeley plan that comes forward. Thus, effects on nearby sites are unknown at this time (8).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.

MITIGATION: No mitigation is identified at this time.

SR5: LEISURE AND RECREATION USE OF THE KENNETSIDE AREAS

	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
SR4(i) *	No policy	0	?	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0
SR4(ii) ▼	Business as usual, SA10a SDPD (just Fobney Mead)	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
SR4(iii)	New policy including land north and east of Rose Kiln Lane	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

SR4(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would likely continue the current use of the site. This would bring no negative effects, but represents a missed opportunity in terms of providing a recreational resource at the River Kennet for the increasing residential population in South Reading. Positive effects would occur with regard to the natural environment (7) if no development were to take place. The capacity of this site is limited due to flood risk, biodiversity and landscape considerations.

SR4(ii): Business as usual, SA10a SDPD (just Fobney Mead)

The current policy allocates Fobney Mead for low-intensity leisure uses. This would bring positive effects with regard to climate change (2), but keeping non-compatible development out of the flood risk area. A tendency towards positive effects would also occur in relation to the natural environment (7), local character (9), healthy lifestyles (11), public foot and cycle access (14) and recreation and leisure (17) by providing nearby residents with a new recreational resource.

SR4(iii): New policy including land north and east of Rose Kiln Ln

This option carries many of the same positive effects as option (ii), but positive effects with regard to climate change (2) and recreation and leisure (17) are more pronounced with the inclusion of an additional site (land north and east of Rose Kiln Ln).

Conclusion

Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

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
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.																					

WR1: 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
WR1(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	X	?X	?X	0	0	?X	?X	X?	?X
WR1(ii) ▼	Continue policy SA4 (SDPD)	?X	?✓	?X	✓✓	?X	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓

COMMENTS:

WR1(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would miss an opportunity to correct physical and social issues identified on the estate, including a poor quality physical environment associated with crime and anti-social behaviour, lack of integration, poor energy efficiency, lack of facilities, vacancy in the local centre and a lack of housing mix. This would bring many negative effects including poor use of brownfield land (4), poor character (9), crime (12), housing (13), facility access (15), leisure (17), economic development (18), inequality (19) and education (20).

WR1(ii): Continue policy SA4 (SDPD)

This option would result in an appropriate mix of housing at a greater density than presently exists thereby resulting in significant positive impacts in respect of utilisation of previously developed land (4), local character (9) and the provision of high quality housing (13). This option would also ensure the provision of surface water systems (2), biodiversity enhancements (7), elements to encourage healthy lifestyles (11), community cohesion (12), sustainable transport (14), improved facilities (15), economic development opportunities (18) and enhance the role of Ranikhet Primary School (20). These measures would help to address inequality (19) and improve the poor quality physical environment that is associated with crime and anti-social behaviour. The negative effects of redevelopment such as increased CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3) and waste generation (5) must be carefully mitigated.

		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>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The negative effects of redevelopment such as increased CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3) and waste generation (5) must be carefully mitigated.</p>																					

WR2: PARK LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE LAURELS AND DOWNING RD

		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
WR2(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	X

		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
WR2(ii) ▼	Continue current allocation to re-provide school, develop remaining sites	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	?X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓
WR2(iii)	Develop school on the Laurels without using Downing Road	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓X	0	✓	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓
WR2(iv)	Development including town centre use on Park Lane site	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	X	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	?X	0	0	✓✓

COMMENTS:

WR2(i): 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).

WR2(ii): Continue current allocation to re-provide 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 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).

WR2(iii): Develop school on the Laurels would using Downing Road

Although this option would in theory offer some of the same benefits as option (ii) 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

		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>categorical than for option (ii), because there is less certainty that they will happen.</p> <p>WR2(iv): Development including town centre use on Park Lane site This option is largely the same as option (ii), 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>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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>																					

WR3: OTHER SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT IN WEST READING AND TILEHURST

WR3a: FORMER COX AND WYMAN SITE, CARDIFF RD

		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
WR3a(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
WR3a(ii)	Redevelopment for residential use	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	X	?X	0	?X	0	X
WR3a(iii) ▼	Employment uses	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?X	?✓	X	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
WR3a(iv)	Retail and leisure uses	✓X	?X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	✓X	?✓	X	XX	X	0	✓	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3a(i): 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).

WR3a(ii): 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 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 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 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). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

WR3a(iii): 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 re-provision 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).

WR3a(iv): 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

		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>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 by car (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).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</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>																					

WR3b: 2 ROSS RD AND PART OF MEADOW RD

		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
WR3b(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	?	0	0

		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
WR3b(ii)	Allocate for residential (40-60 dwellings)	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓	?X	?X	?✓	?X	0	?X
WR3b(iii)	Higher density residential (over 80 dwellings)	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?X	?✓	✓✓	✓	X	?X	?✓	?X	0	X
WR3b(iv)	Offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3b(v)	Leisure/Retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?X	0	0	✓	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3b(i): 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). The building is older and may not remain in use into the future. If it were to become vacant, this would send the wrong economic message (18).

WR3b(ii): Allocate for residential (40-60 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 site is surrounded by Flood Zone 2, but is not in it itself, so there may be 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 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 well-being. Redevelopment of the 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). It would also locate residents closer to town centre leisure uses (17). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

WR3b(iii): Higher density residential

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but negative effects on education and healthcare infrastructure would be more pronounced (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>Additionally, higher density residential is likely to require taller buildings. This would be out of step with surround residences and would detract from local character (9).</p> <p><u>WR3b(iv): Offices</u> Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (2, 11, 15, 20) There would be a significant positive effect on the economy through re-provision of employment generating uses (18). An employment development would be likely to make a positive contribution to the townscape, but this is largely dependent on design (9). This alternative would fail to provide housing (13).</p> <p><u>WR3b(v): Leisure/Retail</u> 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 by car (14). Whilst it would provide employment, it could potentially detract from the town centre economy (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The effects of noise, poor air quality and contamination on the residents can be mitigated through design and creating a buffer between industrial and residential areas. 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.</p>																					

WR3c: 28-30 RICHFIELD AVE

		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

		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
WR3c(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3c(ii)	More mixed commercial area	✓X	X	✓X	✓	✓X	X	0	0	?X	0	X	0	X	✓	0	0	✓	✓X	0	0
WR3c(iii)	Residential development	✓X	XX	✓X	✓	✓X	X	0	0	?X	0	X	0	✓	✓	?X	?X	✓	?X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

WR3c(i): Do not allocate

As this would largely continue the existing situation, most effects would 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).

WR3c(ii): More mixed commercial area

A development option includes the usual potential negative and positive environmental effects associated with development (1, 3, 5), with 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 this area would enhance access to the Thames-side recreation and leisure functions (17).

WR3c(iii): Residential development

Many of the effects would be the same as for other types of development under option (ii), but the introduction of residential could mean some major issues, for instance a significant negative effect on the risk from flooding (2) and exposure to areas of potential contamination (6), both of which lead to a significant negative impact on health (11). There would also be a 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. Residential development would bring positive effects with regard to housing (13) and locate residents closer to town centre leisure uses (17). An increase in residents may place pressure on already strained healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

Conclusion

		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
Option (iii) is considered to be the best option because it provides housing. Negative effects can be mitigated.																					
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.																					
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.																					

WR3d: RIVERMEAD LEISURE CENTRE, RICHFIELD AVE

		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
WR3d(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
WR3d(ii)	Additional leisure development	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
WR3d(iii)	Commercial (office, warehouse or industrial)	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3d(iv)	Residential	?X	XX	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?	0	XX	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3d(v)	Open Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3d(i): Do not allocate

As this would largely continue the existing situation, most effects would be neutral. Retention of the open space surrounding the existing leisure centre may have positive effects on landscape character (9).

WR3d(ii): Additional leisure development

Any redevelopment will carry negative environmental effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). Additionally, this may not represent the best use of undeveloped land (4). The development has an opportunity to contribute to landscape character (9), although this is largely dependent on design. Additional leisure development would bring significant positive effects with regard to recreation and leisure (17), which could in turn contribute to healthy lifestyles (11).

WR3d(iii): Commercial (office, warehouse or industrial)

Many of the effects would be the same as for a residential development, but lacking the effects of residents in this location (2, 11, 15, 20) There would be a significant positive effect on the economy through re-provision of employment generating uses (18). An employment development would have an opportunity to make a positive contribution to the landscape, but this is largely dependent on design (9). This alternative would fail to provide housing (13).

WR3d(iv): Residential

There would be the same environmental costs as for all types of redevelopment on CO₂ (1), energy use (3), undeveloped land (4), waste (5) and pollution (6). The site is in an area of flooding, so there would be significant negative effects on adaptation to climate change (2) and health (11) by locating residents in the flood zone. This site is in a relatively accessible location (14) and could provide a significant amount of housing (13). Residential could put

		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>pressure on town centre health (15) and education (20) infrastructure.</p> <p>WR3d(v): Open Space The effects of this option are neutral, as it would continue the current use.</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Development must address contamination and flood risk issues.</p>																					

WR3e: YEOMANRY HOUSE, CASTLE 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
WR3e(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
WR3e(ii)	Residential (10-14 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3e(iii)	Offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3e(iv)	Retail/Restaurant	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3e(i): Do not allocate

This option would have largely neutral effects, although it may fail to ensure the care of the listed building. If the building were to become unused or neglected, this would detract from townscape character (9) and harm the historic environment since the building is listed and located within a conservation area (10).

WR3e(ii): Residential (10-14 dwellings)

Residential development would provide housing in a highly accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). There may be harmful effects in terms of pollution (6) and health (11) by locating residents in an area of poor air quality. This would require mitigation. Additionally, locating more residents in the town centre would place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Redevelopment from offices to residential would provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Any development will carry environmental costs (1, 3, 5, 6) but these are likely to be outweighed if building performance improves. Any development may also impact the wooded frontage of the site along Castle Hill (7) and any development should ensure its preservation.

WR3e(iii): Offices

The effects of this option are largely similar to that of option (ii), but commercial development would remove residents from an area of poor air quality (11) and remove pressures on schools and healthcare facilities (15, 20). Unlike option (ii), this alternative would bring positive effects with regard to economic development and employment (18).

WR3e(iv): Retail/ Restaurant

This appraisal is identical to that of option (iii).

Conclusion

Options (ii), (iii) and (iv) all bring positive sustainability effects with limited negative effects that could be addressed through mitigation.

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
The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option. MITIGATION: The effects of noise and poor air quality on the residents can be mitigated through design. Development must avoid detrimental effects on the significance of the listed building and the Conservation Area, as well as the wooded frontage to Castle Hill.																					

WR3f: 4 BERKELEY AVE

		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
WR3f(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0
WR3f(ii)	Residential (10-14 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	0	✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3f(iii)	Higher density residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	X	0	?X	0	✓	✓	X	0	0	0	0	X
WR3f(iv)	Offices/Retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
COMMENTS: <u>WR3f(i): Do not allocate</u> This option would have largely neutral effects. If the building were to become unused or neglected, this would detract from townscape character (9) and may send the wrong economic message (18). <u>WR3f(ii): Residential (10-14 dwellings)</u> Residential development would provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). There may be harmful effects in terms of pollution (6) and																					

		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
	health (11) by locating residents in an area of poor air quality. This would require mitigation. Additionally, residents would place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Redevelopment to residential would provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9). Any development will carry environmental costs (1, 3, 5, 6) but these are likely to be outweighed if building performance improves.																				
	<u>WR3f(iii): Higher density residential</u> This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but negative effects on education and healthcare infrastructure would be more pronounced (15, 20). Additionally, higher density residential is likely to require taller buildings. This would be out of step with surrounding residences and would detract from local character (9).																				
	<u>WR3f(iv): Offices/retail</u> The effects of this option are largely similar to that of option (ii), but commercial development would remove residents from an area of poor air quality (11) and remove pressures on schools and healthcare facilities (15, 20). Unlike option (ii), this alternative would bring positive effects with regard to economic development and employment (18).																				
	<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																				
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																				
	<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																				
	<u>MITIGATION:</u> 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. Any contamination on-site should be addressed.																				

WR3g: 211-221 OXFORD RD, 10 AND REAR OF 8 PROSPECT ST

	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
WR3g(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3g(ii) ▼	Residential development with District Centre uses on the ground floor	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	✓X	0	✓	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0
WR3g(iii)	Development for residential only	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3g(iv)	Development for offices with ground floor district centre uses	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	?X	✓	0	X	✓✓	✓	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3g(i): Do not allocate

Where no development activity would take place on 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).

WR3g(ii): Residential development with district centre uses on the ground floor

Developing the site 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 district 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 buildings opposite and nearby conservation area would need to be mitigated. There would also be potentially 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.

WR3g(iii): Development for residential only

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

		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
the opportunity were not taken to include town centre uses in this accessible district centre location.																					
<p>WR3g(iv): Development for offices with ground floor district 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 district centre uses (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14, 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 employment opportunities (11). Since no residents would be present, the negative effects on health would not occur to the same extent (11).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: The site is within the 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>																					

WR3h: REAR OF 303-315 OXFORD RD

		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
WR3h(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
WR3h(ii) ▼	Comprehensive development for residential (14-20 dwellings)	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3h(iii)	Development for commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3h(iv)	Development for mixed use residential and commercial	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	?X
WR3h(v)	Development for retail	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	✓	X	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3h(vi)	Development for community use/leisure	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	✓X	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓	X	✓	✓	0	?✓	✓X	0	?

COMMENTS:

WR3h(i): Do not allocate

Under this option, the site would remain as residential gardens and garages, with parking for businesses fronting onto Oxford Rd. This retention of existing uses would save on CO₂ emissions (1), resources (3) and minimise the generation of waste (5). The layout of 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).

WR3h(ii): Comprehensive redevelopment for residential (14-20 dwellings)

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 the 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).

WR3h(iii): Development for commercial

		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>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 the 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 opportunities for employment (18). Potential effects on healthcare and education infrastructure would need to be investigated and mitigated (15, 20).</p>																					
<p><u>WR3h(iv): Development for mixed use residential and commercial</u></p> <p>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 the 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 healthcare and education infrastructure in this part of Reading would need to be investigated and mitigated (15, 20).</p>																					
<p><u>WR3h(v): Development for retail</u></p> <p>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), but would provide new employment opportunities (18).</p>																					
<p><u>WR3h(vi): Development for community use/leisure</u></p> <p>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><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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
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.																					

WR3i: PART OF FORMER BATTLE HOSPITAL, PORTMAN RD

		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
WR3i(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	X	✓	XX	✓	?X	0	0	XX	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3i(ii) ▼	Development for residential use (160-240 dwellings)	✓X	X	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	XX	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	?X
WR3i(iii)	Mixed use development (commercial and residential)	✓X	X	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	✓	0	?X	✓	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	0	?X
WR3i(iv)	Industrial and commercial development	✓X	X	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3i(i): Do not allocate

The existing built environment on this site consists of older buildings 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 the 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

		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>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.</p> <p><u>WR3i(ii): Development for residential use (160-240 dwellings)</u> 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 underdeveloped 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 Rd 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 is referenced in the policy. In addition, there is the potential for new housing to affect the capacity of healthcare and education facilities (15, 20). Failing to address flooding issues would have negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.</p> <p><u>WR3i(iii): Mixed use development (commercial and residential)</u> 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).</p> <p><u>WR3i(iv): 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. The use of the site would contribute to economic growth in the area (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</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
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.																					

WR3j: LAND AT MOULSFORD MEWS

		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
WR3j(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
WR3j(ii)	Residential (10-16 dwellings)	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3j(iii)	Higher density residential	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X	?✓	✓	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	X
WR3j(iv)	Commercial (offices and retail)	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3j(v)	Mixed use (ground floor retail/office and upper floors residential)	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

WR3j(i): Do not allocate

The site is currently vacant. This does not represent good use of previously developed land (4), detracts from local character (9) and may attract crime or vandalism (12). This sends the wrong economic message (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>WR3j(ii): Residential (10-16 dwellings)</u> Residential development would provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). There may be harmful effects in terms of pollution (6) and health (11) by locating residents in an area of poor air quality. This would require mitigation. Additionally, residents would place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Redevelopment to residential would provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9). Any development will carry environmental costs (1, 3, 5, 6).</p> <p><u>WR3j(iii): Higher density residential</u> This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but negative effects on education and healthcare infrastructure would be more pronounced (15, 20). Additionally, higher density residential is likely to require taller buildings. This would be out of step with surrounding residences and would detract from local character (9).</p> <p><u>WR3j(iv): Commercial (offices and retail)</u> The effects of this option are largely similar to that of option (ii), but commercial development would remove residents from an area of poor air quality (11) and remove pressures on schools and healthcare facilities (15, 20). Unlike option (ii), this alternative would bring positive effects with regard to economic development and employment (18). This option would not deliver housing (13).</p> <p><u>WR3j(v): Mixed use (ground floor retail/office and upper floors residential)</u> This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but provides some scope for commercial activity, meaning economic development and employment (18). Provision of housing may be less pronounced (13).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Potential contamination and poor air quality on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies.</p>																					

WR3k: 784-794 OXFORD RD

		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
WR3k(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	?X	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3k(ii) ▼	Development for residential (14-22 dwellings)	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0
WR3k(iii)	Development for commercial	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
WR3k(iv)	Development for mixed use including residential	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
WR3k(v)	Development for retail	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0
WR3k(vi)	Development for community use	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3k(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site would remain in its current uses (car showroom, commercial, B1 offices and residential). This retention 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.

WR3k(ii): Development for residential (10-17 dwellings)

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 risk and the fear of crime (12). 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
		would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Development would result in a loss of employment uses (18).																			
	<u>WR3k(iii): Development for commercial</u>	Development would emit CO ₂ (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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an 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).																			
	<u>WR3k(iv): Development for mixed use including residential</u>	Development would emit CO ₂ (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 the AQMA, 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 risk and the 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).																			
	<u>WR3k(v): Development for retail</u>	The physical processes 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 (18).																			
	<u>WR3k(vi): Development for community use</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 uses of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). 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).																			
	<u>Conclusion</u>	Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																			
	<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u>	The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																			

		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>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Potential contamination, noise and poor air quality on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies.																					

WR3I: 816 OXFORD RD

		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
WR3I(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	?X	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0

		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
WR3I(ii)	Development for residential (14-22 dwellings)	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3I(iii)	Development for commercial	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3I(iv)	Development for mixed use including residential	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	✓X	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
WR3I(v)	Development for retail	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3I(vi)	Development for community use	X	?X	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3I(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site is likely to remain vacant (9). This could send the wrong economic message (18). This retention 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 near Flood Zone 2, and the coverage by hardstanding could have a negative effect on water flows in the event of a flood (2). The vacant site may facilitate vandalism or crime (12).

WR3I(ii): Development for residential (10-17 dwellings)

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site in near 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 risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

WR3I(iii): Development for commercial

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site near Flood Zone 2 could have a negative effect on water

		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>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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an 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 new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>WR3I(iv): Development for mixed use including residential</u> Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). Development of the small part of the site in near 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 the AQMA, as well as near Flood Zone 2, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the 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 new employment uses (18). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).</p> <p><u>WR3I(v): Development for retail</u> The physical processes 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 new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>WR3I(vi): Development for community use</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 uses of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would result in the new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Potential contamination, noise and poor air quality on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community</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
infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies.																					

WR3m: 103 DEE RD

		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
WR3m(i) *	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3m(ii) ▼	Residential (34-50 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓✓	?✓	X	✓	✓	0	0	0	?✓	0
WR3m(iii)	Retained fire service/community uses	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3m(iv)	Higher density residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3m(iv)	Retail development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	X	XX	✓X	0	0	?✓	?✓	0

COMMENTS:

WR3m(i): 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).

WR3m(ii): Residential (34-50 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 is likely to be an improvement when compared to the current building (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,

		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
20). The effect on health and safety would depend on whether the loss of the fire station meant no different 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).																					
<u>WR3m(iii): Retained fire service/community uses</u> 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 the 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).																					
<u>WR3m(iv): Higher density residential development</u> These effects are largely the same as option (ii), but harm to townscape character (9) is more likely to occur if the buildings are of an inappropriate height that does not mirror surrounding development.																					
<u>WR3m(v): Retail development</u> 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 and employment generating use (19), but housing would not be provided (13). A significant retail development could compete with town or district centres and is likely to ultimately increase the need to travel (14) and reduce access to services in the town centre (15).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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.																					

WR3n: AMETHYST 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
WR3n(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
WR3n(ii)	Residential (32-48 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3n(iii)	Higher density residential	X	0	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?X	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3n(iv)	Commercial (offices or retail)	X	0	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3n(v)	Community or leisure use	X	0	X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3n(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site is likely to become vacant (9). This could send the wrong economic message (18). This retention 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). The vacant site may facilitate vandalism or crime (12).

WR3n(ii): Residential (32-48 dwellings)

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

WR3n(iii): Higher density residential

These effects are largely the same as option (ii), but harm to townscape character (9) is more likely to occur if the buildings are of an inappropriate height that does not mirror surrounding 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><u>WR3n(iv): Commercial (offices or retail)</u> Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an 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 new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>WR3n(v): Community or leisure use</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 uses of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would result in the new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies.</p>																					

WR3o: 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

		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
WR3o(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	XX	0	0	?X	0	X	X	0	?✓	X	X	0
WR3o(ii)	Develop as district centre	✓X	?X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	?✓	?	✓✓	✓✓	✓	?✓	✓	✓	0
WR3o(iii)	Residential	✓X	?X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	?✓	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	?	0	?✓	?X
WR3o(iv)	Offices	✓X	?X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?X	0	✓✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0

COMMENTS:

WR3o(i): Do not allocate

Many of the effects identified are the opposite of the effects identified for option (ii), 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 local character (9) from an unattractive and decaying centre.

WR3o(ii): Develop as 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 hold some significance for wildlife (7) and provide shading (2). The removal of aging and unattractive buildings would have a significant positive effect on the local townscape (9). Regeneration of the centre with a new and 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 a part of the development, so any impact of the delivery of housing is uncertain (13). This option would bring positive effects with regard to equality (16), since smaller centres provide accessible facilities and services for older residents or residents with disabilities.

WR3o(iii): Residential

The effects of this option are similar to that of option (ii), but with no scope for economic development (18) and positive effects for housing provision (13). Increasing the number of residents in this area will place pressures on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). This should be mitigated. This option would not address inequality and deprivation through employment opportunity, but it may increase the amount of affordable housing in the area (19).

WR3o(iv): Offices

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but removes the potential for leisure development (17).

		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>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are expected to be positive effects based on age and disability from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies. Diversity of types and sizes of uses will help to create an attractive environment. The design can incorporate re-provision of any green areas to be lost, or enhancement of remaining areas. Any contamination on site will need to be investigated and addressed.</p>																					

WR3p: ALICE BURROWS HOME, DWYER RD

		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
WR3p(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	XX	✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	XX	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
WR3p(ii) ▼	Development for residential and/or residential care (18-27 dwellings)	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	?	?	✓	0	0	0	0
WR3p(iii)	Commercial development	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	X	?	?	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3p(iv)	Leisure or community use	X	?✓	X	✓✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	✓	✓	X	?	?	0	✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3p(i): Do not allocate

Under this option, the vacant site would remain as 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).

WR3p(ii): Development for residential and/or residential care (17-27 dwellings)

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). Good design can minimise pollution (6), as well. Construction would produce waste (5). Development would utilise and unused site and 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). Providing residential care bedspaces would positively affect residents based on age (16).

WR3p(iii): Commercial development

The physical process of development would have similar effects on CO₂ emissions (1), adaptation to climate change (2), energy efficiency (3), waste (5), pollution (6) and minimising the use of brownfield land (4). Development will utilise an unused site and good design can ensure a safe, clean and green environment (9). Crime prevention will help minimise the risk and fear of crime (12). An office development would miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Good transport links would have to be provided to ensure good access to services (14, 15). Provision of offices will provide employment opportunity (18).

WR3p(iv): Leisure or community use

		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
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 miss an 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, 15).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> A negative effect based on age may occur if bedspaces are not provided.																					
MITIGATION: 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.																					

WR3q: NORCOT COMMUNITY CENTRE, LYNDHURST RD

		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
WR3q(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	?✓	?	0	0

		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
WR3q(ii)	Residential (13-20 dwellings w/ replacement community use)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	?X
WR3q(iii)	Higher density residential (more than 40 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?X	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3q(iv)	Commercial (offices or retail)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3q(v)	Open space	✓	0	✓	?	X	✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	?	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3q(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site is likely to become vacant (9). This could send the wrong economic message (18). This retention 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). The vacant site may facilitate vandalism or crime (12). If the site's current community use continues, this could have a tendency towards positive effects with regard to recreation, leisure and culture (17).

WR3q(ii): Residential (13-20 dwellings w/ replacement community use)

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Retention of some community uses would provide opportunity for leisure and recreation (17).

WR3q(iii): Higher density residential (more than 40 dwellings)

These effects are largely the same as option (ii), but harm to townscape character (9) is more likely to occur if the buildings are of an inappropriate height that does not mirror surrounding 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><u>WR3q(iv): Commercial (offices or retail)</u> Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an 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 new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>WR3q(v): Open space</u> Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Open space would generate some waste (5) during the removal of the current structure, but would contribute to local character (9). Open space should be well designed to create community cohesion and prevent crime (12).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies. Development should take account of any archaeological significance and avoid detrimental effects on existing green links and pedestrian routes.</p>																					

WR3r: CHARTERS CAR SALES, OXFORD RD

		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

		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
WR3r(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	?	0	0
WR3r(ii)	Residential (12-18 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
WR3r(iii)	Higher density residential (more than 30 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?X	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	X	0	0	X	0	X
WR3r(iv)	Commercial (offices or retail)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
WR3r(v)	Open Space	✓	0	✓	?	X	✓	0	0	✓	0	?✓	?	X	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

WR3r(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site is likely to become vacant (9). This could send the wrong economic message (18). This retention 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). The vacant site may facilitate vandalism or crime (12). If the site's current commercial use continues, this could have an effect on local employment opportunities (18), but there is no guarantee that the site will not become vacant within the plan period.

WR3r(ii): Residential (12-18 dwellings)

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Development would result in a loss of employment uses (18).

WR3r(iii): Higher density residential development (more than 30 dwellings)

This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but negative effects on education and healthcare infrastructure would be more pronounced (15, 20). Additionally, higher density residential is likely to require taller buildings. This would be out of step with surrounding residences and would detract from local character (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>WR3r(iv): Commercial (offices or retail)</u> Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development in this out-of-centre location would increase the need to travel (14). Development would result in new employment uses (18).</p> <p><u>WR3q(v): Open space</u> Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Open space would generate some waste (5) during the removal of the current structure, but would contribute to local character (9). Open space should be well designed to create community cohesion and prevent crime (12).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Potential contamination, noise, poor air quality and impacts on wildlife on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as schools or healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies. Development should take account of the two-storey character of houses south of Oxford Road.</p>																					

WR3s: LAND AT 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

		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
WR3s(i) *▼	Do not change allocation, retain as open space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3s(ii)	Develop the whole area for housing (200-250 dwellings)	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	0	X	0	XX	0	✓✓	✓	✓X	0	XX	0	0	X
WR3s(iii)	Only develop previously developed areas (11-17 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	X	?X	0	✓X	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X
WR3s(iv)	Develop entire area except for the recreation ground	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	0	X	0	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	X	0	0	X
WR3s(v)	Develop land fronting Kentwood Hill for housing (40-70) dwellings	X	X	X	XX	X	X	X	0	X	0	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

WR3s(i): Do not change allocation, retain as open space

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).

WR3s(ii): Develop 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 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 option

		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>(v). This would mean developing a significant amount 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 for recreation.</p>																					
<p><u>WR3s(iii): Only develop previously developed areas (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 (v) 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 would be a piecemeal approach which would not address the wider issues of the area.</p>																					
<p><u>WR3s(iv): Develop entire area except for the recreation ground</u> This option is similar to that of option (ii), 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.</p>																					
<p><u>WR3s(v): Develop land fronting Kentwood Hill for housing (40-70) dwellings</u> The effects of this option strike a balance between option (vi) and option (iii). It would deliver housing (13) and locate residents in a location with sustainable transport options near a local centre (14). Residents may place further stress on education and health infrastructure (20, 15), but this can be mitigated.</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (v) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. The recreation ground and the allotments must be protected. Development should create cohesion between the recreation ground and housing development along Armour Hill. Transport impacts should be mitigated, including increasing walking and cycling infrastructure provision. Development must retain biodiversity and create green links with respect to TPOs. Wastewater and water concerns should be mitigated through working closely with Thames Water.</p>																					

WR3t: LAND AT ARMOUR 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
WR3t(i) *▼	Do not change allocation, retain as open space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WR3t(ii)	Develop 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
WR3t(iii)	Develop entire area except for allotments	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	0	X	0	X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	X	0	0	X
WR3t(v)	Develop land fronting Armour Hill for housing (10-20) dwellings	X	X	X	XX	X	X	X	0	X	0	?X	0	✓	✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

WR3t(i): Do not change allocation, retain as open space

Not allocating the site will have largely neutral effects, other than on provision of housing (13).

WR3t(ii): Develop 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 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 option (v). This would mean developing a significant amount 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 for recreation.

		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>WR3t(iii): Develop entire area except for the allotments</u> This option is similar to that of option (ii), 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.</p> <p><u>WR3t(iv): Develop land fronting Armour Hill for housing (10-20) dwellings</u> The effects of this option strike a balance between option (vi) and option (iii). It would deliver housing (13) and locate residents in a location with sustainable transport options near a local centre (14). Residents may place further stress on education and health infrastructure (20, 15), but this can be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (vi) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. The recreation ground and the allotments must be protected. Development should create cohesion between the recreation ground and housing development along Armour Hill. Transport impacts should be mitigated, including increasing walking and cycling infrastructure provision. Development must retain biodiversity and create green links with respect to TPOs. Wastewater and water concerns should be mitigated through working closely with Thames Water.</p>																					

CA1: SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT IN CAVERSHAM AND EMMER GREEN

CA1a: READING UNIVERSITY BOAT CLUB, THAMES PROMENADE

		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

		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
CA1a(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
CA1a(ii)	Residential development only in Flood Zone 2 (16-25 dwellings)	✓X	?X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?✓	?✓	✓	✓	✓X	?X	✓X	0	0	?X
CA1a(iii)	Higher density residential (over 40 dwellings)	✓X	XX	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	?✓	?✓	✓✓	✓	✓X	X	✓X	0	0	?X
CA1a(iv)	Leisure uses associated with meadows	✓X	?X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CA1a(i): 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 (13). A leisure facility would be retained, although it is not clear that there is a future for the current use (17, 11).

CA1a(ii): Residential development only in Flood Zone 2 (16-25 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), but these may be offset by future improved performance. A negative effect on flood risk has been identified (2) due to the location in the floodplain. 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). Failing to address flooding issues would have significant negative effects with regard to equality (16). Locating residents with in areas of flood risk may disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities and older residents.

CA1a(iii): Higher density residential (over 40 dwellings)

The effects would largely be the same as for option (ii), although it is considered that the effect on housing provision would be significant (13). An increase in the number of dwellings would place residents in areas of the site at higher risk of flooding, bringing significant negative effects (2).

		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>CA1a(iv): Leisure uses associated with meadows 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), with knock-on effects on human health (11).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues A negative effect based on age and disability has been identified if residents are located within an area of flood risk, but these effects can be mitigated.</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. Due to the risk of flooding, development should only be located in Flood Zone 2 along Abbotsmead Road. Development must avoid detrimental visual effects on the Thames Valley major landscape feature, provide a green link connecting to Christchurch Meadow and take account of possible archaeological significance.</p>																					

CA1b: PART OF READING GOLF COURSE, KIDMORE END RD

		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
CA1b(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CA1b(ii)	Residential development and new golf clubhouse (90-130 dwellings)	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	?X	0	?✓	0	0	?X
CA1b(iii)	New clubhouse only	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
CA1b(iv)	Leisure use with new clubhouse	✓X	?X	✓X	XX	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?	0	✓	0	X	?X	0	0	✓✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CA1b(i): Do not allocate

Most of the effects would be neutral, although a potential housing site would not be used (13).

CA1b(ii): Residential development and new golf clubhouse (90-130 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 and reduce 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).

CA1b(iii): New 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), but would fail to provide housing (13).

CA1b(iv): Leisure use with new 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.

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

		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
Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
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. Development must mitigate highway impacts on Kidmore End Rd, take account of any archaeological significance, take account of any protected trees and provide a green link from Kidmore End Rd. Wastewater and water requirements must be considered through close working with Thames Water. Finally, community provision must be included, particularly healthcare infrastructure.																					

CA1c: LAND AT LOWFIELD RD

		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
CA1c(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	XX	✓	?✓	0	0	X	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1c(ii) ▼	Development for residential (24-36 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓✓	X	X	0	0	✓	0	?✓	✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	✓	0	0	?X
CA1c(iii)	Cemetery use	?X	0	?X	✓	?X	?X	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMENTS: CA1c(i): 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 CO ₂ emissions (1) and natural resource use (3), the vacant status of the site is clearly an inefficient use of valuable brownfield (4). It also																					

		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>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).</p>																					
<p><u>CA1c(ii): Development for residential (24-36 dwellings)</u></p> <p>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 and healthcare infrastructure (20).</p>																					
<p><u>CA1c(iii): Cemetery use</u></p> <p>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. This option would fail to provide housing (13).</p>																					
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p>																					
<p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u></p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p>																					
<p><u>Equality issues</u></p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. Development must take account of any archaeological significance and of any protected trees and provide a green link. Development should prevent a loss in net biodiversity and increase biodiversity interest where possible. Detrimental visual effects on the North Reading Dry Valleys major landscape feature should be avoided.</p>																					

CA1d: REAR OF 200-214 HENLEY RD, 12-24 ALL HALLOWS RD AND 4, 7 & 8 OF COPSE AVE

		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
CA1d(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1d(ii)	Residential development (17-25 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
CA1d(iii)	Only develop gardens behind homes on All Hallows Rd (northern part)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1d(iv)	Only develop gardens behind homes along Henley Rd (southern part)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CA1d(i): 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).

CA1d(ii): Residential development (17-25 dwellings)

As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of CO₂ (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 the 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). Residents would likely place further stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20).

CA1d(iii): Only develop gardens behind homes on All Hallows Road (northern part)

		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>Most of the effects of this option would be identical to option (ii), albeit limited to a smaller area. The effect on housing provision (13) would be less positive.</p> <p>CA1d(iv): Only develop gardens behind homes along Henley Rd (southern part)</p> <p>Most of the effects of this option would be identical to option (ii), albeit limited to a smaller area. The effect on housing provision (13) would be less positive.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues</p> <p>The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues</p> <p>There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</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. Development must take account of any archaeological significance and of any protected trees and avoid a loss in biodiversity. Development should provide appropriate back-to-back separation. Access should be provided from Overton Drive. Contamination on-site must be addressed, as well as the effects of poor air quality on residents.</p>																					

CA1e: REAR OF 13-14A HAWTHORNE RD AND 282-292 HENLEY RD

		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
CA1e(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
CA1e(ii)	Residential development (9-13 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1e(iii)	Higher density residential (more than 20 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	0	0	XX	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CA1e(i): Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (13).

CA1e(ii): Residential development (9-13 dwellings)

As for development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of CO₂ (1), energy use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6). In addition, development would use undeveloped land (4). The site is partially within the 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).

CA1e(iii): Higher density residential

The effects of this option are largely similar to option (ii), but higher density residential development is much more likely to adversely impact local character (9). Additionally, such an increase in residents may place stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.

MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Development must take account of any archaeological significance and of any protected trees and avoid a loss in biodiversity. Access should be provided from Maytree Walk. 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
effects of poor air quality on residents must be addressed.																					

CA1f: REAR OF 1 & 3 WOODCOTE RD AND 21 ST PETERS 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
CA1f(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1f(ii)	Residential development (8-12 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1f(iii)	Higher density residential (over 20 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	XX	0	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CA1f(i): Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (13).

CA1f(ii): Residential development (8-12 dwellings)

As for development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of CO₂ (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).

CA1f(iii): Higher density residential (over 20 dwellings)

The effects of this option are largely similar to option (ii), but higher density residential development is much more likely to adversely impact local character (9). Additionally, such an increase in residents may place stress on education and healthcare 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>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Environmental impacts can be mitigated to some extent through sustainable design and construction measures. Development must take account of any archaeological significance and of any protected trees and avoid a loss in biodiversity. Access should be provided from Symeon Place. The effects of poor air quality on residents must be addressed. Development should provide appropriate back-to-back separation.</p>																					

CA1g: Land West of Henley Road Cemetery

		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
CA1g(i) *▼	Do not allocate, retain as open space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0
CA1g(ii)	Cemetery extension	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	?✓	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA1g(iii)	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	0	?X	0	?✓	0	0	0	✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
CA1g(iv)	Higher density residential development	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	0	✓	?	X	0	0	0	0	X
COMMENTS:																					

		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>CA1g(i): Do not allocate, retain as open space</u> Under this option the site is likely to remain open space (9). Not allocating 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). If the site's current open space use continues, this could have a tendency towards positive effects with regard to recreation, leisure and culture (17).</p> <p><u>CA1g(ii): Cemetery extension</u> Development for a cemetery extension may use energy (3) during redevelopment or as a result of increased car trips in the local area. Development might result in waste (5). The development might damage the local wildlife, habitat and diversity, including important trees on the site (7). Development might contribute to local character (9). This option would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13).</p> <p><u>CA1g(iii): Residential development</u> Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). The use of greenfield land for housing will use undeveloped land (4), but good design could ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Development would result in waste (5) and might damage the local wildlife, habitat and diversity, including important trees on the site (7). Development would provide housing (13), and could increase the need to travel by car given the fringe of location of the site, although there are bus links (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).</p> <p><u>CA1g(iv): Higher density residential development</u> This appraisal is similar to that of option (ii), but negative effects on education and healthcare infrastructure would be more pronounced (15, 20). Additionally, higher density residential development is likely to require taller buildings. This would be out of step with surrounding residences and would detract from local character (9).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development must take care to ensure biodiversity and avoid detrimental effects to the nearby major landscape feature.</p>																					

CA2: CAVERSHAM 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
CA2(i) *▼	No policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
CA2(ii)	Redevelop for 40-45 dwellings with public access	?X	0	?X	?✓	?X	?X	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?X
CA2(iii)	Redevelop for many more dwellings	?X	0	?X	XX	?X	?X	X	0	XX	XX	0	0	✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	XX
CA2(iv)	No residential development, open to public access	?	0	0	?✓	?	?	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CA2(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would leave Caversham Park with an uncertain future. The site contains a number of listed elements that need to be conserved, including Caversham Park House and a Registered Historic Park and Garden. The site also forms a key feature of the landscape on North Reading. Thus, development must protect the historic interest, landscape value and biodiversity importance of the site. A 'no policy' option would leave these features vulnerable to loss and bring negative benefits with regard to biodiversity (7), landscape character (9), the historic environment (10) and housing provision (13). This option would also miss an opportunity to provide public access for informal leisure and recreation (17).

CA2(ii): Redevelop for 40-45 dwellings with public access

This option seeks to strike a balance between careful protection of landscape features and heritage value while providing some housing. Any redevelopment would bring a tendency towards negative effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste (5) and pollution (6) generated during construction. A tendency towards positive effects would occur in relation to re-use of valuable brownfield land (4), the natural environment (7), landscape character (9), the historic environment (10), community cohesion (12) and housing (13). Because the policy details requirements for established walking paths and public access, this would bring benefits to health (11), sustainable transport (14) and leisure/recreation (17). However, because school places are under strain in the north of the Borough, locating residents here may place further stress on school places (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>CA2(iii): Redevelop for many more dwellings</u> This option may bring positive effects in terms of housing provision (13) and locating residents in areas of facility access (15), but negative effects far outweigh these benefits. Locating so many residents in an area of strained education resources would place significant stress on school places (20). Significant negative effects would also occur in terms of landscape character (9), the historic environment (13) and use of brownfield land (4), since much of the site remains undeveloped. Other negative effects would occur with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste (5), pollution (6) and the natural environment (7).</p> <p><u>CA2(iv): No residential development, open to public access</u> This option would miss an important opportunity to provide housing (13), but would accomplish many of the same positive effects as option (ii). Effects on CO₂ emissions (1), waste (5) and pollution (6) are unclear. This would depend largely on the type of development pursued. A cultural centre would bring a tendency towards positive effects with regard to recreation, leisure and culture (17), as well as economic growth (18). Public access would provide open space and opportunities for informal recreation. This option would also conserve the natural environment and biodiversity (7).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Options (ii) and (iv) are considered to be the best option because they bring the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated, as well as pressure on school places. Development must take care to preserve historic value and biodiversity.</p>																					

ER1: SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT IN EAST READING

ER1a: THE WOODLEY ARMS PH, WALDECK ST

	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
ER1a(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0
ER1a(ii)	Residential (w/ potential for 26-38 student studio bedspaces or equivalent amount of residential)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	✓X
ER1a(iii)	Development for commercial	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
ER1a(iv)	Development for mixed use including residential	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	X	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
ER1a(v)	Development for retail	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	X	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1a(i): Do not allocate

Under this option the site would remain vacant (9). This could send the wrong economic message (18). This retention 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). The vacant site may facilitate vandalism or crime (12).

ER1a(ii): Residential development

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise the use of unused 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, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13), and could reduce the need to travel by car given the proximity to the town centre and good bus links (14). If the development does provide student studio bedspaces it may increase access to education (20). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).

ER1a(iii): Development for commercial

Development would emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). The use of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4), minimise pollution (6) and

		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
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 of fear of crime (12). Development would miss an opportunity to provide housing (13). Development would provide new employment uses (18).																					
<u>ER1a(iv): Development for mixed use including residential</u> Development would emit CO ₂ (1) and use energy (3). 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 the AQMA, and effects on health would need to be mitigated (11). Crime prevention through design will help to minimise risk and the fear of crime (12). Development would provide housing (13). Development could reduce the need to travel by car given the good bus links and location near the town centre (14). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Development would provide new employment uses (18).																					
<u>ER1a(v): Development for retail</u> The physical processes of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12). 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 uses (18).																					
<u>ER1a(vi): Development for community use</u> The physical process of development would have similar positive and negative effects to other development (1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12). The uses of brownfield land will minimise the use of undeveloped land (4). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development would miss the opportunity to provide housing (13). Development is likely to provide new employment uses (18).																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Potential contamination and poor air quality on the site would need to be investigated and remedied. Any impacts on community infrastructure, such as healthcare, would also need to be addressed. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies. Development should take account of surrounding heights.																					

ER1b: DINGLEY HOUSE, 3-5 CRAVEN RD

		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
ER1b(i) *▼	Do not allocate	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	?	0	0	X	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1b(ii)	Residential (15-22 dwellings) with limited additional development	✓X	0	✓X	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	✓	✓	?X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
ER1b(iii)	Development for offices	✓X	0	✓X	0	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	X	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
ER1b(iv)	Development for community use	✓X	0	✓X	0	?✓	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1b(i): Do not allocate

This site is currently in use and is a locally listed building. Choosing not to allocate the site would not yield any significant negative sustainability effects, but it would fail to provide housing in an accessible location (13). Redevelopment may also miss an opportunity to improve townscape character (9) and make a contribution to the historic environment (10) by caring for a locally listed building. Retaining the existing structure would avoid environmental costs, but improving the environmental performance of the site may outweigh these.

ER1b(ii): Residential (15-22 dwellings) with limited additional development

This development will emit CO₂ (1) and use energy (3). A change of use to residential would provide housing in an accessible brownfield location (4, 13, 14). The use of brownfield land for housing will minimise pollution (6) and ensure that a safe, clean and green environment is provided (9). Residents may increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Redevelopment may provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). The limited additional development may provide community or employment opportunities (17, 18).

ER1b(iii): Development for offices

		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 option is similar to that of option (ii), but it would yield more pronounced benefits in terms of economic activity (18). This option would fail to provide housing (13).</p> <p>ER1b(iv): Development for community use This option is similar to that of option (i), but may provide an opportunity for development to make a positive contribution to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10). Development may contribute towards healthy lifestyles (11) and would provide access to community and leisure facilities (17). Development is likely to provide new employment uses (18).</p> <p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Increasing the scope for residential development in this area will place additional stress on school places in the town centre. School capacity must be carefully monitored and increased if necessary in order to mitigate these effects. Additional healthcare capacity may also be required. Development should avoid negative effects on the nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings. Environmental effects can largely be mitigated through Sustainable Design and Construction policies.</p>																					

ER1c: LAND REAR OF 8-26 REDLANDS RD

		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
ER1c(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		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
ER1c(ii)	Residential development (12-18 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	X	?X	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1c(iii)	Higher density residential development (over 30 dwellings)	?X	?X	?X	X	?X	?X	?X	0	XX	XX	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

ER1c(i): Do not allocate

As there would be no development, undeveloped land would be preserved (4), but potential provision of housing would be adversely impacted (13).

ER1c(ii): Residential development (12-18 dwellings)

As for any development, there would be a number of potential adverse effects in terms of CO₂ (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 the 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).

ER1c(iii): Higher density residential development (over 30 dwellings)

The effects of this option are largely similar to option (ii), but higher density residential development is much more likely to adversely impact local character (9). Additionally, an increase in residents may place stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

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
There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development should make a positive contribution to the conservation area and adjacent listed building and take account of any potential archaeological significance. Development should retain mature trees and create a green link, as well as retain the wall fronting Morgan Rd. Air quality effects on residents must be mitigated.																					

ER1d: LAND ADJACENT TO 40 REDLANDS RD

		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
ER1d(i) *	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1d(ii) ▼	Residential development (23-35 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	X	?X	0	0	?X
ER1d(iii)	Less dense residential (15-22 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	X	?X	0	0	?X
ER1d(iv)	Development for community use	X	0	X	?✓	X	X	0	0	?	?	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0
COMMENTS: <u>ER1d(i): Do not allocate</u> 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 (9), the historic environment (10) and crime at a vacant site (12). <u>ER1d(ii): Residential development (23-35 dwellings)</u>																					

		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>As for any development, there will be negative effects in terms of some environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6). New residential development could increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Loss of a community facility could impact access to recreation activities (17). New housing development would help to meet housing needs (13), reduce greenfield land use (4), reduce the need to travel (14) and potentially reduce crime by 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. Allocation would result in the loss of religious use (16).</p> <p><u>ER1d(iii): Less dense residential (15-22 dwellings)</u> This option is similar to option (ii), but provides less housing (13).</p> <p><u>ER1d(iv): Development for community use</u> 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).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> Although a possible negative effect with regard to religious belief has been identified, these effects are unlikely since the religious group that occupies the site are in favour of the allocation.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development should make a positive contribution to the conservation area and take account of any potential archaeological significance. Development should avoid adverse impacts to important trees and take account of possible biodiversity interest, as well as ensure appropriate back-to-back separation to nearby residential uses.</p>																					

ER1e: ST PARTRICKS HALL, NORTHCOURT AVE

	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
ER1e(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1e(ii)	Intensify student accommodation while retaining locally listed building	✓X	0	✓X	✓	?X	?X	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓
ER1e(iii)	Intensify student accommodation with loss of St Patricks Hall	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	?X	0	0	X	XX	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓

COMMENTS:

ER1e(i): Do not allocate

Generally, the effects would be neutral, but there would be negative effects in terms of housing provision (13). Positive effects would occur with regard to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) since the existing building makes a positive contribution.

ER1e(ii): Intensify student accommodation while retaining locally listed building

As for any development, there will be negative effects in terms of some environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6). Intensifying student accommodation on the grounds of the University would bring positive effects with regard to housing provision (13) and may free up dwellings elsewhere in the town. This also contributes to education objectives (20). This option would reduce greenfield land use (4) and reduce the need to travel (14). The effect on townscape (9) and the adjacent conservation area (10) would be uncertain and would depend on the design.

ER1e(iii): Intensify student accommodation with loss of St Patricks Hall

This option would have similar effects to option (ii), but with more pronounced negative effects with regard to waste (5), townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

		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
Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option. MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development should make a positive contribution to locally listed building's setting and take account of any potential archaeological significance. Development should retain mature trees and enhance green links, as well as take account of biodiversity interest.																					

ER1f: HAMILTON CENTRE, BULMERSHE 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
ER1f(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1f(ii)	Residential development (13-19 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	0	0	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X
ER1f(iii)	Higher density residential development (over 30 dwellings)	X	0	X	✓	X	X	0	0	?	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X
ER1f(iv)	Redevelop for community use	X	0	X	?✓	X	X	0	0	?	0	0	?✓	✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0
COMMENTS: ER1f(i): 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 (9) and crime should the site become vacant (12).																					

		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>ER1f(ii): Residential development (13-19 dwellings)</u> As for any development, there will be negative effects in terms of some environmental objectives (1, 3, 5, 6). New residential development could increase pressure on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Loss of a community facility could impact access to recreation activities (17). New housing development would help to meet housing needs (13), reduce greenfield land use (4), reduce the need to travel (14) and potentially reduce crime (12). The effect on townscape (9) would be uncertain, and would depend on the design, but may require mitigation.</p> <p><u>ER1f(iii): Higher density residential development (over 30 dwellings)</u> The effects of this option are largely similar to option (ii), but higher density residential development is much more likely to adversely impact local character (9). Additionally, such an increase in residents may place stress on education and healthcare infrastructure (15, 20).</p> <p><u>ER1f(iv): Redevelop for community use</u> 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).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development must justify the loss of existing community provision and address any contamination.</p>																					

ER1g: ALEXANDER HOUSE, KINGS RD

		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

		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
ER1g(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	0	✓X	X	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1g(ii)	Residential development (26-38 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	X	0	✓	✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
ER1g(iii)	Higher density residential development (over 50 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	0	X	0	✓✓	✓	X	0	0	?X	0	X
ER1g(iv)	Development for offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	X	?X	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1g(i): 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).

ER1g(ii): Residential development (26-38 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 healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20) and would locate residents in an area of poor air quality and noise (11). A loss of an employment generating use could have negative effects on economic growth (18).

ER1g(iii): Higher density residential development (over 50 dwellings)

This option is largely the same as for option (ii), but more housing would be provided (13). This may require heights that are out of step with surrounding properties and could negatively affect townscape character (9).

ER1g(iv): Development for offices

Many of the effects would be the same as for 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

		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
accessible, the site is not in an optimal location for offices in terms of accessibility by means other than the car (14).																					
<p>Conclusion Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations issues The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p>Equality issues There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development must take account of any potential archaeological significance and address the impacts of noise and air quality on residents. Development must ensure appropriate back-to-back separation between existing residential properties.</p>																					

ER1h: ARTHUR HILL SWIMMING POOL, 221-225 KINGS RD

		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
ER1h(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	?X	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓X	0	0	0

		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
ER1h(ii)	Residential development (6-10 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	X	0	0	?X
ER1h(iii)	Higher density residential development (over 20 units)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	?X	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	X	0	0	?X
ER1h(iv)	Office development	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?	0	0	X	?X	0	0	X	✓	0	0
ER1h(v)	Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors residential	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?	?X	0	✓	?✓	?X	0	X	✓	0	?X
ER1h(vi)	Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors offices	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	?	0	0	X	?X	0	0	X	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1h(i): 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 (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). A brownfield site would not be used for housing (4, 13). The building is in poor condition and is likely to become vacant because it is not fit for purpose and requires high maintenance costs. This detracts from townscape character (9) and the nearby listed building (10). A leisure use would be preserved initially, but its future is insecure. This brings mixed effects with regard to health (11) and recreation/leisure (17).

ER1h(ii): Residential development (6-10 dwellings)

Redevelopment brings some negative environmental effects, but these are likely to be outweighed by improved building performance in the long term (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). This option would provide housing on a brownfield site (4, 13). Loss of a leisure use is likely to negatively affect health and leisure access (11, 17) and residents may place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20). Townscape character (9) and the setting of the nearby listed building (10) could improve under this option, but this is dependent on design.

		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>ER1h(iii): Higher density residential development (over 20 units)</u> This appraisal is largely the same as option (ii), but carries a tendency toward negative effects with regard to townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) as higher density housing is more likely to be out of step with the surrounding environment.</p> <p><u>ER1h(iv): Office development</u> This option carries similar effects to options (ii), but fails to provide housing (13). An increase in office space may promote economic growth and employment opportunity (18), but the site is in a location that is likely to encourage car travel (14).</p> <p><u>ER1h(v): Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors residential</u> This option is identical to that of option (ii), but provides scope for economic growth and employment opportunity (18).</p> <p><u>ER1i (vi): Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors offices</u> This option is identical to that of option (iii), but provides scope for economic growth and employment opportunity (18).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development should retain the existing frontage of the building, where possible and avoid adverse effects on the nearby listed building. Development must address noise and air quality impacts on residents.</p>																					

ER1i: 261-275 LONDON RD

	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
ER1i(i) *	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	X	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1i(ii) ▼	Residential development (10-16 dwellings) with district centre uses on the ground floor	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	✓X	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
ER1i(iii)	Residential only	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	X	✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
ER1i(iv)	Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors offices	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	?✓	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0
ER1i(v)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	?X	0	✓	X	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1i(i): Do not allocate

Where no development activity would take place on this 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 (13), and would not make good use of an underused brownfield site (4).

ER1i(ii): Residential development (10-16 dwellings) with district centre uses on the ground floor

Developing the site for residential use would mean CO₂ emissions (1), use of energy (3) and waste generation (5), although the environmental performance of the building 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 the health of the residents that would need to be mitigated (11). The development would provide housing (13) and make good use of brownfield site (4), and would remove a potential focus for crime (12). The effect on the historic environment (10) and cleaner and greener environments (9) would be largely dependent on design. 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). At a local level, there may be increased journeys within the AQMA (6). There would also be potential positive effects in creating employment opportunities (18) and improving access to leisure (17), although the latter effect will depend on which town centre uses are provided. The effect on health (11) would also be mixed—whilst there would also be potential negative effects on residents as already identified, the accessible nature of the site will encourage walking and cycling. Residents may place stress 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>ER1i(iii): Residential only</u> Many of the effects would be the same as the residential option (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20), although not incorporating district centre uses would mean less positive effects on the need to travel (14) and provision of local services (15).</p> <p><u>ER1i(iv): Ground floor district centre uses and upper floors offices</u> The effects of a small-scale office development with district 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). 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 and education would not occur (11, 15, 20).</p> <p><u>ER1i(v): Office development</u> This appraisal is largely similar to option (iv), but misses an opportunity to provide leisure/culture uses on the ground floor (17). An office development in this location may encourage travel by car (14).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development should mitigate impacts on the Cholmeley Rd and London Rd junction. It should make a positive contribution to the setting which includes registered historic park, Reading Cemetery. Development must take account of any potential archaeological significance and potential contamination. Development must address noise and air quality impacts on residents.</p>																					

ER1j: PALMER PARK STADIUM 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
ER1j(i) *▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	?X	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0
ER1j(ii)	Allocate for new leisure development (swimming pool)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	✓X	0	0	0	?	?	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1j(i): Do not allocate

Where no development activity would take place on this site, this would minimise CO₂ emissions (1), energy use (3) and waste generation (5). However, there would also be a missed opportunity for leisure provision (17) which may encourage healthy lifestyles (11). Currently, the car park does not contribute to townscape character (9) or the historic environment (10) and a new development would provide an opportunity to improve this.

ER1j(ii): Allocate for new leisure development (swimming pool)

Developing the site would mean CO₂ emissions (1), use of energy (3) and waste generation (5), but would make good use of brownfield land (4). The effect on the historic environment (10) and cleaner and greener environments (9) would be largely dependent on design. There may be a positive effect on reducing the need to travel by car (14) should the car parking be lost. This may encourage residents to take public transport. This option would bring significant positive effects with regard to leisure (17) and would contribute to healthy lifestyles (11).

Conclusion

Option (ii) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.

MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. It should make a positive contribution to the setting which includes a listed monument and avoid adverse impacts on existing sports and leisure facilities. Development must take account of any potential archaeological significance and retain public rights of way across the site. Finally, development must demonstrate that the existing car park can be lost or re-provided off-site.

ER1k: 131 WOKINGHAM RD

		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
ER1k(i) *▼	Do not allocate	✓	0	✓	X	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER1k(ii)	Residential development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	0	X	✓	✓	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
ER1k(iii)	Office development	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	✓	X	?X	0	0	0	✓	0	0
ER1k(iv)	Ground floor local centre uses and residential on upper floors (8-12 dwellings)	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	✓	✓	✓	?X	0	?✓	?✓	0	?X
ER1k(v)	Ground floor local centre uses and offices on upper floors	✓X	0	✓X	✓	X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?✓	✓	X	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER1k(i): Do not allocate

Where no development activity would take place on this 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 (13), and would not make good use of an underused brownfield site (4).

ER1k(ii): Residential development

Many of the effects would be the same as option (iv) (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20), although not incorporating district centre uses would mean less positive effects on the need to travel (14) and provision of local services (15).

		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>ER1k(iii): Office development</u> This appraisal is largely similar to option (v), but misses an opportunity to provide leisure/culture uses on the ground floor (17). An office development in this location may encourage travel by car (14).</p> <p><u>ER1k(iv): Ground floor local centre uses and residential on upper floors</u> Developing the site for residential use would mean CO₂ emissions (1), use of energy (3) and waste generation (5), although the environmental performance of the building 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 the health of the residents that would need to be mitigated (11). The development would provide housing (13) and make good use of brownfield site (4), and would remove a potential focus for crime (12). The effect on cleaner and greener environments (9) would be largely dependent on design. 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). At a local level, there may be increased journeys within the AQMA (6). There would also be potential positive effects in creating employment opportunities (18) and improving access to leisure (17), although the latter effect will depend on which town centre uses are provided. The effect on health (11) would also be mixed—whilst there would also be potential negative effects on residents as already identified, the accessible nature of the site will encourage walking and cycling. Residents may place stress on healthcare and education infrastructure (15, 20).</p> <p><u>ER1k(v): Ground floor local centre uses and offices on upper floors</u> The effects of a small-scale office development with district 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). 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 and education would not occur (11, 15, 20).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Option (iv) is considered to be the best option because it brings the most positive sustainability effects and all negative effects are expected to be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Equality issues</u> There are not expected to be any differential effects on individuals or different groups from the proposed option.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects occurring during redevelopment would need to be carefully mitigated. Development must take account of any potential archaeological significance and potential contamination. Development must address noise and air quality impacts on residents.</p>																					

ER2: 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
ER2(i) *	No policy	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ER2(ii) ▼	Continue with current policy (SDPD SA6)	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓

COMMENTS:

ER2(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would rely on cross-cutting policies which would not be site specific to the Whiteknights Campus. All objectives have a neutral impact bar three, namely appropriately utilising previously developed land (4), protecting and enhancing wildlife and the natural environment (7) and creating community cohesion (12). The lack of a specific policy results in a tendency towards negative effects.

ER2(ii): Continue with current policy (SDPD SA6)

This option would carry forward the existing site-specific policy for Whiteknights Campus and would result in many positive sustainability benefits. Positive effects would occur with regard to use of brownfield land (4), wildlife and the natural environment (7), landscape and townscape character (9), health (11), community cohesion (12), housing provision (13), sustainable transport (14) and access to recreation/leisure/culture (17). Significant positive effects would occur with regard to economic growth (18) and education (20). This policy would provide specific guidance on the type of education establishment and facilitate sustainable economic growth.

Conclusion

Option ii is the preferred option because brings the most positive sustainability effects.

Habitat Regulations issues

The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.

Equality issues

No equality issues have been identified with the proposed option.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified for the proposed approach.

ER3: ROYAL BERKSHIRE HOSPITAL

		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
ER3(i) *▼	No policy	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	?X	?X	0	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?X	0	0
ER3(ii)	Policy to grow healthcare development on-site	?X	0	?X	?✓	?X	?X	0	0	?X	?X	✓	0	?X	?X	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0
ER3(iii)	Flexible policy to allow relocate, growth on-site allowed with transport and heritage considerations	✓	0	?X	?✓	?X	?✓	0	0	?✓	✓	✓✓	0	?✓	✓	✓	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

ER3(i): No policy

A 'no policy' option would miss an important opportunity to mitigate transport impacts, prevent adverse effects on nearby heritage assets and provide a long-term opportunity for a new site. This would bring negative effects with regard to CO₂ emissions (1), local character (9), the historic environment (10), healthy lifestyles (11), nearby housing (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth (18).

ER3(ii): Policy to grow healthcare development on-site

Encouraging the hospital's expansion at its current location would serve health (11), facility access (15), economic growth and employment (18), as well as use valuable brownfield land (4). Despite these positive effects, expansion is likely to worsen CO₂ emissions (1), natural resource use (3), waste production (5), pollution (6), local character (10), the quality of nearby heritage assets and conservation areas (10), nearby housing (13) and sustainable transport (14). Without important policy elements to mitigate these effects, these costs outweigh the benefits.

ER3(iii): Flexible policy to allow relocate, growth on-site allowed with transport and heritage considerations

This option allows for some growth on-site with careful consideration of transport and heritage effects and introduces a long-term opportunity for the hospital to move to a new site, provided that it is accessible and does not compromise the standard of care. This would bring positive effects with regard

		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
to CO ₂ emissions (1), use of brownfield land (4), pollution (6), local character (9), heritage (10), housing (13), sustainable transport (14), facility access (15) and economic growth and employment (18). Significant positive effects would occur with regard to health (11). Redevelopment would carry a tendency towards negative effects in relation to natural resource use (3) and waste (5). These must be carefully mitigated both during on-site expansion and relocation.																					
<u>Conclusion</u> Option (iii) is the preferred option because brings the most positive sustainability effects.																					
<u>Habitat Regulations issues</u> The proposed option should not have any effects on internationally designated wildlife sites.																					
<u>Equality issues</u> No equality issues have been identified with the proposed option.																					
MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects that would occur as a result of redevelopment (natural resource use, waste, etc.) should be carefully mitigated.																					

APPENDIX 3: HABITAT REGULATIONS SCREENING ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN

The following abbreviations are used in this appendix:

- Nd & v - Noise, disturbance and vibration
- Ap & q - Air pollution and quality
- Wp & q - Water pollution and quality
- Wf - Water flows
- Cc - Climate change
- Hl & d - Habitat loss and degradation
- Le - Landscape effects
- L - Lighting

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

APPENDIX 4: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN

CC1: Presumption is favour of sustainable development

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing and employment 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? A presumption in favour of sustainable development 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC2: Sustainable design and construction

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets sustainable design and construction requirements for non-residential developments.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and greater preparedness for climate change.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Non-residential development to meet higher BREEAM standards with reduced water use, energy use and emission of greenhouse gases			
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? Sustainable design and construction standards are 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? Sustainable design and construction standards are 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? Sustainable design and construction standards are 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? Sustainable design and construction standards are 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? Sustainable design and construction standards are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Sustainable design and construction standards are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC3: Adaptation to climate change

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires developments to incorporate measures to adapt to climate change.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from greater preparedness for climate change			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Greater proportion of new developments incorporating measures to maximise resistance and resilience to climate change			
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? Adaptation to climate change 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? Adaptation to climate change 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? Adaptation to climate change 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? Adaptation to climate change 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? Adaptation to climate change is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Adaptation to climate change 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC4: Decentralised energy

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires developments to consider decentralised energy sources.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from sustainable development, lower energy costs and decreased greenhouse gas emissions.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Greater energy efficiency and reduced costs and greenhouse gas emissions			
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? Decentralised energy 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? Decentralised energy 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? Decentralised energy 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? Decentralised energy 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? Decentralised energy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Decentralised energy 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC5: Waste minimisation

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy promotes sustainable approaches to waste management			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and minimised waste from construction			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Minimised waste in construction, promotion of adequate waste storage space			
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? Waste minimisation 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? Waste minimisation 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? Waste minimisation 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? Waste minimisation 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? Waste minimisation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Waste minimisation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC6: Accessibility and the intensity of development

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure that the densest and largest scale development will take place in the most accessible locations (walking, cycling and public transport to a range of services)			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from decreased car trips			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Fewer car trips, increased access to facilities, greater participation in walking and cycling, increased public transport use, improved air quality			
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? A policy encouraging accessibility 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? A policy encouraging accessibility 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? A policy encouraging accessibility 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? A policy encouraging accessibility 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? A policy encouraging accessibility is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? A policy encouraging accessibility 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC7: Design and the public realm

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure that all development is of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a greater sense of place			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A greater sense of place, high quality public realm, provision of green spaces and landscaping, ease of movement, legibility, adaptability and diversity of uses			
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? A policy encouraging good design 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? A policy encouraging good design 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? A policy encouraging good design 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? A policy encouraging good design 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? A policy encouraging good design is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? A policy encouraging good design 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC8: Safeguarding amenity

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to prevent development from causing detrimental impacts to nearby properties			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby occupants will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from safeguarded amenity			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Privacy, access to light, lack of disturbance or visual dominance			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Nearby occupants, developers, the 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? Safeguarding amenity 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? Safeguarding amenity 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? Safeguarding amenity 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? Safeguarding amenity 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? Safeguarding amenity is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Safeguarding amenity 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CC9: Securing infrastructure

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy states that development will not be permitted unless needed infrastructure is provided			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from new transport infrastructure, open space, education, employment, etc.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Development should minimise damage, loss and impact upon existing infrastructure and mitigate any impact caused by development.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the wider community, surrounding authorities			
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 infrastructure policy 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 infrastructure policy 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 infrastructure policy 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 infrastructure policy 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? This infrastructure policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This infrastructure policy 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN1: Protection and enhancement of the historic environment

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that elements of the historic environment will be protected and enhanced.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community would benefit from protection and enhancement of the historic environment			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Preservation and enhancement of listed buildings, conservation areas and other features with local or national significance			
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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment 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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment 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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment 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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment 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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection and enhancement of the historic environment 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN2: Area of archaeological significance

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires that applicants identify and evaluate sites of archaeological significance			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community through preservation of an element of the historic environment			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Proper excavation, investigation and recording of archaeological remains			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Evaluation of archaeological significance 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN3: Enhancement of conservation areas

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure that all development proposals within Conservation Areas make a positive contribution to local character.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Residents within conservation areas will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a maintained and enhanced historic environment			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Reduced visual clutter, no inappropriate alterations, improved heritage elements and signage, restoration of original features			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Conservation Area residents and the wider community, developers			
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? Enhancement of conservation areas 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? Enhancement of conservation areas 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? Enhancement of conservation areas 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? Enhancement of conservation areas 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? Enhancement of conservation areas is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Enhancement of conservation areas 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN4: Locally important heritage assets

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy ensures that proposals affecting locally important heritage assets should demonstrate conservation of significance, appearance and character.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Residents nearby or occupying locally important heritage assets will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a maintained and enhanced historic environment			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Retention of locally important heritage assets in the first instance, any replacement building should take cues from historical qualities that made the previous building significant			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, nearby residents, occupiers of locally important heritage assets, the 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Preservation of locally important heritage assets 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN5: Protection of key views and vistas

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to preserve views with acknowledged historical significance			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community would benefit from a maintained and enhanced historic environment			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Preservation and enhancement of the views listed in this policy			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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? Protection of key views and vistas 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? Protection of key views and vistas 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? Protection of key views and vistas 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? Protection of key views and vistas 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? Protection of key views and vistas is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of key views and vistas 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN6: New Development in a Historic Context

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for new development to be informed and shaped by the historic environment.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites and nearby residents will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a maintained and enhanced historic environment.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? New development that makes a positive contribution to the existing historic townscape, exhibits sensitivity to historic context, reflects borough-wide heritage themes or promotes previously neglected historic significance			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? New development in a historic context 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? New development in a historic context 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? New development in a historic context 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? New development in a historic context 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? New development in a historic context is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? New development in a historic context 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN7: Local Green Space and Public Open Space

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy protects Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space from development.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby residents and the wider community would benefit from accessible public open spaces.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Protection of local green spaces and public open space from development, including preventing loss or erosion on quality though insensitive adjacent development			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, nearby residents, the 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of Local Green Spaces and Public Open Space 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN8: Undesignated open space

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes a presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby residents and the wider community would benefit from open space			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Development does not result in the loss of or jeopardise use and enjoyment of undesignated open space			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, nearby residents, the 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? A presumption in favour of retention of undesignated open space 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN9: Provision of new open space

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for all new development to make provision for appropriate open space.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the provision of new open space			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? On sites of 50 dwellings or more, new provision on-site; for sites of less than 50 dwellings, appropriate contributions secured			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? Provision of new open space 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? Provision of new open space 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? Provision of new open space 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? Provision of new open space 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? Provision of new open space is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision of new open space 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN10: Access to open space

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that new development should improve access to nearby green space			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from increased green links and connectivity			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Improved access to green space, including creation or linking of safe off-road routes to parks			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? Improved access to open space 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? Improved access to open space 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? Improved access to open space 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? Improved access to open space 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? Improved access to open space is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Improved access to open space 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN11: Waterspaces

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that Reading's waterspaces will be protected.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby residents of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from protected and enhances biodiversity, local character and amenity.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Enhanced local character, protection of biodiversity and ecology, enhanced visual amenity, leisure and recreation opportunities, navigation, strengthened role of waterways as important landscape features			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection and enhancement of waterspaces 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN12: Biodiversity and green network

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to maintain, protect, consolidate, extend and enhance The Green Network, including identified sites with biodiversity interest and areas with potential for biodiversity value.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All residents will benefit from increased and enhanced biodiversity.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Permission will not be granted for development that negatively affects sites with biodiversity interest. All new development should maintain and link into the existing Green Network.			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Maintenance and enhancement of the Green Network 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN13: Major landscape features and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes protection for Major Landscape Features and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from retention of the character and appearance of Major Landscape Features and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Retention of the character and appearance of Major Landscape Features and AONB			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people, developers			
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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB 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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB 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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB 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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB 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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of Major Landscape Features and AONB 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to protect and extend trees, groups of trees, hedges and woodlands.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from increased tree cover for shading, amenity and adaptation to climate change.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Increased tree, hedge and woodland cover			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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 protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands 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 protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands 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 protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands 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 protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands 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? The protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The protection and extension of trees, hedges and woodlands 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN15: Air quality

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that developments should reduce the effects of poor air quality and mitigate poor air quality, when necessary.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from improved air quality.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Mitigation of poor air quality, especially for sensitive uses			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, 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? Mitigation of poor air quality 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? Mitigation of poor air quality 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? Mitigation of poor air quality 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? Mitigation of poor air quality 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? Mitigation of poor air quality is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Mitigation of poor air quality 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN16: Pollution and water resources

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that development will only be permitted where it would not be damaging to the environment through land, noise or light pollution or harm water quality or existing sewerage and wastewater infrastructure.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants and the wider community will benefit from reduced pollution.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of land, noise, water and light pollution			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Preventing pollution and protecting water resources 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EN17: Flooding

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that planning permission will not be permitted for development in an area identified at being at high risk or flooding or where development would reduce floodplain capacity, impede the flow of floodwater or increase risks to life and property. All major developments must incorporate SuDS.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants and the wider community will benefit for decreased risk to life and property.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? No planning permission in areas at high risk of flooding and inclusion of SuDS for all major developments and smaller schemes, where appropriate			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the 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? Flood prevention and management 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? Flood prevention and management 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? Flood prevention and management would benefit those with disabilities. Failure to implement this policy could place individuals with disabilities at risk due to limited mobility.			
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? Flood prevention and management 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? Flood prevention and management would benefit older residents. Failure to implement this policy could place older residents at risk due to limited mobility.			
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? Flood prevention and management 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 No providing sufficient protection from flooding would disproportionately affect older residents and individuals with disabilities.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

EM1: Provision of employment development

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide specified amounts of office and industrial or warehouse floorspace.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, future commercial occupants and future employees will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The appropriate amount of new commercial floorspace to provide for economic growth without creating additional housing need			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, employers, workers, 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? Provision of employment development 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? Provision of employment development 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? Provision of employment development 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? Provision of employment development 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? Provision of employment development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision of employment development 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EM2: Location of employment development

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that major office development will take place in the centre and along the A33 corridor. Industrial/warehouse uses will take place in the A33 corridor or within Core Employment Areas.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, future commercial occupants and future employees will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of employment development in order to fulfil identified needs in the appropriate locations			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, employers, workers, 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 location of new employment development 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 location of new employment development 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 location of new employment development 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 location of new employment development 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? The location of new employment development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The location of new employment development 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EM3: Loss of employment land

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy a presumption in favour of retaining Core Employment Areas.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, future commercial occupants and future employees will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of employment development in order to fulfil identified needs in the appropriate locations			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, employers, workers, 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? Protection of employment land 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? Protection of employment land 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? Protection of employment land 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? Protection of employment land 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? Protection of employment land is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of employment land 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

EM4: Maintaining a variety of premises

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure a range of types and sizes of commercial units.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, future commercial occupants and future employees will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of employment development in order to fulfil identified needs in the appropriate locations			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, workers, employers, 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? Maintaining a variety of premises 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? Maintaining a variety of premises 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? Maintaining a variety of premises 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? Maintaining a variety of premises 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? Maintaining a variety of premises is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Maintaining a variety of premises 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H1: Provision of housing

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide an additional 15,134 homes within the Borough throughout the plan period.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified housing 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? Provision 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? Provision 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? Provision of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision 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? Provision of housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H2: Density and mix

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy specifies densities and dwelling mix in order to meet housing needs.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order 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? Specified density and dwelling mix 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? Specified density and dwelling mix 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? Specified density and dwelling mix is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Specified density and dwelling mix 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? Specified density and dwelling mix may have a differential impact in relation to age, since age determines the type of housing needed. This policy aims to ensure that a mix of dwelling sizes and types is available for all ages.			
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? Specified density and dwelling mix 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 Not providing the appropriate mix of dwellings would disproportionately affect residents with specific needs based on their age. For example, growing families may need larger homes while older residents wish to downsize.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

H3: Affordable housing

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy outlines specific affordable housing requirements based on the number of dwellings.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from increased housing affordability.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision affordable housing to meet Reading's needs			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? Provision of affordable 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? Provision of affordable 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? Provision of affordable housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision of affordable 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? Provision of affordable housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision of affordable 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H4: Standards for new housing

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that new housing is built to specified standards regarding space, water efficiency, emission rates, accessibility, adaptability and wheelchair access.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants will benefit from accessibility and adaptability standards directly, and the wider community will benefit from reduced emissions and better water efficiency.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Higher water efficiency, compliance with the nationally-described space standard, reduced emissions, increased accessibility and adaptability and increased dwellings for wheelchair users			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, individuals with disabilities, older residents, the 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? Standards for new housing are 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? Standards for new housing are 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? Standards for new housing may have a differential impact in relation to disability. This policy aims to provide more accessible, adaptable and wheelchair user dwellings for residents with 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? Standards for new housing are 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? Standards for new housing may have a differential impact in relation to age. This policy aims to provide more accessible, adaptable and wheelchair user dwellings for residents with disabilities.			
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? Standards for new housing are 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 Not providing the appropriate mix of accessible and adaptable dwellings would disproportionately affect older residents and individuals with disabilities.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

H5: Accommodation for vulnerable people

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide specific levels of residential care bedspaces for elderly people and accommodation for people with physical disabilities or limited mobility.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants will benefit directly from the provision of accommodation for vulnerable people			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly those of older residents and individuals with disabilities			
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? Accommodation for vulnerable people 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? Accommodation for vulnerable people 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? Accommodation for vulnerable people may have a differential impact in relation to disability. This policy aims to provide more dwellings for vulnerable residents.			
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? Accommodation for vulnerable people 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? Accommodation for vulnerable people may have a differential impact in relation to age. This policy aims to provide more dwellings for vulnerable residents.			
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? Accommodation for vulnerable people 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 Not providing the appropriate amount of dwellings suitable for accommodating vulnerable individuals would disproportionately affect older residents and individuals with disabilities.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

H6: Protecting the existing housing stock

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to protect existing residential accommodation unless there are exceptional circumstances.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Current occupants will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit since the number of dwellings available will not decrease.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, 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? Protection of existing housing stock 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? Protection of existing housing stock 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? Protection of existing housing stock 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? Protection of existing housing stock 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? Protection of existing housing stock is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of existing housing stock 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H7: Residential conversions

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy prescribes standards for HMOs and aims to prevent proliferation in order to prevent harm to amenity and preserve the amount of family housing.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants will benefit from the availability of flexibly let accommodation, and nearby residents and the wider community will benefit from preventing harm to amenity.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing; retention of local character, retention of appropriate housing mix			
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? Regulation of residential conversions 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? Regulation of residential conversions 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? Regulation of residential conversions 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? Regulation of residential conversions 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? Regulation of residential conversions is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Regulation of residential conversions 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H8: House extensions and ancillary accommodation

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy states that extensions and ancillary accommodation will be acceptable if it respects local character and design and avoids blank facades. Additionally, ancillary accommodation must not be able to operate as a separated dwelling.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby residents will benefit if extensions and ancillary development respects local character			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of harm to amenity			
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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation 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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation 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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation 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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Regulating house extensions and ancillary accommodation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H9: Private and communal outdoor space

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for dwellings to be provided with private or communal open space with respect to local character, safety and privacy.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from an increase in outdoor space.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of private and communal outdoor space for a variety of uses that are safe, private (when appropriate) and reflective of local character			
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? Private and communal outdoor space 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? Private and communal outdoor space 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? Private and communal outdoor space 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? Private and communal outdoor space 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? Private and communal outdoor space is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Private and communal outdoor space 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H10: Development of private residential gardens

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allows for new residential development within the curtilage of private residential gardens within certain parameters (reflects local character, has appropriate access, provides family-sized housing, provides gain in biodiversity, etc.).			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the provision of more family-sized housing.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing; increased biodiversity value, appropriate development that reflects local character			
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? Development of private residential gardens 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? Development of private residential gardens 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? Development of private residential gardens 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? Development of private residential gardens 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? Development of private residential gardens is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Development of private residential gardens 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

H11: Student accommodation

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide student accommodation only on or adjacent to existing campuses or existing student accommodation, unless additional need can be demonstrated.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Protection of housing sites for residential development in the first instance, while still allowing for student accommodation in appropriate locations			
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? Student accommodation 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? Student accommodation 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? Student accommodation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Student accommodation 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? Student accommodation may have a differential impact in relation to age, since many students are younger than the average resident and have specific needs for smaller, more flexibly let dwellings or shared accommodation.			
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? Student accommodation 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 Not providing student accommodation would disproportionately affect residents based on their age.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

H12: Provision for gypsies and travellers

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople based on need on sites having met certain criteria (safe access, good access to range of facilities, no adverse impacts on local character and amenity and no loss of wildlife).			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly through the provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and traveling showpeople.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing sites for gypsies and travellers			
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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers may have a differential impact in relation to race. Gypsies and travellers must be protected against race discrimination, as they're considered ethnic groups under the Equality Act.			
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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers 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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers 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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers 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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers 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 Not providing sites for gypsies and travellers would disproportionately affect residents based on their race.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?		Y✓ N	Please explain If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

H13: Suburban regeneration and renewal

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to improve some of Reading's suburban residential areas through renewal and regeneration.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from regeneration and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing and employment needs; elements that make a positive contribution to character, sufficient community facilities			
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? Suburban regeneration and renewal 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? Suburban regeneration and renewal 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? Suburban regeneration and renewal 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? Suburban regeneration and renewal 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? Suburban regeneration and renewal is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Suburban regeneration and renewal 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

TR1: Achieving the transport strategy

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy states that proposed development should contribute appropriately to meeting the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community would benefit from provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and better accessibility.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of transport infrastructure in order to meet needs required of new housing and economic development			
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 transport strategy 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 transport strategy 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 transport strategy 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 transport strategy 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? The transport strategy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The transport strategy 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

TR2: Major Transport Projects

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to deliver the major transport projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All people and organisations will benefit from reduced congestion and sustainable transport infrastructure.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Delivery of major projects including Mass Rapid Transit, Park and Ride, Green Park Station and Interchange, Reading West Station Upgrade, Cow Lane Bridges, Crossing of the River Thames, National Cycle Network Route 422 and high-quality bus services.			
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? Delivery of major transport projects 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? Delivery of major transport projects 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? Delivery of major transport projects 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? Delivery of major transport projects 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? Delivery of major transport projects is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Delivery of major transport projects 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

TR3: Access, traffic and highway-related matters

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires consideration of development's effects on safety, congestion and the environment.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All people and organisations will benefit from reduced congestion and safety on the transport network.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Mitigation of the transport effects of new development			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, transport network users			
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? Mitigation of the transport effects 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? Mitigation of the transport effects 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? Mitigation of the transport effects 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? Mitigation of the transport effects 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? Mitigation of the transport effects is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Mitigation of the transport effects 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

TR4: Cycle routes and facilities

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to maintain, extend and enhance existing cycle routes and facilities.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Users of the cycle network will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from increased sustainable transport infrastructure.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? New facilities for cycling, improvements to existing cycling infrastructure			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, cyclists, the 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? Improved cycling infrastructure 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? Improved cycling infrastructure 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? Improved cycling infrastructure 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? Improved cycling infrastructure 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? Improved cycling infrastructure is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Improved cycling infrastructure 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

TR5: Car and cycle parking

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide car parking and cycle parking that is appropriate to the accessibility of sites to public transport.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All people and organisations will benefit from reduced congestion and greater public transport participation.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A balance between under-provision and over-provision of car parking in order to encourage greater public transport use and discourage less sustainable travel choices			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, road users, public transport providers, the 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? Car and cycle parking 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? Car and cycle parking 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? Car and cycle parking 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? Car and cycle parking 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? Car and cycle parking is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Car and cycle parking 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL1: Network and hierarchy of centres

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy identifies regional, district, major local and local centres and seeks to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Viable and accessible centres with a broad range of facilities, varied uses and environmental and transport enhancements			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the 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 network and hierarchy of centres 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 network and hierarchy of centres 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 network and hierarchy of centres 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 network and hierarchy of centres 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? The network and hierarchy of centres is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The network and hierarchy of centres 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide new retail, leisure and culture facilities with the largest developments in the town centre.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from an expanded retail, leisure and cultural offer.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs retail, leisure and culture needs (with larger sites in the town centre and accessible by a choice of means of transport)			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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? Retail, leisure and culture development 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? Retail, leisure and culture development 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? Retail, leisure and culture development 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? Retail, leisure and culture development 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? Retail, leisure and culture development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Retail, leisure and culture development 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy outlines specific proportions of uses in smaller centres in order to increase vitality and viability.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from accessible smaller centres.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Accessible and viable small centres throughout the Borough			
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 vitality and viability of smaller centres 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 vitality and viability of smaller centres 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 vitality and viability of smaller centres is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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 vitality and viability of smaller centres 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? The vitality and viability of smaller centres is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The vitality and viability of smaller centres 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL4: Betting shops and pay-day loan companies

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to limit the concentration of betting shops and payday loan companies.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community, particularly in deprived areas of the Borough, will benefit from fewer payday loan and betting shops which are tied to economic problems and detrimental effects on the appearance of an area.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Less concentration of payday loan and betting shops			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, shop owners, residents, the 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Limiting the concentration of betting and payday loan shops 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL5: Impact of town centre uses

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to avoid adverse impacts on existing centres of additional edge-of-centre or out-of-centre floorspace.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Business owners in smaller centres will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from increased investment in existing centres.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of negative impacts on smaller centres caused by edge-of-centre or out-of-centre development			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, business owners, residents, the 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? Protection of existing centres 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? Protection of existing centres 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? Protection of existing centres 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? Protection of existing centres 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? Protection of existing centres is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of existing centres 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

RL6: Protection of leisure facilities and public houses

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to protect leisure facilities and public houses, particularly outside the Central Area.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from the retention of such facilities close to where people live.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Retention of leisure facilities and public houses, particularly outside the Central Area			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Protection of leisure facilities and public houses 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

OU1: New and existing community facilities

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to extend and improve community facilities, particularly involving co-location, and locate these uses in areas with a choice of means of travel.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from co-location and intensification of community facilities.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? New, extended and improved community facilities involving co-location in accessible locations			
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? Improved and co-located community facilities are 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? Improved and co-located community facilities are 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? Improved and co-located community facilities are 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? Improved and co-located community facilities are 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? Improved and co-located community facilities are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Improved and co-located community facilities are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

OU2: Hazardous installations

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to avoid adverse health and safety risks to population and the environment.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from a healthy and safe environment.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of adverse health and safety effects as a result of hazardous installations			
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? Careful management of hazardous installations 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? Careful management of hazardous installations 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? Careful management of hazardous installations 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? Careful management of hazardous installations 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? Careful management of hazardous installations is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Careful management of hazardous installations 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

OU3: Telecommunications

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to minimise the visual impact of telecommunications development.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Residents and the wider community will benefit by avoiding the adverse visual impacts of telecommunications development.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of adverse impacts on visual amenity caused by telecommunications development			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Telecommunications developers, residents, the 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Minimising the visual impact of telecommunications development 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

OU4: Advertisements

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure that advertisements do not detrimentally affect visual amenity and respect the local character of the area.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Nearby residents and the wider community will benefit from advertisements that do not harm or make a contribution to local character and amenity.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of the detrimental effects of advertisements with regard to visual and aural amenity, as well as public safety			
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? Advertisements are 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? Advertisements are 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? Advertisements are 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? Advertisements are 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? Advertisements are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Advertisements are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

OU5: Shopfronts and Cash Machines

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for shopfronts and individual features to respect local character.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from shopfronts that respect local character and avoid harm to amenity. Safety and security will also be maintained and enhanced.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of harm to local character as a result of insensitive shopfronts and cash machines			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Shopfronts and cash machines are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR1: Definition of Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes the boundary of the Central area for retail development, major office development and other main town centre uses.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth in the most accessible area of the Borough.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The majority of development will occur in the most accessible location within the Borough and reflect a mix of uses			
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 definition of Central Reading 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 definition of Central Reading 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 definition of Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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 definition of Central Reading 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? The definition of Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? The definition of Central Reading 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR2: Design in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes that development within Central Reading will build on and respect existing character, provide public spaces, provide green infrastructure, reflect high-quality design and contribute to the diversity of the area.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sense of place.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Creation of high-quality place with a diversity of uses that reflects local character			
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? Design in Central Reading 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? Design in Central Reading 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? Design in Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Design in Central Reading 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? Design in Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Design in Central Reading 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR3: Public realm in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires new development to make a positive contribution towards the quality of the public realm.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community would benefit from an improved public realm in Central Reading.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? New public open space and civic squares, street trees, access to waterways, pedestrianisation and traffic management, where appropriate			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Improvements to the public realm in Central Reading are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR4: Leisure, culture and tourism in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy establishes Central Reading as the primary focus for major leisure, cultural and tourism development.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from leisure, culture and tourism uses in the most accessible location in the Borough.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Leisure, cultural and tourism uses that attract a wide range of people into the centre and add to the range and offer of facilities; informal recreation and sporting uses along the River Thames			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Leisure, culture and tourism uses in Central Reading are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to have a range of evening and night-time uses in the town centre while avoiding adverse impacts on amenity and character.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from the 18-hour economy and night-time uses in the most accessible location in the Borough.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A range of evening and night-time uses in the town centre, avoidance of adverse impacts on amenity and character			
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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are 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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are 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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are 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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are 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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Drinking establishments in Central Reading are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR6: Living in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for a mix of different sized residential units within the town centre, mitigation of poor air quality and noise and avoidance of an over-concentration of social renting for single persons.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from an increase in residences in the most accessible location in the Borough.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A mix of different sized units, mitigation of poor air quality and noise, avoidance of overconcentration of social renting for single persons, restrictions on serviced apartments outside the C3 use class			
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? Living in Central Reading 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? Living in Central Reading 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? Living in Central Reading 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? Living in Central Reading 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? Living in Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Living in Central Reading 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims for town centre uses on ground floor levels with active frontages in order to maintain the overall retail character of the centre.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a vibrant town centre with high quality frontages			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A vibrant town centre reflective of overall retail character			
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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are 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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are 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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are 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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are 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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Primary frontages in Central Reading are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR8: Small shop units in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to promote small shop units in Central Reading.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a diverse retail offer and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of amalgamation of individual shop fronts, major retail development for multiple units will include some provision for small shop units			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, small shop owners, the 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Small shop units in Central Reading are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR9: Terraced housing in Central Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to retain traditional town centre terraced housing and respect their character.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Occupants of terraced housing will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from retention of these homes that contribute to the historic environment and a mix of housing types.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of loss of and detrimental effects to terraced housing in Central Reading			
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? Terraced housing in Central Reading 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? Terraced housing in Central Reading 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? Terraced housing in Central Reading 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? Terraced housing in Central Reading 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? Terraced housing in Central Reading is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Terraced housing in Central Reading 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR10: Tall buildings

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to drive tall buildings developments to specific areas within Central Reading.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from economic development in an accessible part of the Borough.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Tall buildings in specific areas that contribute to the skyline, are of high-quality design and contribute to a clean and green environment while avoiding negative impacts on amenity or the historic environment			
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? Tall buildings are 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? Tall buildings are 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? Tall buildings are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Tall buildings are 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? Tall buildings are not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? Tall buildings are 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this policy 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

CR11: Development in the station/river Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates various sites in the the station/river Major Opportunity Area for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR11a: Friar St and Station Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Friar St and Station Rd site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR11b: Greyfriars Rd Corner

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Greyfriars Rd Corner site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR11c: Station Hill and Friars Walk

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Station Hill and Friars Walk site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR11d: Brunel Arcade and Apex Plaza

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Brunel Arcade and Apex Plaza site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR11e: North of Station

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the North of Station site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR11f: West of Caversham Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the West of Caversham Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR11g: Riverside

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Riverside site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR11h: Napier Rd Junction

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Napier Rd Junction site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR11i: Napier Court

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Napier Court site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR12: Development in the west side Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites in the west side Major Opportunity Area for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR12a: Cattle Market

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Cattle Market site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR12b: Great Knollys St and Weldale St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Great Knollys St and Weldale St site for mixed-use development (primarily residential with some small business units). The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR12c: Chatham St, Eaton Place and Oxford Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Chatham St, Eaton Place and Oxford Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR12d: Broad St Mall

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Broad St Mall site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR12e: Hosier St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Hosier St site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR13: Development in the east side Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Development in the east side Major Opportunity Area site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR13a: Reading Prison

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Reading Prison site for residential or hotel development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR13b: Forbury Retail Park

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Forbury Retail Park site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR13c: Kenavon Dr and Forbury Business Park

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Kenavon Dr and Forbury Business Park site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR13d: Gas Holder

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Gas Holder site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR14a: Central Swimming Pool, Battle St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Central Swimming Pool, Battle St site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14b: Former Reading Family Centre, North St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Former Reading Family Centre, North St site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14c: 17-23 Queen Victoria St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 17-23 Queen Victoria St site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14d: 173-175 Friar St and 27-32 Market Place

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 173-175 Friar St and 27-32 Market Place site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14e: 3-10 Market Place, Abbey Hall and Abbey Square

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 3-10 Market Place, Abbey Hall and Abbey Square site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14f: 1-5 King St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 1-5 King St site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14g: The Oracle Extension, Bridge St and Letcombe St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the The Oracle Extension, Bridge St and Letcombe St site for retail and town centre uses. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14h: Central Club, London St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Central Club, London St site for residential and community use. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment.

CR14i: Enterprise House 89-97 London St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Enterprise House 89-97 London St site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14j: Corner of Crown St and Southampton St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Corner of Crown St and Southampton St site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14k: Corner of Crown St and Silver St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Corner of Crown St and Silver St site for residential or residential care development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14I: 187-189 Kings Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 187-189 Kings Rd site for residential or student accommodation development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR14m: Caversham Lock Island and Caversham Weir, Thames side

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Caversham Lock Island and Caversham Weir, Thames side site for leisure development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CR15: Abbey quarter

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to establish the Abbey Quarter as a major heritage and cultural destination.			
2. Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from a defined heritage quarter with tourism, education, economic and open space opportunities.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Protect and enhance the historic setting of the Abbey and create a cohesive heritage destination			
4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? The 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Island Road Major Opportunity Area site for business development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR1a: Former Landfill, Island Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Former Landfill, Island Rd site for industrial or warehouse development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR1b: North of Island Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the North of Island Rd site for industrial and warehouse development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR1c: Island Rd A33 Frontage

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Island Rd A33 Frontage site for industrial , warehouse or alternative commercial uses. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR2: Land north of Manor Farm Rd Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land north of Manor Farm Rd Major Opportunity Area site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR3: South of Elgar Road Major Opportunity Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the South of Elgar Road Major Opportunity Area site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR4a: Pulleyn Park, Rose Kiln Ln

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Pulleyn Park site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

--	--	--	--

SR4b: Rear of Newcastle Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rear of Newcastle Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR4c: 169-173 Basingstoke Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 169-173 Basingstoke Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR4d: 16-18 Bennet Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 16-18 Bennet Rd site for industrial and warehousing development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR4e: Part of Former Berkshire Brewery site

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Part of Former Berkshire Brewery site for industrial and warehouse development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR4f: Land south west of Junction 11 of the M4

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land south west of Junction 11 of the M4 site for development associated with Grazeley. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

SR5: Leisure and Recreation Use of the Kennetside Areas

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates areas around the River Kennet for low-intensity leisure and recreation use. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR1: Dee Park

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Dee Park site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR2a: Park Lane Primary School, The Laurels and Downing Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3a: Former Cox and Wyman Site, Cardiff Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Former Cox and Wyman site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

WR3b: 2 Ross Rd and part of Meadow Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates 2 Ross Rd and part of Meadow Rd for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

WR3c: 28-30 Richfield Ave

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 28-30 Richfield Ave site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

WR3d: Rivermead Leisure Centre, Richfield Ave

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rivermead Leisure Centre, Richfield Ave site for additional leisure floorspace development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3e: Yeomanry House, Castle Hill

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Yeomanry House, Castle Hill site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3f: 4 Berkeley Avenue

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 4 Berkeley Avenue site for residential. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3g: 211-221 Oxford Rd, 10 and rear of 8 Prospect St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 211-221 Oxford Rd, 10 and rear of 8 Prospect St site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3h: Rear of 303-315 Oxford Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rear of 303-315 Oxford Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3i: Part of Former Battle Hospital, Portman Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates part of the Former Battle Hospital site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

WR3j: Land at Moultsford Mews

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land at Moultsford Mews site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3k: 784-794 Oxford Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 784-794 Oxford Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3I: 816 Oxford Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 816 Oxford Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3m: 103 Dee Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 103 Dee Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3n: Amethyst Ln

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Amethyst Ln site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3o: The Meadway Centre, Honey End Lane

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Meadway Centre, Honey End Lane site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation 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? This allocation may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents with mobility issues since local centres play an important role in providing facility access.			
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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of failing to deliver mixed-use development has been identified in relation to age.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain If this allocation is delivered, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

WR3p: Alice Burrows Home, Dwyer Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Alice Burrows Home, Dwyer Rd site for residential or residential care development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation 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? This allocation may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents in need of residential care bedspaces.			
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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of failing to deliver residential care has been identified in relation to age.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y	N	Please explain If this allocation is delivered, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.

WR3q: Norcot Community Centre, Lyndhurst Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Norcot Community Centre, Lyndhurst Rd site for residential and community use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3r: Charters Car Sales, Oxford Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Charters Car Sales, Oxford Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3s: Land at Kentwood Hill

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land at Kentwood Hill site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

WR3t: Land at Armour Hill

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land at Armour Hill site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1a: Reading University Boat Club, Thames Promenade

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Reading University Boat Club, Thames Promenade site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to disability, particularly 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? This allocation 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? This allocation in the floodplain may have a differential impact in relation to age, particularly on older residents 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? This allocation 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 A potential adverse effect of residential development in the floodplain due to age and disability has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain If taken forward, this allocation would require a flood risk assessment. Development will not be permitted in the area of the site at highest risk of flooding.

CA1b: Part of Reading Golf Course, Kidmore End Road

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Part of Reading Golf Course, Kidmore End Road site for residential development including healthcare and community provision. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1c: Land at Lowfield Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land at Lowfield Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1d: Rear of 200-214 Henley Rd, 12-24 All Hallows Rd and 4, 7 & 8 of Copse Ave

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rear of 200-214 Henley Rd, 12-24 All Hallows Rd and 4, 7 & 8 of Copse Ave site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1e: Rear of 13-14A Hawthorne Rd 282-292 Henley Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rear of 13-14A Hawthorne Rd 282-292 Henley Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1f: Rear of 1 & 3 Woodcote Rd and 21 St Peters Hill

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Rear of 1 & 3 Woodcote Rd and 21 St Peters Hill site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA1g: Land West of Henley Rd Cemetery

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the land west of Henley Rd Cemetery for cemetery use. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from increased cemetery space.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

CA2: Caversham Park

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Caversham Park site for offices, residential or community use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER1a: The Woodley Arms PH, Waldeck St

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the The Woodley Arms PH, Waldeck St site for residential or student accommodation development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2b: Dingley House, 3-5 Craven Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Dingley House, 3-5 Craven Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2c: Land Rear of 8-26 Redlands Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land Rear of 8-26 Redlands Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2d: Land Adjacent to 40 Redlands Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Land Adjacent to 40 Redlands Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation may have a differential impact in relation to religious belief since the site is currently in religious use.			
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 for adverse impacts with regard to religious belief has been identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified?	Y✓	N	Please explain This site is allocated at the request of the religious group that owns it, so we can assume that adverse effects will not occur and the group is eager to locate elsewhere within the Borough.

ER2e: St Patricks Hall, Northcourt Ave

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the St Patricks Hall, Northcourt Ave site for student accommodation development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2f: Hamilton Centre, Bulmershe Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Hamilton Centre, Bulmershe Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2g: Alexander House, Kings Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Alexander House, Kings Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2h: Arthur Hill Swimming Pool, 221-225 Kings Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Arthur Hill Swimming Pool, 221-225 Kings Rd site for residential development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2i: 261-275 London Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 261-275 London Rd site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2j: Palmer Park Stadium Area

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Palmer Park Stadium Area site for further leisure use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2k: 131 Wokingham Rd

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the 131 Wokingham Rd site for mixed-use development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading site for continued development associated with the University. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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

ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital

1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates the Royal Berkshire Hospital site for continuation of healthcare development. The aim is 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 development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.			
3. What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome 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 and the 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? This allocation 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 allocation 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 allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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? This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation 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? This allocation 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 No, there is no reason to believe that this allocation 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 Offices

Bridge Street, Reading

RG1 2LU

Tel: 0800 626540

Email: planningpolicy@reading.gov.uk

Website: www.reading.gov.uk/readingldf



Reading
Borough Council

Working better with you