

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE SCOPE AND CONTENT LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL UPDATE

November 2023

Contents

Contents	2
1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	7
2. INTRODUCTION	9
Requirement for the Sustainability Appraisal	9
Background	10
Components of the Local Plan	10
What does this report contain?	10
Policy context	11
Limitations	12
Who carried out the Sustainability Appraisal?	12
3. BASELINE INFORMATION	14
Sustainability Appraisal baseline information.....	14
Review of other plans and programmes	16
4. FRAMEWORK FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	17
Sustainability objectives	17
Table 1: Sustainability Objectives (2014).....	17
Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives).....	17
Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society (Social & Economic Objectives)	17
Table 2: Sustainability Objectives (Updated 2023).....	18
Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives).....	18
Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society (Social & Economic Objectives)	19
5. STAGES OF A SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	20
Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope	20
Task A1 – Identifying other relevant policies, plans, programmes, and sustainability objectives	20
Task A2 – Collecting baseline information.....	20
Task A3 – Identifying sustainability issues and problems.....	20
Task A4 – Developing the sustainability appraisal framework.....	21
Task A5 – Consulting the consultation bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal report	24
Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects	25
Task B1 – Testing the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework	25
Task B2 – Developing the Local Plan Options including reasonable alternatives.....	25
Task B3 – Evaluating the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives.....	26
Task B4 – Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects	27
Task B5 – Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan	27

Stage C: Preparing the sustainability appraisal report.....	27
Stage D: Seeking representations on the Sustainability Appraisal report from consultation bodies and the public.....	27
Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring.....	27
Task E1 – Preparing and publishing post-adoption statement.....	27
Task E2 – Monitoring significant effects of implementing the Local Plan.....	28
Task E3 – Responding to adverse effects.....	28
6 SIGNIFICANT SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS	29
7 CONSULTATION.....	30
8. REFERENCES.....	31
APPENDIX 1: MATRIX OF SIGNIFICANT SUSTAINABILITY EFFECTS	33
APPENDIX 2: TESTING THE CORE OBJECTIVES AGAINST THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK	38
APPENDIX 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF POLICIES AND SITE ALLOCATIONS.....	39
CC2: Sustainable design and construction.....	41
CC3: Adaptation to climate change.....	44
CC4: Decentralised energy.....	46
CC7: Design and the public realm.....	48
CC9: Securing infrastructure.....	50
EN4: Locally important heritage assets.....	53
EN7: Local green space and public open space.....	55
EN12: Biodiversity and the green network.....	59
EN13: Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty.....	62
EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands.....	64
EM1: Provision of employment development.....	66
EM2: Location of employment development.....	68
H1: Housing provision.....	70
H2: Density and mix.....	74
H3: Affordable housing.....	79
H4: Build to rent schemes.....	83
H5: Standards for new housing.....	85
H6: Accommodation for vulnerable people.....	89
H7: Protecting the existing housing stock.....	92
H8: Residential conversions.....	94
H14: Suburban renewal and generation.....	98
New Policy: Co-Living.....	100
TR1: Achieving the transport strategy.....	103
TR2: Major transport projects.....	105
TR4: Cycle routes and facilities.....	107

TR5: Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging	109
RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development	111
RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres.....	113
RL4: Betting shops and payday loan companies.....	115
OU2: Hazardous installations.....	117
OU3: Telecommunications development	119
CR2: Design in Central Reading	121
CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading.....	123
CR6: Living in Central Reading.....	125
CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading.....	127
CR11: Station/River Major Opportunity Area	129
CR12: West Side Major Opportunity Area	131
CR13: East Side Major Opportunity Area	133
CR14: Other sites for development in Central Reading.....	135
CR15: The Reading Abbey Quarter.....	137
SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area.....	139
SR4: Other sites for development in South Reading	140
SR5: Leisure and recreation use of the Kennetside areas	142
WR3: Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst	144
CA1: Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green	146
ER1: Other sites for development in East Reading	148
ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading.....	150
ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital.....	152
Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrove Street.....	155
Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square	158
Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane	161
Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue	164
Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place.....	169
Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street	172
Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road.....	175
Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road	178
Site Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road	181
Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road	185
Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park.....	188
Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road.....	191
Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way.....	193
Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road.....	196
Site Sou5: Hexham Road.....	198

Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road.....	200
Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue.....	203
Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road	207
Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane	210
Site Eas1: Land at 9 Upper Crown Street.....	212
APPENDIX 4: HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN.....	214
APPENDIX 5: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN.....	223
CC2: Sustainable design and construction	224
CC3: Adaptation to climate change.....	225
CC4: Decentralised energy	226
CC7: Design and the public realm	227
CC9: Securing infrastructure.....	228
EN4: Locally important heritage assets	229
EN7: Local green space and public open space.....	230
EN12: Biodiversity and the green network.....	231
EN13: Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty.....	232
EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands.....	233
EM1: Provision of employment development.....	234
EM2: Location of employment development.....	235
H1: Housing provision	236
H2: Density and mix	237
H3: Affordable housing.....	238
H4: Build to rent schemes	239
H5: Standards for new housing.....	240
H6: Accommodation for vulnerable people	241
H7: Protecting the existing housing stock	242
H8: Residential conversions.....	243
H14: Suburban renewal and regeneration	244
New Policy: Co-living	245
TR1: Achieving the transport strategy.....	246
TR2: Major transport projects.....	247
TR4: Cycle routes and facilities.....	248
TR5: Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging.....	249
RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development	250
RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres.....	251
RL4: Betting shops and payday loan companies.....	252
OU2: Hazardous installations.....	253
OU3: Telecommunications development	254

CR2: Design in Central Reading	255
CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading.....	256
CR6: Living in Central Reading.....	257
CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading.....	258
CR11: Station/River Major Opportunity Area	259
CR12: West Side Major Opportunity Area	260
CR13: East Side Major Opportunity Area	261
CR14: Other sites for development in Central Reading.....	262
CR15: The Reading Abbey Quarter.....	263
SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area.....	264
SR4: Other sites for development in South Reading	265
SR5: Leisure and recreation use of the Kennetside areas	266
WR3: Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst	267
CA1: Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green	268
ER1: Other sites for development in East Reading	269
ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading.....	270
ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital.....	271
Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrave Street.....	272
Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square	273
Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane	274
Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue	275
Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place.....	276
Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street	277
Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road.....	278
Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road	279
Site Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road	280
Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road	281
Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park.....	282
Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road.....	283
Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way	284
Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road.....	285
Site Sou5: 2 Hexham Road.....	286
Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road.....	287
Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue.....	288
Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road	289
Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane	290
Site Eas1: Land at 9 Upper Crown Street.....	291

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 This document is a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposed changes to each policy as set out within the Regulation 18 Consultation (Scope and Content) which forms a part of the Partial Update of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)¹. It takes on each option for a policy or site, in turn, and examines it against a range of environmental, social and economic objectives, which are based on the Council's Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report². These objectives are defined in section 4 of this report.
- 1.2 The object of the exercise is to highlight what the likely effects the proposed changes to specific policies or sites 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.
- 1.3 At this stage, although the proposed changes to specific policies are still currently out for consultation on the 'Scope and Content', 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 any potential adverse effects.
- 1.4 The updates to the development management policies show positive sustainability effects, for instance, providing much needed housing, improving the environment, and making best use of previously developed land.
- 1.5 For all development options, there are some environmental costs, such as carbon dioxide emissions, energy use, and waste management. Mitigation of effects is a constant feature and can be partially achieved through adherence with other policies. Certain potentially negative effects requiring mitigation regularly appear. These include the following:
- Air quality issues: The Air Quality Management Area³ is extensive and covers the most accessible parts of the borough. There will be a need to consider measures to mitigate the effects on residents from local air quality, and on the quality of the air from additional traffic.
 - Noise issues: There are a number of sites that have been put forward for residential development which are adjacent to/within close proximity of major arterial roads. There will be a need to consider measures to mitigate the effects on potential residents from noise pollution, if these sites are allocated.
 - Flood Risk: Sites that may be allocated must consider the extent to which new development in the floodplain puts potential residents at risk and affects flood risk elsewhere. Where effects cannot be mitigated, allocations on such sites should not be pursued.

¹ The Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

² The 2014 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

³ Information on Air Quality can be found on the Council's website at [2020 Air Quality Annual Status Report \(ASR\) - Reading Borough Council](#)

- Education and healthcare infrastructure: Certain areas of the Borough are under pressure in terms of healthcare capacity. This is an issue which has been considered in preparing the Local Plan.
 - Provision of housing to meet local needs, particularly family-size housing: There is a lack of family-sized housing within the borough. Consideration is required on potential allocations and their ability to deliver 3+bedroomed accommodation to meet these needs.
- 1.6 The Sustainability Appraisal has been published for public consultation alongside the Consultation on Scope and Content. Details regarding the consultation can be found in section 7 of this report.

2. INTRODUCTION

Requirement for the Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.1 Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004⁴ requires local planning authorities to carry out a sustainability appraisal during the preparation of a local plan. In addition, the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004⁵ (the ‘Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations’) has a set of legal requirements that must be fulfilled.
- 2.2 In essence, the Sustainability Appraisal assesses the likely environmental, social and economic effects of the plan. This is done by appraising the plan against a number of sustainability objectives. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report sets the framework for sustainability appraisal, by containing all of the basic information needed to carry out the assessment. It therefore includes the sustainability objectives against which the appraisal will be made, baseline information relating to the various aspects of sustainability, other plans and strategies that need to be taken into account, and major sustainability issues in the area.
- 2.3 The Sustainability Appraisal process is intended to be an integral part of preparing a Local 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. The Sustainability Appraisal should inform the evaluation of options and provide a key means to demonstrate the appropriateness of a plan given reasonable alternatives.
- 2.4 Therefore, the 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.
- 2.5 The Sustainability Appraisal is a multi-stage process, most of which is undertaken in separate appraisals of individual plans. The national guidance on sustainability appraisals⁶ 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

⁴ [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/20)

⁵ [The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukreg/2004/1114)

⁶ National Guidance on Sustainability Appraisal
[Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations requirements checklist.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/100000/Strategic_Environmental_Assessment_Regulations_requirements_checklist.pdf)

- 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
- E3- Respond to adverse effects

Background

- 2.6 The most recent Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Tasks A1 to A5) for Reading was published in September 2014, and the latest Appraisal that assesses the content of the currently adopted Local Plan (2019) was published in November 2017. Both documents were used in the production of subsequent versions of development plan documents, including Reading's Local Plan (2019). However, the Council is now undertaking a Partial Review of the adopted Local Plan⁷, and this therefore provides a good opportunity to review documents in support of the previous Sustainability Appraisal.
- 2.7 In addition, there are other reasons to consider a review, for example, the declaration of a 'Climate Emergency' in 2019 and the subsequent publishing of the Reading Climate Emergency Strategy in 2020, as well as changes in background data, influenced by factors such as the Covid-19 pandemic and the publication of 2021 Census data plus new plans and strategies having been produced at a national and local level that influence the way we should be planning for the future of Reading.

Components of the Local Plan

- 2.8 The Local Plan Partial Update replaces selected policies set out within the existing development plan (Reading Borough Local Plan, adopted November 2019) and will set out how Reading will develop up until 2041.
- 2.9 At the current stage (Regulation 18 Consultation), the Local Plan includes the proposed changes to each policy and part of the plan that is within the scope of the update. Full draft policies will be a matter for the next consultation. Upon adoption, the Local Plan Partial Update will identify key sites, allocate land for a range of uses and guide applicants on a range of policies.

What does this report contain?

- 2.10 The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the policies and sites set out within the Local Plan Partial Update. These policies work at a range of levels, from policies for dealing

⁷ Information on the new Local Plan can be found on the Council's webpage: [New Local Plan - Reading Borough Council](#)

with broad strategic matters, such as how to accommodate Reading's housing need, to policies for different development on specific sites.

- 2.11 This report covers a number of stages including stages B, C and D of the above list. Stage A is dealt with in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2014). Although this report was produced to inform the currently adopted Local Plan (2019), given that the information was produced relatively recently, and considering the Local Plan Partial Update comprises an update of a select number of policies only, it is not deemed necessary to carry out a full new Scoping Report (i.e., Task A of the process). Instead, the existing contents of the Scoping Report (2014) will be used to inform this appraisal process and updated where necessary, for example, where we have more up-to-date information. Stage E cannot be undertaken before the Local Plan is adopted.
- 2.12 This Appraisal generally consists of assessing the content of the plan against the 20 sustainability objectives (set out in section 4, which involves updating some of the objectives compared to those previously used for the Local Plan), based on the objectives set out within 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.
- 2.13 This Appraisal first assesses the additional objective proposed for the Local Plan against the 20 sustainability objectives. It should be noted that the only proposed change/addition to the Local Plan objectives is to include reference to addressing the climate emergency. As such, it is only this objective that is appraised against the 20 sustainability objectives. This is undertaken in Appendix 2.
- 2.14 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 3, but with detailed Habitat Regulations Assessment in Appendix 4 and Equality Impact Assessment in Appendix 5.
- 2.15 In addition, this document appraises some sites that have been nominated for inclusion as a result of the 'Call for Sites' exercise, or on any significant proposed changes to existing sites. Their inclusion does not mean that they will be included within the final plan.

Policy context

- 2.16 Currently, the Council's adopted documents which have 'local plan' status comprises the Reading Borough Council Local Plan⁸, together with the Proposals Map⁹, adopted November 2019. In addition, the Central and Eastern Berkshire Minerals and Waste Plan was adopted in January 2023¹⁰. There are also a number of

⁸ The Council's adopted Local Plan can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

⁹ The Proposals Map can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

¹⁰ The Minerals and Waste Plan can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) in place that provide more detail to the policies¹¹.

- 2.17 The Local Plan Partial Update, as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) dated November 2023¹², will update and replace selected policies within the Reading Borough Local Plan (adopted 2019), based on the outcome of the review of the local plan, to ensure that policies are up-to-date. The LDS sets out the timescales for this process, with adoption currently anticipated in Summer 2025. The first stage is the publication of a Scope and Content Report for consultation, which will take place from November 2023 – January 2024, which is a discussion paper considering the general direction and approach that will be taken to updating the policy, as well as relevant alternative options. Following this, the process will move to the production of a draft Local Plan, which will be subject to consultation. The Regulation 19 Consultation is currently planned for August – September 2024.

Limitations

- 2.18 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.
- 2.19 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.
- 2.20 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.

Who carried out the Sustainability Appraisal?

- 2.21 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.
- 2.22 This Sustainability Appraisal was drafted mainly by the officers responsible for the production of the Local Plan Partial Update. This is appropriate at this stage, as the consideration of environmental, social and economic outcomes is the central element

¹¹ The Council's SPD's can be found on the Council's website at [Planning policy - Reading Borough Council](#)

¹² The Council's amended Local Development Scheme (November 2023) can be found on the Council's website at [Local Development Scheme November 2023 \(reading.gov.uk\)](#)

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 Partial Update.

3. BASELINE INFORMATION

Sustainability Appraisal baseline information

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 This Sustainability Appraisal does not seek to comprehensively redesign the existing Sustainability Appraisal Baseline Information as found within the Scoping Report (2014). This is due to the fact that the information was produced relatively recently and is therefore reasonably up-to-date. In addition, given that the Local Plan Partial Update comprises a *review* of a select number of policies only, it is not deemed necessary to undertake a full appraisal. Notwithstanding, the information in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report has inevitably become out-of-date in some respects. Therefore, this Sustainability Appraisal considers whether more up-to-date information is available that will affect the outcome of a particular policy or site and looks to update a handful of objectives that formed part of the original Sustainability Appraisal that was carried out in support of the existing Local Plan (2019). This is in light of the fact that there are plans and documents that were published more recently than this framework, and new information that has become available, set out in more detail below.
- 3.3 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.

3.4 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. A number of important assessments, policy updates and reports have been completed since the publication of the scoping report. The conclusions and implications of each are summarised below:

- The Council's Corporate Plan (2022-2025) which includes targets for provision of family housing of three bedrooms or more of 117 in 2022-2023, 124 in 2023-2024, and 137 in 2024-2025.
- The Reading Climate Emergency Strategy, published in 2020, identifies a number of actions across a number of partners to address the climate emergency, including higher standards of energy efficiency for new development, including larger housing developments to be built at zero carbon standards.
- The Transport Strategy (2040) is due to be adopted in 2024 which sets out a range of objectives and policies relating to transport.
- The Housing Strategy 2020-2025 identifies the importance of improving the sustainability of Reading's housing stock. It notes that, using funds raised through the zero-carbon approach in policy H5, it will be used to support the retrofit of carbon reduction measures to existing housing in the borough.
- The 2021 Census results which indicates that there has been an increase in population of Reading Borough by 12%, and an increase in households by 8% between 2011-2021. In addition, the Census results show that there has been an increase in household sizes, an overall ageing population, declining economic activity rates, and increases in homeworking.
- National policy requires housing need to be calculated based on a national standard methodology which takes into account projections of household numbers and local housing affordability, whilst also applying a 35% uplift to the local authorities that cover the core of the 20 largest urban areas in England, of which Reading is one. This means that there is a need for 877 homes per year up to 2041, an increase from the existing plan figure of 689 per year.
- A Housing Needs Assessment is currently being undertaken to look at overall levels of housing need and review the different types of housing needed, including affordable and family-sized housing. The results of this report will be published in due course, but a locally based need of 735 homes per year has been identified.

- Work on employment and commercial needs, flood risk, transport modelling and viability is due to be commissioned in November 2023.
- The impacts of recent major events including the Covid pandemic and the implications of Brexit are potentially significant and need to be factored into background evidence where possible.

Review of other plans and programmes

- 3.5 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive states that an SEA must provide information on the ‘relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.’
- 3.6 The Local Plan must be consistent with national planning guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Consistency with the NPPF will be taken into account in considering the Local Plan at Examination.
- 3.7 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 within section 8.

4. FRAMEWORK FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Sustainability objectives

- 4.1 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 1: Sustainability Objectives (2014)

Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives)

1	To limit the impact of climate change through minimising CO2 emissions and other greenhouse gases.
2	Adapt to inevitable climate change in terms of preparedness for extreme weather events, including avoiding and managing the risk of flooding, heat wave, drought and storm damage.
3	Ensure appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources.
4	Minimise the consumption of, and reduce damage to, undeveloped land.
5	Minimise the generation of waste and promote more sustainable approaches to waste management.
6	Minimise air, water, soil/ ground and noise pollution, and improve existing areas of contaminated land and poor air and water quality.
7	Value, protect and enhance the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology, and other contributors to natural diversity, including establishing/enhancing ecological networks, including watercourses and surrounding corridors.
8	Avoid contributing towards a likely significant effect, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, that could lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of internationally-designated wildlife sites.
9	Create, enhance and maintain attractive and clean environments including protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing landscape and townscape character.
10	Value, protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment and the heritage assets therein and the contribution that they make to society and the environment.

Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society (Social & Economic Objectives)

11	Protect, promote and improve human health, safety and well-being including through healthy lifestyles.
12	Promote strong and vibrant communities through reduction in crime and the fear of crime and enhanced community cohesion.
13	Ensure high quality housing of a type and cost appropriate to the needs of the area.
14	Reduce the need for travel and transport particularly by car or lorry and facilitate sustainable travel choices.
15	Ensure good physical access for all to essential services and facilities, including healthcare.

16	Avoid significant negative effects on groups or individuals with regard to race, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation.
17	Value, protect and enhance opportunities for all to engage in culture, leisure, and physical and recreational activity, particularly in areas of open space and waterspace.
18	Facilitate sustainable economic growth and regeneration that provides employment opportunities for all and supports a successful, competitive, and balanced local economy that meets the needs of the area.
19	Reduce deprivation and inequality within and between communities.
20	Maximise access for all to the necessary education, skills and knowledge to play a full role in society and support the sustainable growth of the local economy.

4.2 The most recent Sustainability Appraisal Framework was produced in 2014. This remains a reasonable basis for undertaking sustainability appraisal, but some of the above objectives require updating to ensure that they are in line with priorities in 2023.

4.3 The table below sets out the proposed objectives (revised), with a description and explanation on which objectives have been amended (and why) that follows.

Table 2: Sustainability Objectives (Updated 2023)

Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives)

1	To address the climate emergency 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, facilitate and encourage sustainable and active 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, age, 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, inclusive 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.

- 4.4 Objective 1 has been updated to make clear reference to the addressing of the climate emergency.
- 4.5 Objective 14 has been updated to make explicit reference to the encouragement of sustainable and active travel choices, as per the objectives set out within Reading Borough Council's Draft Transport Strategy 2040.
- 4.6 Objective 16 has been updated to ensure equality for those irrespective of age.
- 4.7 Objective 18 has been updated to ensure that economic growth within the borough will result in an inclusive local economy.

5. STAGES OF A SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

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

5.1 Stage A of the Sustainability Appraisal consists of the following:

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

5.2 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.

5.3 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.

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

5.4 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., Southeast, Berkshire/Sub-regional, Reading and adjoining areas.

Task A2 – Collecting baseline information

5.5 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.

5.6 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.

Task A3 – Identifying sustainability issues and problems

5.7 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 of and adaptation to 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

Task A4 – Developing the sustainability appraisal framework

- 5.8 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.
- 5.9 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.

- 5.10 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.

Incorporating Habitat Regulations Assessment

- 5.11 Objective 8 encompasses the screening stage of the Habitat Regulations Assessment.
- 5.12 The legislation for the Habitat Regulations Assessment was formerly known as the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). However, changes were made to this legislation by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Welsh Ministers following the decision to leave the European Union in 2016 to ensure that the legislation still operates effectively. Changes to the legislation were set out within the Conservation and Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, which came into full force on 1 January 2021¹³.
- 5.13 The majority of changes to the 2017 Regulations involve transferring functions from the European Commission to the appropriate authorities in England and Wales¹⁴. All other processes or terms in the 2017 Regulations remain unchanged and existing guidance is still relevant and indeed the obligations of a competent authority in the 2017 Regulations for the protection of sites or species do not change.
- 5.14 Habitat sites are any site which would be included within the definition at regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and include Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas
- 5.15 The HRA process is characterised by the precautionary principle. This is described by the European Commission as follows:
- “If a preliminary scientific evaluation shows that there are reasonable grounds for concern that a particular activity might lead to damaging effects on the environment, or on human, animal or plant health, which would be inconsistent with protection normally afforded to these within the European Community, the Precautionary Principle is triggered.”*
- 5.16 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.
- 5.17 The overall methodology for the screening exercise goes through seven sequential stages:
- Stage 1: Identify the sites to be assessed

¹³ The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 can be found here: [The Conservation of Habitats and Species \(Amendment\) \(EU Exit\) Regulations 2019 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk)

¹⁴ Further information on the changes to legislation can be found here: [Changes to the Habitats Regulations 2017 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

- 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

- 5.18 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.
- 5.19 Appendix 4 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.
- 5.20 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);
 - 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.
- 5.21 More detail can be found in section 7 of the Scoping Report.

Incorporating Equality Impact Assessment

- 5.22 An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) 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').
- 5.23 Reading Borough Council has a clear process for meeting the requirements of undertaking EqIAs. 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 EquiA 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

- 5.24 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, age, 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.
- 5.25 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.
- 5.26 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.
- 5.27 Completed Stage 1 pro-formas can be found in Appendix 5 of this Sustainability Appraisal.
- 5.28 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 the sustainability appraisal.
- 5.29 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.
- 5.30 More information about the Equality Impact Assessment methodology can be found in section 8 of the Scoping Report.

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

- 5.31 In November 2013, a consultation paper on proposed changes to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was published. This included all three of the statutory bodies¹⁵, along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.
- 5.32 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.

¹⁵ Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency

Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects

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

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

Task B1 – Testing the Local Plan objectives against the sustainability appraisal framework

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

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

5.36 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.

Task B2 – Developing the Local Plan Options including reasonable alternatives

5.37 The options for the Local Plan Partial Update are those set out in Appendix 3.

5.38 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. However, because this Sustainability Appraisal has been produced in support of a *Partial Update* to the existing Local Plan, the majority of the policies listed here are pre-existing within the currently adopted local plan. As such, there is little point in appraising the ‘no plan/no policy’ approach, except for the new Co-living policy. For the majority of the policies, therefore, a ‘business as usual’ analysis has been undertaken, which means that an equivalent Local Plan policy or allocation, if any exists, would be carried forward, and a ‘proposed approach’, which is the proposed alterations to the existing policy as set out within the Regulation 18 ‘Scope and Content’ document.

5.39 Alongside ‘proposed approach’ and ‘business as usual,’ 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.

- 5.40 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 significantly out of conformity with national policy without clear justification and therefore unsound. For this reason, alternative options are limited to those which would be appropriate given the existing policy context or achievable in practice.

Task B3 – Evaluating the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives

- 5.41 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 3.
- 5.42 The potential options on each site have been appraised according to their predicted impact on the sustainability objectives using the criteria below:

Symbol	Description
✓✓	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
○	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

- 5.43 As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, the SA process 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.
- 5.44 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.

Task B4 – Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

- 5.45 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. Below each table in Appendix 3 contains a short discussion on mitigation.

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

- 5.46 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.

Stage C: Preparing the sustainability appraisal report

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

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

- 5.48 Public consultation on the Partial Update will take place for at least eight weeks following the publication of this document. This is a significant consultation exercise including all three of the statutory bodies¹⁶, along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals. The Sustainability Appraisal report will be available alongside the Partial Update.

Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

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

STAGE E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

E1 – Prepare and publish post-adoption statement

E2 – Monitor significant effects of implementing the Local Plan Partial Update

E3 – Respond to adverse effects

Task E1 – Preparing and publishing post-adoption statement

- 5.50 Following adoption of the Local Plan Partial Update, 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.

¹⁶ Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

Task E2 – Monitoring significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

- 5.51 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 Partial Update can be identified, and future predictions made more accurately.
- 5.52 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.

Task E3 – Responding to adverse effects

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

6 SIGNIFICANT SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Appendix 1 contains a summary illustrating the key sustainability effects associated with the preferred options. More detail on the effects is available in the section before Appendix 2.
- 6.2 The predicted significant effects of the updates to the existing Local Plan policies are mostly positive, in particular, for the preferred approaches.
- 6.3 For site allocations, by far the majority of significant sustainability effects are positive. A number of sites have significant positive effects in making the best use of previously-developed land (4), provision of housing (13) and in some cases, encouraging sustainable/active travel (14).
- 6.4 Where significant negative effects have been identified, these relate to the ability to provide the appropriate type of housing for the borough should the latest needs not be considered (e.g. for family sized dwellings), heritage impacts as a result of higher densities for new development, the impact on culture and leisure should the existing theatre be lost at the Reading College site, and concerns around viability if the BNG threshold is increased to 20%. In general, the supporting text in this section provides preferred alternatives to avoid these effects, and any negative effects that arise for the potential allocation policies highlight matters which would need to be addressed in planning applications. More detail on flooding issues can be found on the Council's website.

7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 This Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan Partial Update has been published alongside the Local Plan Partial Update Consultation on Scope and Content. This is a significant consultation exercise, including all three of the statutory bodies¹⁷, along with business organisations, community and voluntary groups, adjoining authorities, infrastructure providers and interested individuals.
- 7.2 Comments should be made in writing by 5 pm on 31st January 2024. Written comments should be submitted by e-mail or by post.
- 7.3 E-mailed comments should be sent to planningpolicy@reading.gov.uk
- 7.4 Comments sent by post should be addressed to:
- Planning Policy Team
Reading Borough Council
Civic Offices
Reading
RG1 2LU

¹⁷ Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

8. REFERENCES

- Department for Levelling Up, Housing, and Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government: Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal guidance (2020)
- Reading Borough Council (2019): Local Plan
- Reading Borough Council (2019): Proposals Map
- Reading Borough Council (2023): The Central and Eastern Berkshire Minerals and Waste Plan
- Reading Borough Council (2017): Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan
- Reading Borough Council (2014): Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
- Reading Borough Council (2022): Annual Monitoring Report
- Reading Borough Council (2023): Local Development Scheme
- Reading Borough Council: Council Corporate Plan (2022-2025)
- Reading Borough Council: Reading Climate Emergency Strategy 2020-2025 (2020)
- Reading Borough Council: Reading Transport Strategy 2040 (Draft, June 2023)
- Reading Borough Council: Housing Strategy for Reading 2020-2025
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)
- 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

APPENDIX 1: MATRIX OF SIGNIFICANT SUSTAINABILITY EFFECTS

Policies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CC2 Sustainable design and construction	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓✓		✓✓			✓✓				✓✓		
CC3 Adaptation to climate change	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓✓	✓✓					✓✓									
CC4 Decentralised energy	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓			✓✓														
CC7 Design and the public realm									✓✓					✓✓						
CC9 Securing infrastructure																		✓✓		
EN4 Locally important heritage assets										✓✓										
EN7 Local green space and public open space							✓✓											✓✓		
EN12 Biodiversity and the green network				✓✓			✓✓		✓✓											
EN13 Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty				✓✓			✓✓		✓✓											
EN14 Trees, hedges and woodlands	✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓		✓✓											
EM1 Provision of employment development																		✓✓		
EM2 Location of employment development																		✓✓		
H1 Housing provision													✓✓							
H2 Density and mix											✓✓		✓✓							
H3 Affordable housing													✓✓			✓✓			✓✓	
H4 Build to rent schemes													✓✓							
H5 Standards for new housing	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓										✓✓			✓✓				
H6 Accommodation for vulnerable people											✓✓		✓✓			✓✓				
H7 Protecting the existing housing stock													✓✓							
H8 Residential conversions																				
H14: Suburban renewal and regeneration													✓✓							
New Policy: Co-Living													✓✓							
TR1 Achieving the transport strategy	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓✓	✓✓					✓✓	✓✓		✓✓				✓✓		
TR2 Major transport projects														✓✓				✓✓	✓✓	
TR4 Cycle routes and facilities														✓✓						

ER2 Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading																		✓✓		✓✓
ER3 Royal Berkshire Hospital																				
Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrove Street				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓					✓✓		
Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓			✓✓				
Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓							
Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road																		✓✓		
Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way				✓✓								✓✓								
Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road																		✓✓		
Site Sou5: 2 Hexham Road																	✓✓			
Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road																		✓✓		
Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue				✓✓								✓✓								
Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road				✓✓								✓✓								

Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane																✓✓				
Site Eas1: Land at 9 Upper Crown Street				✓✓										✓✓						

APPENDIX 2: TESTING THE CORE OBJECTIVES AGAINST THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

Obj	<i>To address the climate emergency</i>
1	✓✓
2	✓✓
3	✓✓
4	○
5	✓✓
6	✓✓
7	✓✓
8	○
9	✓✓
10	○
11	✓✓
12	○
13	○
14	✓✓
15	○
16	○
17	○
18	✓✓
19	○
20	○

APPENDIX 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF POLICIES AND SITE ALLOCATIONS

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

Symbol	Description
✓✓	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
○	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 “proposed approach” 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.

❖ “Proposed Approach” option

▼ “Business as usual” option

Effects against objective 8 are assessed in more detail in Appendix 4, 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 4 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 5, 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.

CC2: Sustainable design and construction**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Updates to the policy to require the highest level of sustainability possible as per local and national guidance.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
CC2(ii) ▼	Policy to not refer to the most up-to-date strategies	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CC2(iii)	Omit policy and rely on updates to Part L of the Building Regulations	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CC2(iv)	Update the policy, but with less ambitious requirements for target emissions rate reduction	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:**C2(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would have a number of significant positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the generation of waste and promoting more sustainable approaches (5), minimising pollution and improving existing areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), protection and enhancement of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), protection and improvement of human health (11), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), and facilitating sustainable economic growth (18).

C2(ii): Business as usual:

Retaining the existing approach would result in a number of positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the generation of waste and promoting more sustainable approaches (5), minimising pollution and improving existing areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), protection and enhancement of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), protection and improvement of human health (11), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), facilitating sustainable economic growth (18). Although this approach would require improvements past the stated target emissions rate in the Building Regulations, it would rely on BREEAM standards, when more ambitious standards could be achievable.

C3(iii): Alternative Option 1:

This approach would have a number of positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the generation of waste and promoting more sustainable approaches (5), minimising pollution and improving existing areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), protection and enhancement of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), protection and improvement of human health (11), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), facilitating sustainable economic growth (18). This approach would result in some reductions in carbon emissions however, there is a risk of energy performance gap, and there are uncertainties surrounding timescales for forthcoming updates to the building regulations which could result in a delay in progress towards net zero.

C3(iv): Alternative Option 2:

This option would have a number of positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the generation of waste and promoting more sustainable approaches (5), minimising pollution and improving existing areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), protection and enhancement of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), protection and

improvement of human health (11), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), facilitating sustainable economic growth (18). Overall, this approach would result in an improvement but not go as far towards achieving net-zero aims as the preferred approach.

Conclusion:

Option C2(i) would have the most significant positive effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Where some types of development may find it difficult to meet the standards, developments will have an opportunity to demonstrate the highest possible standards in cases where some of the requirements cannot be met for technical or other policy reasons, such as heritage.

CC3: Adaptation to climate change

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Refer to local guidance documents/strategies on climate change adaptation, identify high risk areas, give greater weight to climate change mitigation	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC3(ii) ▼	Do not include reference to new publications/strategies on guidance towards climate change adaptation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC3(i): Proposed Approach:

This option would have significant positive effects for addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring the appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, food, and other natural resources (3), enabling more sustainable approaches to waste management (5), minimising pollution and improving areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), and promoting and improving human health (11). It would have positive effects on reducing the damage to undeveloped land (4), plus the protection of wildlife and habitat (7).

CC3(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have a positive impact on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring the appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, food, and other natural resources (3), enabling more sustainable approaches to waste management (5), minimising pollution and improving areas of contaminated land and poor air/water quality (6), promoting and improving human health (11), reducing the damage to undeveloped land (4), plus the protection of wildlife and habitat (7). However, overall, it would not go as far as the preferred approach.

Conclusion:

Option CC3(i) would have the most significant positive effects on the sustainability objectives as it would refer to the most up to date strategies in place and would give greater weight to climate change mitigation. As such, this is the preferred approach.

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.

CC4: Decentralised energy**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Incorporate references to the Climate Emergency Strategy and progress on establishing district heat networks, and reference to heat Network Zoning.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC4(ii) ▼	No reference to the most up to date government guidance or facilitation of the establishment of Heat Network Zones	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**CC4(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would have significant positive effects in relation to addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring efficient use of energy (3), and minimising pollution (6). It could also result in positive effects in relation to providing high quality housing (13) and enabling sustainable economic growth (18).

CC4(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have positive impacts on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring efficient use of energy (3), and minimising pollution (6). It could also result in positive effects in relation to providing high quality housing (13) and enabling sustainable economic growth (18).

Conclusion:

Option CC4(i) would result in the most significant sustainability effects as it would make clear reference to the most up to date government guidance and facilitate the establishment of Heat Network Zones over the coming years. As such, this is the preferred approach.

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.

CC7: Design and the public realm

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Amendments to provide the basis for the forthcoming authority-wide design code requirements and to align design objectives with those stated in the National Model Design Code	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0
CC7(ii) ▼	No reference to the most up-to-date government guidance or local design codes	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CC7(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would have significant positive effects in relation to landscape and townscape character (9) and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14). It would have positive effects on the natural environment (7), enhancing the historic environment (10), protect and promoting health, safety and wellbeing (11), promoting strong and vibrant communities (12), ensuring good physical access to essential services and facilities (15), and facilitating sustainable economic growth and regeneration (18).

CC7(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would ensure 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 would protect and enhance the historic environment (10), townscape/landscape character (9), as well as creating 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).

Conclusion:

CC7(i) would bring the most positive effects as it would refer to the latest design code requirements and is therefore the preferred option.

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 with the preferred option.

CC9: Securing infrastructure

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Reference to digital infrastructure contributions, future-proofing the policy for the forthcoming Infrastructure Levy. Amendments to supporting text, including the incorporation of existing elements of the Employment, Skills and Training SPD.	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CC9(ii) ▼	Existing policy to be carried forward which would make no reference to the removal of s106 pooling restrictions, the new role of infrastructure funding statements, the Infrastructure Levy and growing importance of digital infrastructure.	✓	○	✓	✓	○	✓	✓	○	✓	○	✓	✓	○	✓	✓	○	✓	✓	○	○

COMMENTS:**CC9(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would have positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), ensuring the reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the damage to undeveloped land (4), minimising pollution, improving areas of contaminated land and air/water quality (6), enhancing and protecting the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing townscape and landscape character (9), promoting human health (11), as well as strong and vibrant communities (12), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), ensuring good physical access to all essential services and facilities (15), and providing opportunities for people to engage in leisure, cultural and recreational activities (18). It would have a significantly positive effect on facilitating sustainable economic growth that provides employment opportunities for all (18), particularly as the updates would refer to the growing importance of digital infrastructure and incorporate any important existing elements of the Employment, Skills and Training SPD.

CC9(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1), ensuring the reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources (3), minimising the damage to undeveloped land (4), minimising pollution, improving areas of contaminated land and air/water quality (6), enhancing and protecting the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing townscape and landscape character (9), promoting human health (11), as well as strong and vibrant communities (12), facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14), ensuring good physical access to all essential services and facilities (15), providing opportunities for people to engage in leisure, cultural and recreational activities (18), and on facilitating sustainable economic growth that provides employment opportunities for all (18).

Conclusion:

Option CC9(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects as the updates would refer to the growing importance of digital infrastructure and incorporate any important existing elements of the Employment, Skills and Training SPD. Therefore, this is the preferred approach.

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 with the preferred option.

EN4: Locally important heritage assets**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy wording is brought in line with NPPF paragraph 201 wording	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN4(ii) ▼	Retain existing policy wording that sets out that benefits should “significantly outweigh” harm or loss	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**EN4(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would bring about positive effects in relation to enhancing the townscape character (9), and significant positive effects with respect to objective 10 which seeks to value, protect, and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.

EN4(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would essentially have the same effects as the proposed approach (EN4(i)). This option would result in positive effects in relation to enhancing the townscape character (9), and significant positive effects with respect to objective 10 which seeks to value, protect, and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.

Conclusion:

The proposed option is the preferred approach as it would result in small amendments to the policy wording to be brought in line with paragraph 201 of the NPPF, as well as minor clarifications on policy/supporting text wording.

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 for the proposed approach.

EN7: Local green space and public open space**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Alteration of boundaries for previously designated Local Green Spaces following changes on the ground, and inclusion of additional sites	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓	0	?✓	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
EN7(ii) ▼	Retain existing Local Green Space Boundaries	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓	0	?✓	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
EN7(iii)	Identify two allocated sites (WR3s and WR3t) as Local Green Space	0	?✓	0	?	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
EN7(iv)	Identify everything apart from the built elements at allocated sites (WR3s and WR3t) as Local Green Space	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	?✓	0	X	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
EN7(v)	Do not update the policy to add the Ibis Club and Scours Lane as a Local Space Designation	0	?✓	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	0	0
EN7(vi)	Identify all additional sports pitches within the Playing Pitches Strategy as Local Green Space	0	?✓	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**EN71(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2) and would continue to minimise the consumption/damage towards undeveloped land (4). Although there is some loss of areas for existing designated Local Green Spaces, the inclusion of the Scours Lane and Ibis Club as additional Local Green Spaces would increase the overall quantum of Local Green Spaces and therefore have a significantly positive impact on the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7) and protection/enhancement of landscape character (9). There is a tendency towards positive sustainability impacts on healthy lifestyles (11) and recreational activity (17). The effect on housing delivery is unknown at this stage.

EN7(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have similar impacts as EN7(i). For example, it would bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2) and would continue to minimise the consumption/damage towards undeveloped land (4). It would have significant positive impacts on protecting and enhancing the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7) and protecting/enhancing landscape character (9). There is a tendency towards positive sustainability impacts on healthy lifestyles (11) and recreational activity (17). The effect on housing delivery is unknown at this stage.

EN7(iii): Alternative option 1:

The alternative option 1 would bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2), plus protecting/enhancing landscape character (9) and protecting and enhancing the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7). There is a tendency towards positive sustainability impacts on healthy lifestyles (11), and recreational activity (17). The effect on housing delivery could be negative as it would result in the loss of two sites previously allocated for development.

EN7(iv): Alternative option 2:

The alternative option 2 would essentially have the same benefits as EN7(iii). It would bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2) and would have positive effects towards the minimisation and consumption/damage towards undeveloped land (4), plus protecting/enhancing landscape character (9) and protecting and enhancing the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7). There is a tendency towards positive sustainability impacts on healthy lifestyles (11) and recreational activity (17). The effect on housing delivery could be negative as it would result in the loss of two sites previously allocated for development.

EN7(v): Alternative option 3:

The alternative option 3 would bring a tendency for positive benefits with regard to adaptation to climate change (2). However, its impact on undeveloped land (4), biodiversity, wildlife and geology (7), plus the impact on housing delivery (13) is unclear at this stage. There would be a negative impact on enhancing opportunities for all to engage in recreational activity, particularly in areas of open space (17).

EN7(vi): Alternative option 4:

Alternative option 4 would potentially have positive benefits with regards to adaptation of climate change (2) and would continue to minimise the consumption/damage towards undeveloped land (4). It is unlikely to cause harm to wildlife, habitat and geology (7) and would potentially have health benefits (11), whilst ensuring opportunities for all to engage in physical and recreational activity.

Conclusion:

EN7(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects (besides the existing approach) combined with the least negative effects. Although EN7(i) would result in a marginal loss of local green space to existing allocations, any negative effects of the loss are mitigated through the proposed allocation of two local green spaces designated within the borough, bringing additional positive benefits to various environmental objectives. The impact on housing is unknown at this stage.

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 for the proposed approach.

EN12: Biodiversity and the green network**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Protect 'irreplaceable habitats', 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement, off-site compensation requirements, reference added to the protection of important soils, avoiding light spillage over rivers, new landscaping next to rivers to be native and wildlife friendly, renaturalisation of riverbanks required for relevant applications.	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN12 (ii) ▼	Do not update the policy to include the above.	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
EN12 (iii)	Increase the on-site BNG requirements to 20%	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN12 (iv)	Do not include any spatial requirements for off-site BNG	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**EN12(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would have a positive effect on addressing the climate emergency (1) and adapting to climate change (2), as well as minimising air, water, soil/ground and noise pollution (6). It would bring significant positive sustainability effects on reducing the damage to undeveloped land (4) as well as enhancing the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7) and enhancing plus protecting landscape character (9). The policy revisions may have a negative impact on meeting housing targets (13) as development land available within the administrative boundaries of RBC are limited. However, if guidance is provided for off-site compensation this could offset any negative impacts on housing delivery, although it could potentially result in a reduction of BNG within the borough, reducing the positive impacts in respect to objectives 1 and 2.

EN12(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have a positive effect on addressing the climate emergency (1) and adapting to climate change (2), as well as minimising air, water, soil/ground and noise pollution (6). It would bring significant positive sustainability effects on reducing the damage to undeveloped land (4) and positive benefits towards enhancing the diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7) and enhancing plus protecting landscape character (9). Retaining the existing policy approach could still have a negative impact on housing (13) to some extent as it still strongly encourages BNG wherever possible.

EN12 (iii): Alternative option 1:

This option would bring positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1) and adapting to climate change (2). It would have significant positive effects on minimising the consumption of, and reducing damage to undeveloped land (4), minimising air, water, soil/ground and noise pollution, improving areas with poor air and water quality (6), plus protecting and enhancing the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7). Furthermore, it would bring significant positive effects towards objective 9, ensuring that the landscape character is enhanced and protected. Notwithstanding, this option would result in a significant negative effect in housing delivery as these on-site targets would significantly reduce the amount of available land for development within the constrained borough.

EN12 (iv): Alternative option 2:

Many of the effects for this option are unknown at this stage as it would depend on where the off-site contributions are located. For example, if the offsite contributions are not within the local area, then, although it would bring positive effects in a broad sense, it would reduce the extent to which this would have a direct positive impact within the borough or indeed meet the individual objectives. This approach could have a positive effect on housing as it may ensure that additional land is available for development, however, the impact is unclear at this stage.

Conclusion:

Option EN12(i) would be the preferred approach as it would have the most positive sustainability effects combined with the least negative effects. Although the impact on housing may still be negative as less land would be available for housing delivery, this can be offset by mitigation measures set out below.

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 biodiversity conservation interferes with housing delivery, sites must be carefully planned to maintain and enhance the natural environment while ensuring the amount and type of housing appropriate to the area's needs. Off-site contributions that are outside of the borough should be carefully controlled to ensure that the benefits are still felt within RBC's boundaries.

EN13: Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy to be extended following results of Chilterns AONB review results	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN13(ii) ▼	Policy protecting 5 existing major landscaping features, but not taking into account the latest position on the AONB boundaries	0	0	0	✓X	0	0	✓X	0	✓X	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN13(i) Proposed Approach:

The policy update option brings significant positive effects with regards to undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7) and landscape character (9). In terms of housing provision (13), the policy option, which would result in the need for development to conserve and enhance the character and natural beauty of the AONB should the boundaries are extended, is unknown at this stage.

EN13(ii): Business as usual:

This approach would still have some positive benefits on undeveloped land (4), wildlife (7), and landscape character (9) as the existing policy does still seek to protect five existing major landscape features. However, it may also have a negative effect on these objectives as it would fail to conserve and enhance the character of the AONB, if extended (although it could be argued that the council would have little control over this in any case). The impact on housing delivery (13) is unknown, however, protection of the revised boundaries, if extended, would be required in

any case, regardless as to whether the policy is updated or not, and therefore retaining the existing approach would have minimal impact on its protection.

Conclusion:

It is considered that option EN13(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects. This option is most likely to result in the minimisation of the consumption of undeveloped land (4), value, protect and enhance the amount of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), and enhance the landscape character (9). Due to the constrained nature of the land within the borough, updating the policy such that it conserves and enhances any AONB land may reduce the amount of land available to meet local housing needs, however, protection of these boundaries would be required even if the policy is not updated and therefore there is little merit in retaining the existing policy approach in this regard.

Habitat Regulations issues:

There are not expected to be any differential effects on the 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 of housing appropriate to the area's needs.

EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Updating policy so that it aligns with the ambitions of the Tree Strategy, NPPF and biodiversity net gain requirements, and emphasis on securing the long term future	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN14(ii) ▼	Protection of trees, hedges and woodlands, but no specific targets set out	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN14(iii)	Alternative option: Require a minimum canopy cover level	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

EN14(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach brings significant positive sustainability effects on limiting the impact of climate change (1), adapting to climate change (2), improving air quality (6), enhancing the amount of diversity of wildlife and habitat (7), and enhancing landscape character (9). It may also

have a positive effect on enhancing opportunities for all to engage in physical and recreational activity in areas of open space (17) and ensuring high quality housing (13), however, there is a risk that this approach could limit the amount of land available for housing delivery.

EN14(ii): Business as usual:

Retaining the existing policy approach would ensure some positive sustainability impacts, including limiting the impact of climate change (1), adapting to climate change (2), improving air quality (6), enhancing the amount of diversity of wildlife and habitat (7), and enhancing landscape character (9). However, it would not maximise its potential to address, in particular, the environmental objectives. This approach does have the potential to result in high quality housing development, and no negative sustainability impacts have been identified.

EN14(iii): Alternative Option 1:

This approach brings significant positive sustainability effects on limiting the impact of climate change (1), adapting to climate change (2), improving air quality (6), enhancing the amount of diversity of wildlife and habitat (7), and enhancing landscape character (9). It may also have a positive effect on enhancing opportunities for all to engage in physical and recreational activity in areas of open space (17). The impact on housing delivery is unclear at this stage (13). It may have a positive effect on ensuring high quality housing, however, if a minimum canopy cover is required, it may limit the amount of housing that can be delivered within the borough.

Conclusion:

It is considered that option (i) would have the most positive (and least negative) sustainability effects. Although option (iii) is also identified as having a number of significant positive sustainability effects, the minimum canopy cover requirement could limit the amount of housing that can be delivered on a given site, failing to deliver high quality housing that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13).

Habitat Regulations issues:

There are not expected to be any differential effects on the 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 for the proposed approach.

EM1: Provision of employment development**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Revised policy to make reference to the updated needs for office, industrial and warehouse uses based on latest data, and to consider opportunities to meet unmet employment needs from other authorities	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓
EM1(ii) ▼	Provision for employment development based on data that is over 5 years old.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	?

COMMENTS:**EM1(i): Proposed Approach:**

Without the results of the most up-to-date evidence on employment needs at this stage, it is difficult to assess what impact the revised level of employment development requirements will have on undeveloped land (4) and housing delivery (13). However, updating the policy to reflect the latest local needs for office, industrial and warehouses will inevitably have a significant positive effect on facilitating sustainable economic growth

and providing opportunities for all (17), as well as a positive impact on ensuring that access to the necessary skills are available to foster economic growth (20). There would be an uncertain negative on internationally-designated wildlife sites (8) if this option is pursued. This is because this approach could result in increased vehicle trips into Reading, meaning negative impacts on Chilterns Beechwoods, Hartslock Wood and/or Thames Basin Heaths in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration and air pollution and quality. However, the impact remains somewhat unknown at this stage as, it would depend on the scale of employment needs identified.

EM1(ii): Business as usual:

The impact of the existing policy approach on housing delivery (13) is uncertain at this stage. If the current employment provision targets are not in accordance with up-to-date information on actual need, then this could result in a surplus of employment development, reducing the amount of land that could instead be freed up for housing. On the other hand, relying on data that is over five years old could also result in under-provision of employment development, limiting the ability to facilitate sustainable economic growth.

Conclusion:

Although the impact of the above options on several sustainability objectives is unknown at this stage, overall, is considered that option EM1(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects as it would ensure that employment opportunities and access to skills are based on up-to-date locally identified needs.

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.

EM2: Location of employment development

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ◆	Amending boundaries of Core Employment Areas subject to the outcome of the latest data on employment needs	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓
EM2(ii) ▼	Retaining the existing boundaries of Core Employment Areas based on existing employment needs data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	?

COMMENTS:

EM2(i): Proposed Approach:

Without the results of the most up-to-date evidence on employment needs at this stage, it is difficult to assess what impact the revised location of new employment development will have on undeveloped land (4) and housing delivery (13). However, updating the policy to reflect the latest local needs for office, industrial and warehouses will inevitably have a significant positive effect on facilitating sustainable economic growth and providing opportunities for all (17), as well as a positive impact on ensuring that access to the necessary skills are available to foster economic growth (20).

EM2(ii): Business as usual:

The impact of the existing policy approach on housing delivery (13) is uncertain at this stage. If the locations for new employment development are not in accordance with up-to-date information on actual need, then this could result in a surplus of employment land, reducing the amount of land that could instead be freed up for housing. On the other hand, relying on data that is over five years old could also result in under-provision of Core Employment Areas, limiting the ability to facilitate sustainable economic growth.

Conclusion:

Although the impact of the above options on several sustainability objectives is unknown at this stage, overall, it is considered that option EM2(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects as it would ensure that employment opportunities and access to skills are based on up-to-date locally identified needs.

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.

H1: Housing provision

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Housing provision figure to be amended to reflect available capacity to 2041, (800 to 825) homes per year	✓X	✓X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X
H1(ii) ▼	Retain existing approach, do not update the housing provision figures	✓X	✓X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓	?	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
H1(iii)	Housing provision of 699 homes per year (existing need)	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓	?	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X
H1(iv)	Housing provision of 877 homes per year (need based on national standard methodology)	✓X	✓X	✓X	?X	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?✓	0	?X

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H1(v)	Housing provision of 735 homes per year (based on latest locally-based need figure)	?X	✓X	?X	?	✓X	✓X	?	O	?	?	O	O	✓	?	?X	O	O	?✓	O	?X

COMMENTS:**H1(i): Proposed Approach:**

This approach could result in both positive and negative effects in respect of addressing the climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6), however, it is hoped that these can be mitigated and controlled through other policies set out within the partial update. The effect on townscape and landscape character (9) is unknown and is subject to design and layout. It would tend towards negative effects on protection of undeveloped land (4). The impact on diversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. Significant positive effects would be brought in respect of housing delivery (13). Potential positive effects would be felt in respect of facilitating sustainable economic growth. Negative effects could be felt in relation to health due to stress placed on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

H1(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have similar effects as H1(i); however, they would be less pronounced. It could result in both positive and negative effects in respect of addressing the climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6), however, it is hoped that these can be mitigated and controlled through other policies set out within the partial update. The effect on townscape and landscape character (9) is unknown and is subject to design and layout. The impacts on diversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. Positive effects would be brought in respect of housing delivery (13). Potential positive effects would be felt in respect of facilitating sustainable economic growth.

H1(iii): Alternative Option 1:

Similarly, this approach could result in both positive and negative effects in respect of addressing the climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6), however, it is hoped that these can be mitigated and controlled through other policies set out within the partial update. The effect on townscape and landscape character (9) is unknown and is subject to design and layout. It would tend towards negative effects on protection of undeveloped land (4). The impact on diversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. Positive effects would be brought in respect of housing delivery (13).

Potential positive effects would be felt in respect of facilitating sustainable economic growth. Negative effects could be felt in relation to health due to stress placed on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

H1(iv): Alternative Option 2:

This approach could result in both positive and negative effects in respect of addressing the climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6), however, it is hoped that these can be mitigated and controlled through other policies set out within the partial update. The effect on townscape and landscape character (9) is unknown and is subject to design and layout. It would tend towards negative effects on protection of undeveloped land (4). The impact on diversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. Significant positive effects would be brought in respect of housing delivery (13). Potential positive effects would be felt in respect of facilitating sustainable economic growth. Negative effects could be felt in relation to health due to stress placed on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

H1(v): Alternative Option 3:

This approach could result in both positive and negative effects in respect of addressing the climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6), however, it is hoped that these can be mitigated and controlled through other policies set out within the partial update. The effect on townscape and landscape character (9) is unknown and is subject to design and layout. It would tend towards negative effects on protection of undeveloped land (4). The impact on diversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. Positive effects would be brought in respect of housing delivery (13). Potential positive effects would be felt in respect of facilitating sustainable economic growth. Negative effects could be felt in relation to health due to stress placed on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

The options would generally have similar effects on the sustainability objectives. However, the options that would result in a higher level of housing provision (options H1(i) and H1(iv)) would likely have greater negative effects in relation to the natural environment and addressing climate change as there would be more intensified use of the land, as well as placing stress on local facilities. However, on the other hand, they would also result in significant positive effects in relation to housing delivery as both options would meet the identified need and capacity within the borough, bringing benefits in relation to economic growth and wellbeing if a suitable amount of housing is delivered. In addition, in light of the wider proposed changes to policy in relation to addressing climate change and BNG requirements, it is hoped that the impact on climate change and the natural environment can be mitigated to an extent. Overall, option H1(i) would be the preferred approach as this would deliver beyond the local identified need for housing and would be in line with the borough's capacity, avoiding unnecessary over development whilst enabling an ample supply of housing for current and future generations.

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: Negative effects as a result of housing must be carefully monitored and mitigated, particularly stress on healthcare, education, infrastructure, and wildlife/biodiversity. 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 and 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) ❖	Minimum densities specified (subject to exemptions), minimum proportion of 3+ bed homes on sites of 10+ dwellings outside of centres 67%, a minimum % of 3-bed dwellings within district/local centres, family housing to take priority where conflict with densities, wording amended such that for 10+ dwellings, developments 'should' make provision for self-build.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0

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) ▼	Do not update minimum density requirements	?X	?X	?X	?	0	0	?	0	0	✓	0	0	X	0	0	?	0	X	X	0
H2(iii)	Set higher minimum densities in line with average achieved densities.	✓	✓	✓	?	0	0	?	0	XX	?X	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0
H2(iv)	3+ bed dwellings delivered at the existing rate, no updates to adopted approach	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	0	0	0	X	0	XX	0	0	XX	0	X	X	0
H2(v)	Seek higher provision of family accommodation on relevant sites outside centres (up to 100%)	?X	?X	?X	?X	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	X	0
H2(vi)	Do not update the wording in reference to self-build provision	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓X	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H2(vii)	Specify minimum proportion of self-build, e.g., 10%	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓X	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0

COMMENTS:**H2(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would result in significant positive effects with respect of housing delivery (13) and promoting health, safety and wellbeing (11). This is because it would ensure that an appropriate amount of family housing is accommodated to meet the needs of the area. It would have a positive impact on the historic environment (10), as there would be exemptions to achieving minimum densities, for example, so that it does not harm nearby heritage assets. It would also facilitate sustainable economic growth (18) as delivering a housing mix that meets the needs of the area will ensure that individuals are able to continue to live and work within the borough. Furthermore, it would reduce deprivation and inequality within and between communities by providing an appropriate mix that serves all people groups and their needs (19, 16), having a positive impact on residents based on age, as delivering the right mix would ensure that the different size needs based on age are met. The impact on climate change (1,2, and 3) could be positive as increased densities would bring positive effects with regard to emission reduction and adaptation to climate change as well as natural resource use and undeveloped land (4). However, more family sized dwellings would also affect the use of undeveloped land since larger homes require more area (4), potentially bringing negative effects towards this objective, as well as meeting the climate change targets. Higher densities would mean that its impact on wildlife and habitat (7) could be positive and in any case the protection of sites of biodiversity would be controlled by other policies set out within the local plan.

H2(ii): Business as Usual:

The existing approach could result in a negative effect on addressing, adapting and preparing for climate change (1,2,3). This is because sites which have higher densities tend to bring more positive impacts in relation to climate change, as opposed to lower density developments. Therefore, if there is a risk of sites not reaching their full potential in relation to maximum densities as a result of not updating the policy, then this could lead to a failure in fulfilling these objectives in this regard. The impact on housing (4) is unknown at this stage. Although lower densities could result in less intensified use of undeveloped land, it may also result in development not making the most efficient or concentrated use of land. The impact on biodiversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage, although it is hoped that the protection of such areas would be regulated

by other policies set out within the update. The existing policy wording would still have a somewhat positive impact on protecting the historic environment (11). Its impact on housing delivery (13) would be negative as it may fail to maximise the quantum of development possible on a given site, failing to address the housing shortage to the best of its ability. Similarly, it may have adverse effects on reducing deprivation and inequality (19) and facilitating economic growth (18) if the amount of housing that could be delivered to address the housing crisis is not brought forward. In light of this, the impact on specific groups and individuals (16) is uncertain at this stage.

H2(iii): Alternative Option 1:

This approach would result in positive impacts in relation to addressing, adapting and preparing for climate change (1,2, and 3), as well as ensuring health, safety and wellbeing through delivering high density levels of development. The impact on undeveloped land (4) and wildlife and habitat (7) is unknown at this stage as although there would be a higher concentration of housing on each site, it would still ultimately result in much more housing overall, potentially interfering with undeveloped land and areas of natural biodiversity on a given site although it is hoped that this could be regulated through other policies. It would have a significant negative effect on townscape character in particular, and potentially the historic environment (10) as it would fail to take into account the different circumstances on each site. The impact on housing delivery and on groups and individuals (16 and 13) is positive. As this approach would still safeguard the delivery of family housing as a priority, it should still enable the delivery of appropriate housing that meets the needs of individuals. It would also have a positive impact on sustainable economic growth (18) and reducing deprivation and inequality (19).

H2(iv): Alternative Option 2:

This option would result in a positive effect on addressing, adapting and preparing for climate change (1,2,3) as higher density developments would still be sought as set out in the preferred approach, and would likely bring more positive impacts in relation to climate change, as opposed to lower density developments of 3+ bedrooms. It could also result in a positive impact on undeveloped land (4) for the reasons set out above, i.e., more concentrated development. The impact on biodiversity and wildlife (7) is unknown at this stage. However, it would have negative effects on promoting health and wellbeing (11), sustainable economic growth (18) and reducing deprivation (19), as it would fail to deliver the required need for family-sized housing. In turn, it would have significant negative effects on housing delivery (13) as it would clearly fail to meet the local need. It would also bring significant negative effects for specific groups and individuals (16) as it would not provide the appropriate types of housing for those of specific ages.

H2(v): Alternative Option 3:

This approach could result in a negative effect on addressing, adapting and preparing for climate change (1,2,3). This is because sites which have higher densities tend to bring more positive impacts in relation to climate change, as opposed to lower density developments of 3+ bedrooms. It could also result in a negative impact on undeveloped land (4) as family accommodation outside of centres would inevitably require the use of more land that may be previously undeveloped. The impact on biodiversity and wildlife is unknown (7) but can hopefully be monitored through

other policies that are being updated as a part of this review. It would have a positive effect on delivering housing for specific groups and individuals (16), facilitating economic growth (18) and a significant positive effect on housing delivery (13) as it would ensure that an increased amount of family sized dwelling would be delivered. However, it would result in negative effects on reducing deprivation and inequality (19) as it would fail to deliver mixed and balanced communities.

H2(vi): Alternative option 4:

This approach would result in similar effects to the proposed approach as the majority of the policy updates would be the same. However, it could also result in a negative effect on housing delivery (13) if the requirement for self-build isn't updated to align with the Self-Build Register.

H2(vii): Alternative option 5:

This approach would result in similar effects to the proposed approach as the majority of the policy updates would be the same. However, it could also result in a negative effect on housing delivery (13) if there is an over-provision of self-build housing in place of the delivery of other housing types that are more pressing.

Conclusion:

Option H2(i) would bring the most positive sustainability benefits and is therefore the preferred approach.

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 with regard to age has been identified, but not with the proposed option.

MITIGATION: No negative effects requiring mitigation have been identified.

H3: Affordable housing

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Updates to tenure split, 25% First Homes to be included and discounted at 30%, a local connection test for access to First Homes to be applied with key workers prioritised, deferred contribution required where affordable provision falls short of policy requirements, a cascade mechanism used where no Registered Provider can be found.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H3(ii) ▼	Rely on Affordable Housing SPD. No inclusion of First Homes.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓X	0	?	?✓	0
H3(iii)	Incorporate First Homes into the tenure required following the approach suggested in national guidance.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?	?X	0	0	✓	0	?	?X	0
H3(iv)	Not include First Homes within the specified tenure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?	?	0	0	✓X	0	?	?X	0
H3(v)	To include First Homes at a greater discount of 40 or 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	?	?	0	0	✓X	0	?	?X	0

COMMENTS:**H3(i): Proposed Approach:**

This approach would result in significant positive effects in relation to housing delivery (13) and reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). It would bring positive effects towards promoting human health, safety and wellbeing by providing affordable housing that meets a variety of different local needs (11) as well as facilitating sustainable economic growth and regeneration, as lack of affordable housing is seen to be a barrier to economic growth (18). It could also result in positive effects with regards to the promotion of strong and vibrant

communities and enhanced community cohesion through providing housing for all people groups within a given development or across the borough, avoiding homogenised and isolated communities (12). This approach would result in significant positive effects on particular individuals (16), for example, by updating the tenure split to introduce the First Homes discount at 30%, positive impacts would be had on those of a younger age who are less likely to already own a home could benefit from the First Homes discount.

H3(ii): Business as usual:

The positive effects with this approach are more ambiguous as there is a risk of lesser weight being applied if the policy is not updated as the affordable housing requirements would be delegated to the Affordable Housing SPD. Therefore, the effect in relation to housing delivery (13) and reducing deprivation and inequality (19) are more uncertain. Furthermore, there would be no inclusion of First Homes provision. As such, it would fail to serve this sub-group, including key workers. Positive and negative effects would be felt for individuals and groups (16). Although affordable housing would still be provided in some capacity, benefiting certain individuals and groups, it would miss an opportunity to serve younger populations (via First Homes) who could continue to struggle with entering into the property market.

H3(iii): Alternative Option 1:

This approach would result in a positive effect in relation to the promotion of human health and wellbeing, including through healthy lifestyles (11). However, the impact in relation to enhanced community cohesion (12) and economic growth (18) is uncertain at this stage, and it would tend towards a negative effect in relation to housing delivery (13) as well as reduction of deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). This is due to the fact that this approach would result in less than half of affordable housing addressing Reading's most pressing needs, for rented accommodation. This approach would result in positive effects on particular individuals (16), for example, by updating the tenure split to introduce the First Homes discount at 25%, positive impacts would be had on those of a younger age who are less likely to already own a home could benefit from the First Homes discount. However, the effect would not be as pronounced as H3(i) (proposed at 30%).

H3(iv): Alternative Option 2:

This option would result in a positive effect with respect to the promotion of human health, safety and wellbeing (11). However, its impact on the promotion of strong and vibrant community with enhanced community cohesion (12) is uncertain at this stage, as well as the delivery of appropriate housing (13) and economic growth (18). This is because not including First Homes may result in an unmet housing need going forward, although at this stage the impact is unknown. It may also result in a negative effect in respect of objective 19 as it may fail to reduce deprivation and inequality by failing to account for those who could benefit from First Homes, including key workers. Positive and negative effects would be felt for individuals and groups (16). Although affordable housing would still be provided in some capacity, benefiting certain individuals and groups, it would miss an opportunity to serve younger populations (via First Homes) who could continue to struggle with entering into the property market.

H3(v): Alternative Option 3:

This approach would result in positive impacts with respect of promoting and improving human health, safety and wellbeing (11), However, the impact on promoting community cohesion (12) and ensuring the right type of housing delivery (13) is uncertain at this stage, as is the impact on economic growth (18). It could result in a negative effect with regards to reducing deprivation and inequality (19). The reason for these impacts is because increasing the discount of First Homes could alter the viability of affordable housing provision and ultimately lead to lower on-site delivery overall. In addition, positive and negative effects would be felt for individuals and groups (16). Although affordable housing would still be provided in some capacity, it may disadvantage other groups if there is too big a priority on First Homes at the expense of other affordable housing tenures that are needed within the borough.

Conclusion:

The first option (H3(i)) would result in the most positive effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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.

H4: Build to rent schemes

Sustainability Objectives and 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(i) ❖	Point 2 of the policy to be amended to state that a further three-year tenancy to be generally offered at the end of the tenancy to increase security for the tenant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0
H4(ii) ▼	Retain existing policy wording so that tenancies are for 3 years only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0

COMMENTS:

H4(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would ensure positive sustainability effects in relation to promoting human health and well-being (11) and reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). It would bring significant positive effects in relation to ensuring that housing is provided of a type and cost that is appropriate to the area (13).

H4(ii): Business as usual:

This approach may fail to promote and improve human health and well-being (11) as well as reducing deprivation and inequality (19). This is because retaining the existing policy wording would miss the opportunity to maximise the security of the tenure and the subsequent likely positive impacts that this revision would have on wellbeing, human health, and equality within communities.

Conclusion:

H4(i) brings the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred option.

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.

H5: Standards for new housing

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	New-builds to achieve water neutrality, net zero carbon, new energy/heating requirements, adherence to the energy hierarchy, Energy Statement requirements set out, “exceptional basis clause” for 10+ dwellings, Embodied Carbon Assessment for 50+ dwelling schemes, full justification for demolition required and show how 95% of construction will be diverted away from landfill, account for increase in need for wheelchair users.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H5(ii) ▼	Specify zero carbon homes, but no standards for total energy use and space heating demand, no requirement for on-site renewables to match total energy use.	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0
H5(iii)	Omit policy and rely on updates to Part L of the Building Regulations	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0
H5(iv)	Update the policy, but with less ambitious requirements for target emissions rate reduction	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**H5(i) Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would bring particularly positive effects in relation to addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), and ensuring appropriate use of energy and water (3), It would have significant positive effects in relation to ensuring high quality housing (13) and supporting individuals (16) as a result of updates to account for any increase in need for wheelchair users.

H5(ii): Business as usual:

The exiting approach would have positive effects in relation to addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), and ensuring appropriate use of energy and water (3). However, it could have a negative effect on objective 13 and 16 as it would not account for any increased need for wheelchair using dwellings as a result of the Housing Needs Assessment.

H5(iii): Alternative option 1:

With this option, the impact on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate use of energy and water (3), and ensuring high quality housing (13), is unclear at this stage. This is because there is uncertainty surrounding timescales for the forthcoming updates to the building regulations, and, if the policy fails to prescribe its own sustainability standards in line with local targets, progress towards net-zero would be delayed. Furthermore, the exact definition of net-zero within the Future Homes Standard is yet to be defined. It could have a negative effect on objective 16 as it would not account for any increased need for wheelchair using dwellings as a result of the Housing Needs Assessment.

H5(iv): Alternative option 2:

This approach would still have positive effects in relation to addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring appropriate use of energy and water (3), and ensuring high quality housing (13), but these effects would not be as pronounced as H5(i). It could have a negative effect on objective 16 as it may not account for any increased need for wheelchair using dwellings as a result of the Housing Needs Assessment.

Conclusion:

Option H5(i) is the preferred option as it would result in the most positive 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 the preferred option. However, the options that do not include updates to account for any increase in the need for wheelchair using dwellings as a result of the Housing Needs Assessment may have detrimental effects on wheelchair users. The preferred option seeks to mitigate these effects by providing more adaptable and accessible housing, as well as homes for wheelchair users.

MITIGATION: It is not expected that the preferred approach would limit economic growth or housing provision. An “exceptional basis clause” is proposed where the new requirements cannot be met for technical or policy reasons for 10+ dwellings, and, where the points cannot be met due to viability, an Energy Statement must set out in full the degree to which the requirements can be met in order to enable the development to become viable, mitigating these effects.

H6: Accommodation for vulnerable people

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Level of need identified based on ongoing housing work, emphasis on no further needs for residential care, the need for modern accommodation noted, ages of eligibility for specialist housing to be justified.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓	0
H6(ii) ▼	Retain existing identified need for residential care, no reference to modern accommodation needs, no justification required for eligibility below 65.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	?	?	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H6(iii)	To move to a criteria-based policy without specific needs identified	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	?	O	?X	O	O	?X	O	?	?	O

COMMENTS:**H6(i): Proposed Approach:**

This approach would result in significant positive impacts on promoting human health, safety and wellbeing through ensuring that the right type of specialist accommodation is provided, based on latest needs (11). In a similar vein, this, as well as an emphasis on the need for modern accommodation and requiring justification for specialist accommodation that serves those under the age of 65, would result in significant positive effects on housing delivery that is of a type that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13). The impacts on different groups and individuals (16) would also be positive as it would ensure that the appropriate amount of housing is provided the vulnerable i.e., specialist accommodation, whilst ensuring that younger people are not excluded through stating that that ages of eligibility for what would otherwise be standard C3 dwellinghouses will need to be robustly justified. Positive impacts would also be felt in regard to facilitating sustainable economic growth (18) through providing the right housing type to meet different needs which will help boost economic growth, and also assist in reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19).

H6(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would tend towards negative effects on housing delivery (13) and health and wellbeing (11) because the level of need would not be based on up-to-date requirements. Although there has been an overprovision of specialist accommodation recently, evidence shows that there is an ageing population and therefore, their required needs may not be met in the future. As such, without incorporating the latest needs data, there could be a discrepancy between supply and demand, which risks under provision for vulnerable groups. On the other hand, if there is an oversupply of such accommodation, then it could disadvantage certain groups (16), for example, younger populations. In addition, there would be no specific reference to noting the need for modern care accommodation which may result in the continuation of facilities that are no longer fit for purpose. The impact on sustainable economic growth (18) and reduction of deprivation and inequality (19) is unknown at this stage.

H6(iii): Alternative option 1:

The impact on a number of options including promotion of health and wellbeing (11), housing delivery (13), impact on specific groups and individuals (16), facilitating sustainable economic growth (18) and reducing deprivation and inequality (19) are somewhat unknown at this stage, however there is a risk that there could be an under provision of the required accommodation without identifying the specific needs at the outset.

Conclusion:

Option H6(i) would bring the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

Habitat Regulations issues:

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

Equality issues:

Failing to provide the required number of bedspaces for the elderly may have significant negative effects on groups of individuals with regard to age or disability. Similarly, development could exclude certain groups, particularly younger populations, if there is a disproportionate delivery of specialist accommodation for those aged 55 and above, and therefore particular care needs to be taken to ensure that the right amount of accommodation is available to all people groups.

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

H7: Protecting the existing housing stock

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Exceptional circumstances to apply to entire policy wording, supporting text to include additional exceptional circumstances e.g., new family accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	?✓	0
H7(ii) ▼	Planning permission will not be granted for a net loss in the number of residential units or gross floor area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0

COMMENTS:

H7(i): Proposed Approach:

It is considered that this approach would have a tendency towards a positive impact with respect to protecting, promoting and improving human health and wellbeing (11) and reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). It would have significant positive effect on the ability to ensure the delivery of housing of a type that is appropriate to the needs of the area. It would tend towards a positive impact with respect of providing the appropriate type of housing for those based on age, for example, ensuring a flexible policy approach to enable a sufficient supply of family-sized housing (16).

H7(ii): Business as usual:

Retaining the existing policy wording would have a tendency to a negative impact on the ability to promote and improvement human health and wellbeing (11) and delivering housing that is of a type that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13) as it would make it more difficult to provide additional family housing that is required within the borough, possibly resulting in adverse effects on individuals and groups based on age (16).

Conclusion:

The proposed approach (H7(i)) would bring the most positive impacts on the sustainability objectives and therefore this is the preferred approach.

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.

H8: Residential conversions

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	To incorporate guidance within Residential Conversions SPD outside Article 4 areas, e.g., clarification on threshold, considerations of deprivation levels, and impact on communities. Clarifications on threshold applying to residential buildings, consideration of 'sandwiching' of a dwelling, and inappropriate stacking, supporting text offer protection against loss of family housing.	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓X	0	0	✓X	0	0	✓	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H8(ii) ▼	Rely on the guidance contained within the Residential Conversions SPD	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓X	0	0	✓X	0	0	✓	0
H8(iii)	To apply the same threshold approach outside the Article 4 direction area	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	X	0	0	?	0	0	?X	0
H8(iv)	To apply a lower threshold outside the Article 4 direction area	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	X	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0
H8(v)	To use a criteria based approach outside the Article 4 direction area	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0

H8(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach could lead to negative effects with respect to undeveloped land (4), as there would be more controls in place to limit the conversion to HMOs in various scenarios. As HMOs help to meet some housing need, thereby reducing the amount of housing that needs to be built elsewhere, placing more controls over this type of development could lead to housing inevitably being built on undeveloped land within the borough. In terms of housing delivery (13), on the one hand, it would bring positive benefits as it would offer some type of protection against the loss of family dwellings, of which there is a shortage of within the borough. It would also ensure that housing is of a high quality and type that meets the need of the area, for example, by ensuring that inappropriate stacking is avoided, and considering the ‘sandwiching’ of dwellings between HMOs. Nonetheless, it would bring some negative effects too, as it would limit the number of available HMOs which are often affordable

and flexibly let. In a similar vein, this would lead to both positive and negative effects on specific groups and individuals, resulting in a positive effect for those who need family housing, but potentially reducing the availability of HMOs, disadvantaging young adults or students who require such flexible and affordable housing (16). Notwithstanding, it is considered that the limits placed would still enable an appropriate number of HMOs that would address inequality and deprivation (19). It would bring positive impacts on protecting townscape character (9) and historic environment (10) through limiting the number of HMOs and its associated paraphernalia which can be detrimental to the townscape/historic character of an area. The policy revisions would require consideration where proposals would dilute or harm a sustainable and mixed community, thereby having a positive effect on objective 12.

H8(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would technically have similar effects to option H8(i) as the majority of the proposed changes are already dealt within the existing Residential Conversions SPD. However, it should be noted that this option could lead to difficulties on actually implementing the updates as they would not have full development plan policy weight, bringing some level of risk to this approach on meeting the sustainability objectives in reality.

H8(iii): Alternative option 1:

As above, this approach could lead to negative results with respect of protecting undeveloped land (4) as having a threshold of 25% HMOs outside the Article 4 area could well require further land to be built on for future development. This approach could also tend towards inequality and deprivation (19) if there are such stringent limits on HMOs across the borough and would result in negative effects with respect to housing delivery and provision that meets the needs of the area (13). The impact on those of certain age groups, for example, students or young adults could be negative as this form of accommodation would be more restricted (16). It would continue to have a positive effect on townscape and heritage (9, 10) as well as community cohesion (12), as there is evidence that areas with a high concentration of HMOs experience negative impacts on the communities.

H8(iv): Alternative approach 2:

Applying a lower threshold outside of the Article 4 direction area would lead to negative results with respect of protecting undeveloped land (4). This approach could also tend towards inequality and deprivation (19) if there are such stringent limits on HMOs across the borough and would result in negative effects with respect to housing delivery and provision that meets the needs of the area (13). The impact on those of certain age groups, for example, students or young adults could be negative as this form of accommodation would be more restricted (16). It would continue to have a positive effect on townscape and heritage (9, 10) as well as community cohesion (12).

H8(v): Alternative approach 3:

The impacts as a result of this option in respect of undeveloped land (4), townscape and heritage (9 and 10), community cohesion (12), housing delivery (13), individuals and groups (16) and deprivation and inequality (19) are uncertain at this stage, as it would adopt a criteria-based approach of which is unknown.

Conclusion:

Options H8(i) and H8(ii) would both bring a similar number of positive effects on the sustainability objectives. However, it is recommended that option H8(i) is adopted as this would ensure that the contents of the SPD are incorporated into planning policy, giving it full weight, and providing more certainty that the objectives will indeed be met in reality.

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 preferred option. However, the options that seek to significantly limit the delivery of HMOs may have adverse effects on those of a certain age group, for example, young adults or students. The preferred option seeks to mitigate these effects by ensuring some level of control over HMOs to ensure that a sufficient amount of family dwellings are protected, whilst still providing some level of flexibility to this type of accommodation such that local HMO needs can be met.

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.

H14: Suburban renewal and generation

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
H14(i) ❖	Specific opportunities for suburban renewal and regeneration to be identified, once the work has been undertaken	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0
H14(ii) ▼	Proposals for renewal and regeneration of Reading's suburban residential areas but no specific locations identified	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	?	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0
H14(iii)	To identify detailed proposals for areas including housing provision figures	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0

COMMENTS:

H14(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would have positive sustainability impacts on minimising the consumption of, and reducing damage to undeveloped land (4), enhancing the townscape character (9), and promoting strong communities through reduction in crime, fear of crime and enhanced community

cohesion (12). It would have a significant positive effect on ensuring the delivery of high-quality housing that is of a type and cost appropriate to the needs of the area (13). A positive effect would be felt on reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19).

H14 (ii): Business as usual:

The existing policy wording would bring positive effects towards minimising the consumption of and reducing damage to undeveloped land (4), enhancing townscape character (9), promoting strong communities through reduction in crime, fear of crime and enhanced community cohesion (12), and reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). The impact on housing delivery is unclear at this time as the proposals would not provide certainty without high levels of detail.

H14(iii): Alternative option 1:

This approach would have positive effects on reducing damage to undeveloped land (4), enhancing townscape character (9), enhancing community cohesion (12) and reducing deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19). The impact on housing delivery (13) could be positive however there is a lack of certainty without the level of detail required at this stage.

Conclusion:

The proposed approach (H14(i)) would result in the most positive sustainability effects and therefore this is the preferred approach.

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.

New Policy: Co-Living

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Co-Living (i)	No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-Living (ii) ❖	New policy for co-living	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-Living (iii)	Criteria-based policy: omit any preference in terms of location	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-Living (iv)	Negative approach to co-living: discouraging co-living overall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-Living (v)	Positive approach to co-living: encourage co-living proposals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?X	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

Co-Living (i): No Policy:

The no-policy approach could lead to a significant negative effect on providing housing of a type appropriate to the needs of the area (13). Although Reading has not dealt with any applications for co-living within the borough yet, it is becoming more common and is therefore expected

that proposals will be brought forward within the plan period. If there is no policy in place that deals with such applications then delivering this type of housing need may become more difficult, failing to meet the needs of the area.

Co-Living (ii): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would have a significant positive effect on ensuring the provision of housing that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13) should such proposals come forward, as a policy would already be in place to deal with such. It would also have a positive effect on reducing the need for travel and transport, as well as facilitating and encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14) as the policy would limit proposals for co-living to town centre and of edge-of-centre sites where parking is not required. It may also lead to positive impacts with respect to objective 12, that seeks to promote strong and vibrant communities through enhancing community cohesion, as it would include minimum thresholds for communal space and tenancy period and would in essence respond to a need for co-living which is popular amongst younger populations, who are used to living communally after studying.

Co-Living (iii): Alternative option 1:

This option could have a negative effect on delivering the type of housing that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13) as it could result in co-living competing with other much-needed housing for scarce sites, making it difficult to meet Reading's housing needs. As above, it would have a tendency towards positive effects in respect of promoting strong and vibrant communities (12).

Co-Living (iv): Alternative option 2:

This option would likely have a negative effect on ensuring the provision of housing that is of an appropriate type to the needs of the area (13), as it would make co-living more restrictive and limit the flexibility of housing opportunities for younger people in particular.

Co-living (v): Alternative option 3:

Adopting a more positive approach to co-living would have a positive effect on encouraging sustainable and active travel choices (14) and could result in positive effects on promoting strong and vibrant communities through enhancing community cohesion (12). However, it may have a negative impact on delivering the right type of housing if there is a surplus of co-living accommodation delivered, or if there is limited land available for other types of housing within the borough as a result.

Conclusion:

Option Co-Living (ii) has the most positive impacts and is therefore the preferred approach.

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.

TR1: Achieving the transport strategy**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Incorporate new objectives from latest Transport Strategy	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0
TR1(ii) ▼	Retain existing approach, policy to not refer to latest transport strategy	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:**TR1(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would incorporate the objectives of the latest Transport Strategy, including updated references to healthy streets, smart solutions, and cross-referencing the climate emergency, leading to significant positive effects in relation to objectives 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14 and 18.

TR1(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would still have positive effects on addressing the climate emergency (1, 2, 3, 5, 6), promoting human health and strong communities (11,12), encouraging sustainable travel choices (14) and economic growth (18), however, the effects would not be as pronounced as TR1(i).

Conclusion:

TR1(i) would result in the most significant effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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 and 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) ❖	Update list of completed projects, new projects added to policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0
TR2(ii) ▼	Retain existing approach, no updates to transport projects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	XX	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	?X	0

COMMENTS:

TR2(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would have significant positive effects in relation to sustainable and active transport (14), facilitating sustainable economic growth (18) and reducing inequality and deprivation (19) through enabling and supporting the delivery of forthcoming transport projects within the borough.

TR2(ii): Business as usual:

If the policy is not updated to coincide with the latest major transport projects, then it could make it difficult for some of the projects to be delivered. In turn, this could potentially result in negative effects with respect of encouraging sustainable and active travel use (14), encouraging sustainable economic growth (18) and reducing inequality and deprivation (19). There would be a significant negative on internationally designated wildlife sites if this approach was taken forward (8). This is because, if there is no update to promote the major projects, then it could lead to increased vehicle travel which could result in negative impacts on Chilterns Beechwoods, Hartslock Wood and/or Thames Basin Heaths in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration and air pollution and quality.

Conclusion:

Option TR2(i) would have the most positive effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

Habitat Regulations issues:

The impact on internationally-designated wildlife sites is unknown at this stage.

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.

TR4: Cycle routes and facilities

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Proposals map to show cycle network from the LCWP and policy to outline different requirements for the five types of cycle route	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0
TR4(ii) ▼	Retain existing approach, no updates to cycle routes/facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

TR4(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach could result in positive benefits with respect to the environmental objectives (1,2,3,5,6) as it would enhance the cycling-network within the Borough, subsequently reducing the number of CO² emissions. This would have a positive effect on promoting healthy lifestyles (11) and a significant positive effect on reducing the need for travel and transport by car and encouraging sustainable/active travel choices (14). It would also have a positive effect on enhancing opportunities to engage in physical activity (17)

TR4(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would generally have neutral effects on the sustainability objectives. However, it could tend towards negative effects with respect of sustainable transport (14) as it would potentially miss opportunities to enhance the borough's cycling network, failing to further encourage this type of sustainable active travel.

Conclusion:

Option TR4(i) would result in the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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.

TR5: Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Residential EV charging requirements removed, non-residential development EV charging provision increased to 20%, introducing a presumption in favour of charging infrastructure	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
TR5(ii) ▼	No additional EV charging contributions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	?X	0	0
TR5(iii)	Seek a higher proportion of non-residential parking to include charge points	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

TR5(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would result in positive effects with respect to the environmental objectives (1,2,3,5,6) as it would enable the provision of additional EV charging provision across the borough. Similarly, it would result in positive effects in regard to encouraging sustainable travel (14) as well as

encouraging economic growth (18) by providing a sufficient quantum of EV chargers for commuters, visitors, plus businesses providing local services e.g., taxi and delivery services, making Reading a more accessible location that may indirectly help to boost the economy.

TR5(ii): Business as usual:

This approach could result in continued reliance on petrol/diesel car use, having negative effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14). Similarly, if there is insufficient provision of EV charging points, in particular for businesses and local services, it could make mobility in Reading more challenging, having a negative effect on the local economy.

TR5(iii): Alternative Option 1:

This approach would result in positive effects with respect to the environmental objectives (1,2,3,5,6) as it would enable the provision of additional EV charging provision across the borough. Similarly, it would result in positive effects in regard to encouraging sustainable travel (14). However, the impact on the economy is unknown (18) as requiring the provision of a greater number of EV chargers may subsequently result in difficulty with achieving viability/deliverability of a proposed non-residential development.

Conclusion:

Option TR5(i) would result in the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred option.

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.

RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Needs for retail, leisure and culture takes into account the most up-to-date information	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0
RL2(ii) ▼	Needs for retail, leisure and culture based on data that is over five years old	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL2(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would have significantly positive impacts on providing opportunities for all to engage in culture and leisure development (17) and enabling sustainable economic growth and regeneration that provides employment opportunities that meets the current needs of the area (18). The impact on undeveloped land (4) is uncertain at this stage without up-to-date information on retail, leisure and cultural development needs. This approach could result in a negative impact on internationally designated wildlife sites (8), as, it could mean increased vehicle trips into Reading, meaning negative impacts on Chilterns Beechwoods, Hartslock Wood and/or Thames Basin Heaths in terms of noise, disturbance and vibration and air pollution and quality. This depends on the scale of retail need identified.

RL2(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would likely have an unknown effect on enabling residents to engage in culture, leisure and physical and recreational activity (17), as well as facilitating sustainable economic growth and regeneration that provides opportunities for all (18), as the scale and location

of such development would be based on out-of-date information in relation to needs, and therefore may under-provide (or indeed over-provide, resulting in other adverse effects on the local economy), especially as the latest data set was produced before the pandemic.

Conclusion:

RL2(i) would have the most positive sustainability impacts and is therefore the proposed approach.

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.

RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy updated to reflect new use classes and Article 4 direction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
RL3(ii) ▼	Retaining reference to out-of-date use classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0
RL3 (iii)	To seek to retain a minimum proportion of use class E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

RL3(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would have a positive effect in relation to the promotion and improvement of human health (11) as, although Class E encompasses a wider range of uses, part (b) of the policy will be carried forward and retain control over various uses, for example, the quantum of takeaways within a locality. The policy would enable a diverse range of uses within local centres, ensuring a positive effect on encouraging sustainable and active travel choices, for example, walking (14). It would also have a positive effect on facilitating sustainable economic growth, supporting a competitive, inclusive and balanced local economy that meets the needs of the area (18).

RL3(ii): Business as usual:

The existing policy approach essentially has the same impacts on the sustainability objective as option RL3(i). This is because the key changes relate to updating the policy wording so that it accords with the use class order updates the changes of which would have no material effect on the sustainability objectives.

RL3 (iii): Alternative option 1:

Seeking to retain a minimum proportion of use class E is not considered to result in any additional positive sustainability effects given that use class E is so wide ranging.

Conclusion:

All three approaches would have the same impact on the sustainability objectives. This is because the proposed approach relates primarily to revising the wording such that it reflects the new use classes. Given the broad nature of use Class E, option RL3(iii) is not considered to bring any additional effects with respect to the sustainability objectives should this option be pursued. RL3(i) would be the preferred approach overall, as it would be in line with up-to-date use-classes and Article 4 directions, making the application of this policy easier in reality.

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.

RL4: Betting shops and payday loan companies**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy extended to cover all gaming establishments and clarification that where there are already three establishments within 150sqm, no further increase will be permitted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	
RL4(ii) ▼	To allow for adult gaming centres to continue to cluster and the possibility for the policy wording to be interpreted such that there are no limits beyond the threshold of three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0
RL4(iii)	To set an alternative threshold for adult gaming centres	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓X	0

COMMENTS:**RL4(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would have positive effects on enhancing and protecting townscape character (9), protect and promote human health, safety and well-being (11), and promote strong and vibrant communities (12). It would have a significant positive effect on the reduction of deprivation and inequality within and between communities (19), as it would seek to mitigate against proliferating economic problems that can coincide when such uses are clustered together.

RL4(ii): Business as usual:

Although the existing approach would to some extent have a positive effect on objectives 9, 11, 12, and 19 as there is some level of control on betting shops, retaining this approach could also have negative effects on these objectives as it would allow for adult gaming centres to continue to cluster, leaving to effects on local economic conditions and character of the local area.

RL4(ii): Alternative option 1:

This alternative approach would to some extent have a positive effect on objectives 9, 11, 12, and 19 as it would mean applying a different threshold for adult gaming centres. However, it would not address a situation where there is a combination of adult gaming centres and betting shops which could enable the continued clustering of the uses, bringing negative effects on these sustainability objectives.

Conclusion:

The proposed approach (RL4(i)) is the preferred option as this would bring 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.

OU2: Hazardous installations

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Additional clause to make specific reference to development within the revised Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ), new boundary added to Proposals Map, supporting text on AWE Burghfield to be rewritten to include the updated position	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	?	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OU2(ii) ▼	No reference made to the revised DEPZ	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

OU2(i): Proposed Approach:

This option would result in significant positive impacts in respect to human health (11) as it would seek to limit any population increase within the newly defined boundaries of AWE. The impact on undeveloped land (4), biodiversity and wildlife (7) and landscape (9) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on whether any other land uses are put forward within the newly revised DEPZ.

OU2(ii): Business as usual:

In practice, retaining the existing approach would have little effect as proposed development within the revised DEPZ boundaries (such as residential) would not be permitted as a result in the changes to national legislation that would still apply regardless as to whether the policy is updated or not.

Conclusion:

Option OU2(i) is the preferred approach as it would result in the most positive 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 and 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) ❖	Removal of reference to outdated technology, reinforce requirement for careful siting and design of masts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OU3(ii) ▼	No reference to changing technology, the new role of permitted development rights, or the investigation of alternative sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**OU3(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would bring significant positive impacts on landscape and townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10) as the wording would be strengthened so as to express the Council's requirement for careful siting and design of installations to ensure there is no adverse impact on amenity, heritage, trees and highways safety.

OU3(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have positive effects in regard to landscape and townscape character (9) and the historic environment (10), albeit the benefits would be less pronounced.

Conclusion:

Option OU3(i) is the preferred approach as it would bring about 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.

CR2: Design in Central Reading

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Re-establish the 'original grid', add reference to designing BNG, clarify how conflict should be dealt with	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR2(ii) ▼	No reference to the most up-to-date government guidance or adoption of local design codes, reference to the 'existing grid', no addressing of conflicts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR2(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would result in significant positive effects in relation to enhancing the amount of diversity and wildlife and habitat (7) through adding reference to designing biodiversity net-gain. It would also have significant positive effects on enhancing landscape and townscape character (9) through seeking to re-establish the existing grid and incorporating references to the design codes within the supporting text. It would result in positive effects for promoting strong and vibrant communities (12) and sustainable transport.

CR2(ii): Business as usual:

This option would still result in positive effects for landscape and townscape character (9), protection of the historic environment (10), promote strong and vibrant communities (12) and sustainable transport (14), however, these effects overall would be less pronounced.

Conclusion:

Option CR2(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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.

CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy to be in alignment with the Cumulative Impact Assessment when further details are provided	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0
CR5(ii) ▼	Do not update the policy, would not refer to the Licencing Policy or CIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**CR5(i): Proposed Approach:**

The impacts from the proposed approach are unknown at this stage given the full details of the Cumulative Impact Assessment are yet to be published. Subject to this update, there may be implications on health and wellbeing (11), crime (12), leisure (17) and economy (18).

CR5(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have no material impact on the sustainability objectives at this stage.

Conclusion:

Without the full details of the Cumulative Impact Assessment, it is difficult assess fully the impacts of either approach and more information is required to do a full assessment.

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.

CR6: Living in Central Reading

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	To increase the minimum proportion of family homes of three or more bedrooms expected on town centre sites from 5% to 10%.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0
CR6(ii) ▼	Developments for 15+ homes will include 5% of dwellings at three or more bedrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0
CR6(iii)	To increase the minimum proportion of three-bedroom homes to 20%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	?X	0	0	✓X	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR6(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach could have a tendency towards a positive effect in respect of objective 12 which seeks to promote strong and vibrant communities and enhance community cohesion. By increasing the no. of three or more bedrooms within a given development by 5%, it would enable a more diversified and varied locality that could strengthen the sense of community and integration between people of different ages and

life stages. It would have significant positive effects on delivering housing of a type and cost appropriate to the needs of the area (13) and providing for groups of a certain age group who have a need for such type of housing (e.g., families) (16). As the town centre is likely to make up the majority of housing delivery over the plan period, there will likely be a greater demand for dwellings with 3+ bedrooms within this vicinity, and this policy seeks to address this.

CR6(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach could result in a negative effect on housing (13) and supporting certain groups based on age (16) as it would fail to secure more family homes, and, given that the town centre will make up the majority of housing delivery over the plan period, retaining the 5% threshold for family-sized dwellings may fail to meet the demand over the plan period.

CR6(iii): Alternative option 1:

This approach could result in positive effects in respect of objective 12 and 16 by increasing the mixture of family housing on site, as noted with CR6(i). However, at 20%, there is a risk that this approach may not be in line with demand on site, failing to provide housing of a type that is appropriate to the needs of the area (13) or indeed particular groups/individuals of ages with a need for family housing (16).

Conclusion:

Option CR6(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: 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.

CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Removal of final paragraph following the updates to the Use Class Order which introduced Use Class E, amend wording to the 1 st paragraph to refer to revised Use Class Order, changes to the existing/proposed frontages within Proposals Map	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR7(ii) ▼	Wording to refer to former use classes and outdated existing/proposed frontages on Proposals Map	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CR7(iii)	To seek to retain a minimum proportion of use to class E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR7(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would bring positive sustainability effects on protecting the townscape character (9), promoting strong and vibrant communities (12), and facilitating sustainable economic growth and regeneration (18).

CR7(ii): Business as usual:

The existing policy approach would have similar impacts, bringing positive sustainability effects on protecting the townscape character (9), promoting strong and vibrant communities (12), and facilitating sustainable economic growth and regeneration (18).

CR7(iii): Alternative option 1:

Retaining a minimum proportion of use class E would also have similar effects on the sustainability objectives as CR7(i) and CR7(ii). This is because Class E is so wide-ranging that requiring a minimum proportion of use class E would have little effect in practice given the breadth of uses that fall within this class.

Conclusion:

All three approaches would have the same impact on the sustainability objectives. However, RL3(i) would be the preferred approach overall, as it would be in line with up-to-date use-classes and Article 4 directions, making the application of this policy easier in reality.

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.

CR11: Station/River Major Opportunity Area**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Capacity of Apex (CR11d) be increased and separated out from Brunel Arcade. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?	?✓	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:**CR11(i): Proposed Approach:**

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5) and encouraging sustainable travel (14). The impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) and economic growth (18) would have a positive effect if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

CR12: West Side Major Opportunity Area**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA. Possibility for Cattle Market site (CR12a) to increase number of homes and reduces amount of retail.	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	✓X	0	0

COMMENTS:**CR12(i): Proposed Approach:**

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). It would also reduce the need for travel and transport (14) if the capacity of town centre sites is increased. The impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. The impact on sustainable economic growth (18) is positive in a sense as it

would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA. However, there is a possibility that this provision could also be reduced pending the HELAA. In addition, the Cattle Market site is proposing to reduce the amount of retail on site in place of housing, potentially reducing the availability of commercial/retail space for end users. Nonetheless, if alterations on commercial use is based on a needs assessment, then there is no reason why this would necessarily result in negative effects per se. As such, in a sense, the impact on economic growth is somewhat uncertain at this stage.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

CR13: East Side Major Opportunity Area

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA. Possibility for Kenavon Drive and Forbury Business Park site (CR13c) to increase number of homes. Greater emphasis on Reading Prison to deliver cultural, heritage or leisure use.	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	✓?	?✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR13(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). It would also reduce the need for travel and

transport (14) if the capacity of town centre sites is increased. The impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is in part unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. In addition, should the policy be updated to assert greater emphasis on Reading Prison to deliver cultural, heritage or leisure use, this would certainly result in benefits in relation to the townscape and historic character, and would have significant positive effects on providing opportunities for all to engage in culture and leisure (17). The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. The impact on sustainable economic growth (18) is positive as it would enable more homes (and cultural development) within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

CR14: Other sites for development in Central Reading

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CR14(i) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA.*	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	✓?	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

*Possible additions to the policy through the call for sites (or other sources) are assessed separately under CEN1, CEN2, CEN3, CEN4, CEN5, CEN6, CEN7, CEN8, CEN9, CEN10.

COMMENTS:

CR14(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations subject to the outcome of the HELAA, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). It would also reduce the need for travel and transport (14) if the capacity of town centre sites is increased. The possible impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use (pending HELAA results) and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. Depending on the outcome of the HELAA, the impact on sustainable economic growth (18) could be positive in a sense as it would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

CR15: The Reading Abbey Quarter

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Reading Prison to be considered as part of the Abbey Quarter, for the areas to link into and complement one another	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0
CR15(ii) ▼	Abbey Quarter to be considered in the context of Reading Prison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CR15(i): Proposed Approach:

This approach would have positive effects on maintaining and enhancing townscape character (9), promoting strong and vibrant communities (11), and facilitating sustainable economic growth (18). It would have significant positive effects on improving human health and wellbeing (10), and enhancing opportunities for all to engage in culture, leisure, and physical and recreational activity (17).

CR15(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would have positive impacts on maintaining and enhancing townscape character (9), protect and enhancing the historic environment (10), promoting strong and vibrant communities (11), and facilitating sustainable economic growth (18). It would have significant positive effects on improving human health and wellbeing, and enhancing opportunities for all to engage in culture, leisure, and physical and recreational activity. In general, however, the positive impacts would be less pronounced.

Conclusion:

Considering the Reading Prison site as part of the Abbey Quarter within the context of this policy as per the proposed approach contained within CR15(i) would ensure that additional cultural, heritage and/or leisure use is brought to the local community. This approach would result in the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the preferred option.

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.

SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Updates to show where parts of the allocation have been completed, and consider implications of a new assessment of employment needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

SR1(i): Proposed Approach:

The proposed approach would have positive effects in relation to facilitating sustainable economic growth (18, 20) as it would consider the latest assessment of local employment needs within the borough.

Conclusion:

No alternative approaches have been considered within this assessment and therefore SR1(i) should be carried forward.

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.

SR4: Other sites for development in South Reading

Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Removal of SR4(f): Land Southwest of Junction 11 of the M4. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA.*	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	0

*Possible additions to the policy through the call for sites (or other sources) are assessed separately under SOU1, SOU2, SOU3, SOU4.

COMMENTS:

SR4(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations subject to the outcome of the HELAA, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). The possible impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use (pending HELAA results) and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. Depending on the outcome of the HELAA, the impact on sustainable economic growth (18) could positive in a sense as it would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA. space for end users.

The removal of allocation SR4(f) will inevitably result in adverse effects in terms of delivery of housing and commercial use (13, 18). However, even if this policy were to be carried forward, given the changes to the REPPIR legislation which have extended the Detailed Emergency Planning

Zones around AWE Burghfield, development on this site would still be undeliverable and in that sense, there is no merit in considering the adverse effects this may have on the sustainability effects as its implementation is in effect beyond the control of RBC.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

SR5: Leisure and recreation use of the Kennetside areas**Sustainability Objectives and Effect**

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SR5(i) ❖	To state that works to create a resilient wetland in the Kennet Meadows will be supported subject to impact on flood risk and biodiversity	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0
SR5(ii) ▼	To ensure proposals do not have an adverse impact on biodiversity, flood risk, landscape, etc., but to not incorporate aims of Biodiversity Action Plan or Reading Climate Emergency Strategy	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:**SR5(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would result in a number of significantly positive effects, such as addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change in terms of preparedness (2), protecting and enhancing the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), and providing opportunities for all to engage in leisure, and physical and recreational activity in areas of waterspace (17). It would also bring positive effects on promoting human health and well-being (11).

SR5(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would result in moderate positive effects on adapting to climate change in terms of preparedness (2), protecting and enhancing the amount and diversity of wildlife, habitat and geology (7), enhancing landscape character (9), promoting human health and well-being (11), and providing opportunities for all to engage in leisure, and physical and recreational activity in areas of waterspace (17).

Conclusion:

Option SR5(i) would have the most positive sustainability effects and is therefore the proposed approach.

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. If a proposal results in additional use of the Kennet by boats, it should not have an adverse effect on the River Kennet Site of Special Scientific Interest further upstream. Careful attention would be required when assessing any future proposals to ensure that there would be no adverse impacts on flood risk and biodiversity.

WR3: Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
WR3(i) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA.*	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

* Possible additions to the policy through the call for sites (or other sources) are assessed separately under WES1, WES2, WES3, and WES4.

COMMENTS:

WR3(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations subject to the outcome of the HELAA, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). The possible impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use (pending HELAA results) and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. Depending on the outcome of the HELAA, the impact on sustainable economic growth (18) could be positive in a sense as it would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA. space for end users.

Conclusion:

See above.

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.

CA1: Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CA1(i) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA.	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

COMMENTS:

CA1(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations subject to the outcome of the HELAA, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). The possible impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use (pending HELAA results) and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. Depending on the outcome of the HELAA, the impact on sustainable economic growth (18) could be positive in a sense as it would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA. space for end users.

Conclusion

See above.

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.

ER1: Other sites for development in East Reading

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
ER1(i) ❖	Policy updated to reflect the status of development on allocated sites. Possible changes to capacity levels possible following results from HELAA.*	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0

* Possible additions to the policy through the call for sites (or other sources) are assessed separately under EAS1.

COMMENTS:

ER1(i): Proposed Approach:

There could be positive impacts on addressing climate change (1,2,3) though increasing the density on existing allocations subject to the outcome of the HELAA, which could also help to avoid building on undeveloped land (4) as well as making appropriate use of resources (5). The possible impact on townscape character and the historic environment (9 and 10) is unknown at this stage as it would depend on the extent to which the identified sites are altered in terms of their capacity and intensification of use (pending HELAA results) and therefore their impact on the surrounding environment. However, it is hoped that the impact on these objectives would be positive as their effect on such should be controlled via other policies contained within the local plan. The impact on housing delivery (13) would be positive if the capacity is altered to help to meet the various development needs. Depending on the outcome of the HELAA, the impact on sustainable economic growth (18) could be positive in a sense as it would enable more homes within the borough which would help boost the local economy and workforce, and indeed it could be that more office/commercial space is brought forward subject to the results of the HELAA. space for end users.

Conclusion

See above.

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.

ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading**Sustainability Objectives and 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) ❖	Development for the purposes of meeting sustainability goals specifically referenced within the policy, and to include any else emerging from the University's plans to be taken into account	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	?✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓
ER2(ii) ▼	Retain existing approach, no reference in the policy on development meeting sustainability goals or incorporation of other University plans.	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	?✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓

COMMENTS:**ER2(i): Proposed Approach:**

The proposed approach would bring positive effects on addressing, adapting and ensuring efficient use of resources (1,2,3) as the policy update would specifically refer to development meeting the University's sustainability goals. 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 continue to provide specific guidance on the type of educational establishment and facilitate sustainable economic growth.

ER2(ii): Business as usual:

The existing approach would bring positive effects 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 ER2(i) would bring the most positive effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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 and 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) ❖	To reference RBC's preference for RBH to remain in Reading, to enable sensitive expansion, that provisions are set out for the use of the site in the event that the hospital moves.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓X	0	?	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓X	✓X	0	0	?✓	0	0
ER3(ii) ▼	No policy provisions for the potential changes and/or vacating of RBH	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	✓	✓	?	0	0	?	?	0	0	?✓	0	0
ER3(iii)	To identify the site as a formal development allocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	0	?	0	0

COMMENTS:**ER3(i): Proposed Approach:**

Many of the effects on addressing and adapting to the climate emergency are both positive and negative. For example, if the health care facilities are expanded on-site, this would likely lead to positive effects on objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, as it would make more efficient use of an existing developed site that is accessible via public transport, with new facilities adhering to the latest sustainability targets. It would also result in good access to healthcare facilities (15) and facilitate sustainable and active travel choices (14). However, if the hospital moves, then the implications on objective 1-6 are unknown at this stage, without further detail on where the new facility would be located. For example, if it is to be situated on greenfield land that is only accessible by car, then this could result in negative effects on these objectives, as well as objective 14 and 15. However, regardless on whether the hospital remains in situ or relocates, the policy approach would have positive effects on enhancing townscape character (9) and protecting the historic environment (10), as well as protecting, promoting and improving human health (11) as a result of the proposed policy wording. It would also tend towards positive effects on sustainable economic growth that meets the needs of the area (18). The impact on internationally designated wildlife sites (8) is unknown at this stage as if the hospital is relocated, the new site is yet to be confirmed and therefore any proximity to an internationally wildlife site is not known.

ER3(ii): Business as usual:

If the existing policy approach is retained, it is difficult to understand what impact this would have on addressing the climate emergency (1), adapting to climate change (2), ensuring good use of resources (3), reducing the consumption of undeveloped land (4), minimising the generation of waste (5), minimising pollution (6) and promoting human health (11), as it would not provide specific guidance on the future options available to this site. Indeed, it would result in a policy gap, and therefore, meeting these objectives may be more difficult to meet without detailed criteria on either expanding on-site facilities or re-location. The impact on protecting and enhancing townscape (9) and the historic environment (10) would be positive as it would carry forward the existing policy wording. It would still likely result in a positive effect on sustainable economic growth that meets the needs of the area (18). The impact on internationally designated wildlife sites (8) is unknown at this stage as if the hospital is relocated, the new site is yet to be confirmed and therefore any proximity to an internationally wildlife site is not known.

ER3(iii): Alternative option 1:

There would be a lot of ambiguity if the site were to be identified as a formal development allocation. This is because a decision has not yet been made on whether the hospital will remain or move, and therefore the actual delivery of an allocation is uncertain. As such, although allocating this site could in theory bring a number of sustainability effects, because a decision is yet to be made, it is difficult to assess what positive or negative impacts such an allocation would have, if it may not be deliverable. The impact on internationally designated wildlife sites (8) is unknown at this stage as if the hospital is relocated, the new site is yet to be confirmed and therefore any proximity to an internationally wildlife site is not known.

Conclusion:

The proposed approach (ER3(i)) would have the most positive sustainability effects and would ensure a robust policy is in place to guide either outcome, and is therefore the preferred approach.

Habitat Regulations issues:

It is unknown whether the proposed option would have an impact on internationally designated wildlife sites as an alternative site for the hospital, if carried forward, is not confirmed at this stage.

Equality issues:

No equality issues have been identified with the proposed option.

MITIGATION: Any negative environmental effects that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated, as well as effects on local character. Should the hospital be relocated, careful consideration is necessary to ensure that the new site would not adversely impact any internationally designated wildlife sites.

Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrove Street

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN1(i)	Redevelop offices for mixed residential and office development of 10-15 storeys	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?X	?	?	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓✓	0	?X
CEN1(ii) ▼	Do not allocate (remains as offices and car parking)	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN1(iii)	Redevelopment for mixed use residential and office at below tall building threshold (12 storeys)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓✓	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CEN1(i): Option 1:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,2,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. In relation to the impact on townscape (9) and the historic environment (10) there is also a risk that it may harm the existing townscape and historic character given the proposed height (10-15 storeys) and nearby heritage assets, including its siting within a conservation area. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging

sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links and significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). In addition, significant positives would still be felt in terms of economic employment as office development would still be retained at the site (18). A mixed-use development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

CEN1(ii): Option 2:

The land currently comprises office space and a car park. Retaining the existing use could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs.

CEN1(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,2,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. In relation to the impact on townscape (9) and the historic environment (10) there is also a risk that it may harm the existing townscape and historic character given the proposed height and nearby heritage assets, including its siting within a conservation area. However, this could be mitigated through sensitive design and proposed heights, albeit this impact is somewhat uncertain at this stage. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links and significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). In addition, significant positives would still be felt in terms of economic employment as office development would still be retained at the site (18). A mixed-use development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Option CEN1(i) and CEN1(iii) have the same number of positive and negative effects. A decision on which option should be carried forward would be better assessed once there is greater detail on how many housing numbers each option could deliver, as well as proposed design.

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: Any negative effects on health and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated, as well as effects on local character and heritage.

Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN2(i)	Move the Central Library to Bridge Street. Residential-led development at former library site.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓	0	✓X
CEN2(ii) ▼	Do not allocate, site continued as library	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN2(iii)	Commercial development including office and ground floor retail and related uses.	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?	0	0	?	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

CEN2(i): Option 1:

Relocating the library to Bridge Street would result in an upgraded, modern library facility that enhances opportunities for all to engage in culture and leisure (17), provision of economic growth through continuing to provide jobs as a result of the relocation (18) and offering access to education and knowledge (20). Developing the former library site would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment at library site may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. However, care is required in relation to managing flood risk (2) if the existing site would be redeveloped for residential use, it's siting within Flood Zone 2 and proximity to The Holy Brook. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would

be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout of the redevelopment of the existing site and indeed the new library at Bridge Street. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, including the impact it would have on the Market Place/London Street Conservation Area and the Reading Abbey scheduled ancient monument. Caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on these designations. This approach would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given both locations' proximity to nearby transport links, and significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

CEN2(ii): Option 2:

The impact on housing (13) and undeveloped land (4) is uncertain at this stage if the site was kept as a library as it would fail to meet Reading's housing needs, and could require development elsewhere, on land that may not be previously developed.

CEN3(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the library site for commercial (office and retail) would still result in an upgraded, modern library facility that enhances opportunities for all to engage in culture and leisure (17) if it is relocated to Bridge Street. It would also enable economic growth through continuing to provide jobs as a result of the relocation, plus the addition of new offices/commercial use at the existing site (18). Furthermore, it would offer continued access to education and knowledge (20). Developing the former library site for commercial use would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment at library site may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. The impact on undeveloped land (4) and housing delivery (13) is uncertain, because it would not assist in meeting the Borough's housing needs and therefore, it could result in residential development being built elsewhere on land that is not previously developed. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout of the redevelopment of the existing site and indeed the new library at Bridge Street. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, including the impact it would have on the Market Place/London Street Conservation Area and the Reading Abbey scheduled ancient monument. Caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on these designations. This approach would have positive significant effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given both locations' proximity to nearby transport links.

Conclusion:

Option CEN2(i) would have the most positive sustainability impacts and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on flooding, environment, health, or townscape and historic character that would occur as a result of redeveloping the library site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN3(i)	Redevelop warehouse for 200 build to rent dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	0
CEN3(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN3(iii)	Retain as part of existing allocation (CR14g)	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	✓X	0	0	✓	✓	0	0
CEN3(iv)	Residential development at more general town centre or edge of centre densities (75-125 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	0

COMMENTS:

CEN3(i): Option 1:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as building here would enable some of the borough's housing needs to be situated on previously developed land. There are existing trees and hedgerows nearby, particularly along Mill Lane, the impact of which is unknown at this stage (7). The impact on landscape and townscape is also unknown (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the archaeology of the site as well as the nearby conservation area and listed buildings (10). The redevelopment of this site for residential would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, and significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18) could tend towards negative effects as it would result in the loss of an existing employment space.

CEN3(ii): Option 2:

The land currently comprises employment space. Retaining the existing use could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs. It would have a neutral impact on the economy (18) as it would continue with its existing office use.

CEN3(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Redeveloping the site for retail and parking could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs. The impact on the townscape character (9) and nearby heritage assets (10) is unknown at this stage but caution would be required to ensure that redevelopment does not harm the appearance of the nearby conservation area and listed buildings, as well as the existing trees and hedgerows present (7). In relation to sustainable transport (14), the retail use would be situated within proximity to key transport links, helping to meet this objective. However, a new car park would be placed here, encouraging unsustainable modes of travel for employees and customers. Therefore, the impact is both positive and negative. It would have a positive impact on the economy (18) as it would deliver retail use.

CEN3(iv): Option 4:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. There are existing trees and hedgerows nearby, particularly along Mill Lane, the impact of which is unknown at this stage (7). The impact on landscape and townscape is also unknown (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, could be considered that a development that comprises a more general 'town centre' or 'edge of centre' type density would be more appropriate to the surrounding townscape compared with the proposed dwelling numbers under option CEN3(i). Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the archaeology of the site as well as the nearby conservation area and listed buildings (10). The redevelopment of this site for residential would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18) could tend towards negative effects as it would result in the loss of an existing employment space.

Conclusion:

Option CEN3(i) and CEN3(iv) are the preferred options as they would have the most significantly 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: Any negative effects on the environment, health, or townscape and historic character that would occur as a result of redeveloping the library site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN4(i)	Redevelop site for mix of uses through the full or partial redevelopment for hotel with ancillary food and beverage offering, major residential, care home and/or electric vehicle charging station/garage.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓X
CEN4(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN4(iii)	Hotel redevelopment only (whole site)	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN4(iv)	Hotel redevelopment only (car park)	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN4(v)	Residential development and/or residential care only (whole site, estimated at 90-140 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?✓	0	✓X	0	✓X
CEN4(vi)	Residential development and/or residential care only (car park, estimated at 40-60 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	?✓	0	?✓	0	✓X

COMMENTS:**CEN4(i): Option 1:**

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape, townscape and heritage is unknown at this stage (9, 10) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Caution is required to avoid any adverse impacts on the locally listed building just north of the site boundary. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links and provision of EV facilities, as well as meeting housing needs (13). In addition, it could benefit individuals and groups who require specialist accommodation if a care home is delivered (16). It would also ensure positive effects in relation to the local economy as the hotel would continue to operate in some capacity (18, 20). A residential development within this location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

CEN4(ii): Option 2:

This approach would have an unknown effect on undeveloped land (4) as it could risk land that is not previously developed elsewhere coming forward to meet the housing needs. Similarly, it would tend towards negative effects with respect of housing delivery (13) as it would fail to accommodate some of Reading's unmet housing need. It would have a neutral impact on the economy (18) as it would continue with its existing commercial use.

CEN4(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. This approach would have an unknown effect on undeveloped land (4) as it could risk land that is not previously developed elsewhere coming forward to meet the housing needs. Similarly, it would tend towards negative effects with respect of housing delivery (13) as it would fail to accommodate some of Reading's unmet housing need. It would tend towards positive effects in relation to economic growth as it would continue its commercial use (18). The impact on landscape, townscape and heritage is unknown at this stage (9, 10) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Caution is required to avoid any adverse impacts on the locally listed building just north of the site boundary. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature.

CEN4(iv): Option 4:

As with option CEN4 (iii), this approach would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. This approach would have an unknown effect on undeveloped land (4) as it could risk land that is not previously developed elsewhere coming forward to meet the housing needs. Similarly, it would tend towards negative effects with respect of housing delivery (13) as it would fail to accommodate some of Reading's unmet housing need. It would tend towards positive effects in relation to economic growth as it would continue its commercial use (18). The impact on landscape, townscape and heritage is unknown at this stage (9, 10) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Caution is required to avoid any adverse impacts on the locally listed building just north of the site boundary. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature.

CEN4(v): Option 5:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the

part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape, townscape and heritage is unknown at this stage (9, 10) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Caution is required to avoid any adverse impacts on the locally listed building just north of the site boundary. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). In addition, it could benefit individuals and groups who require specialist accommodation if a care home is delivered (16). The impact on the economy is uncertain at this stage (18, 20). If a care home is delivered then it would still enable some level of employment growth, however, if it is residential development only then it would have a negative effect in light of the loss of the former hotel site. A residential development within this location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

CEN4(vi): Option 6:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape, townscape and heritage is unknown at this stage (9, 10) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Caution is required to avoid any adverse impacts on the locally listed building just north of the site boundary. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). In addition, it could benefit individuals and groups who require specialist accommodation if a care home is delivered (16). If the existing hotel remains in situ (with residential development also proposed), then the impact on the economy would be largely neutral (18, 20), however, if a residential care home comes forward in addition, then the impact on the economy would be positive as it would enable some level of employment growth and expansion here. A residential development within this location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Options CEN4(i) and CEN4(vi) both equally have the most positive effects which outweigh the negative impacts. As such, one of these options should be pursued.

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: Any negative effects on landscape, townscape, health or environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN5(i)	Demolish and redevelop site for 240 homes	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	?	✓✓	✓✓	?	?	?	X	0	?X
CEN5(ii) ▼	Do not allocate, retain existing use (offices)	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN5(iii)	Residential development at a more general town centre or edge of centre density (110-185 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
CEN5(iv)	Conversion to residential, estimated 70-80 dwellings	✓	?✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CEN5(i): Option 1:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the fringe of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN5(ii): Option 2:

The land currently comprises office space. Retaining the existing use could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs. It would have a neutral impact on the economy (18) as it would continue with its existing office use.

CEN5(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the fringe of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape townscape is somewhat unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, it is likely that a development that comprises a smaller, 'edge of centre' type density would be more appropriate to the surrounding townscape and location compared with the proposed numbers under option CEN5(i). Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN5(iv): Option 4:

This option would result in positive effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6) as it would enable the re-use of an existing building, rather than demolishing and re-developing the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the fringe of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land, as well as encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, plus meeting housing needs (13). There could be possible negative effects on townscape (9) as retaining the existing building may not positively contribute to the existing character of the area, however this objective is ultimately difficult to determine at this stage. A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

Conclusion:

Options CEN5(iv) is the preferred option as it would result in 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: Any negative effects on health and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN6(i)	Residential development of 300-400 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
CEN6(ii) ▼	Do not allocate, continuation in office use	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN6(iii)	Conversion of existing building to residential, estimated around 200 dwellings	✓	?✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	X	X	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
CEN6(iv)	Residential development at general town centre densities, estimated at around 135 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CEN6(i): Option 1:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the site is located within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. There are a number of TPOs nearby the site and the impact as a result of development on these designations is unknown. The impact on landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, and caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on the nearby listed Reading Bridge. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN6(ii): Option 2:

The land currently comprises office space. Retaining the existing use could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs. It would have a neutral impact on the economy (18) as it would continue with its existing office use.

CEN6(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in positive effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6) as it would enable the re-use of an existing building, rather than demolishing and re-developing the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the site is located within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land, as well as encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, plus meeting housing needs (13). The impact on townscape and heritage (9, 10) is unknown at this stage. A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN6(iv): Option 4:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the site is located within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. There are a number of TPOs nearby the site and the impact as a result of development on these designations is unknown. The impact on landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, it is likely that a development that comprises a more general 'town centre' type density would be more appropriate to the surrounding townscape and location compared with the proposed numbers under option CEN6(i). Careful consideration is required to ensure that there would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, and caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on the nearby listed Reading Bridge. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a prime town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

Conclusion:

Options CEN6(i) and CEN6(iv) are the preferred options as they would result in the most positive sustainability effects combined with the least negative 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: Any negative effects on health, heritage and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN7(i)	Residential development of 150-200 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
CEN7 (ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN7(iii)	Additional retail development	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0
CEN7(iv)	Residential development at more typical urban densities, approximately 100 dwellings.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CEN7(i): Option 1:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as building here would enable

some of the borough's housing needs to be situated on previously developed land. There are existing protected trees within the site, the impact of which is unknown at this stage but would need to be carefully thought out to avoid negative effects (7). The impact on landscape and townscape is also unknown (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. The redevelopment of this site for residential would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its relative proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a peripheral town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

CEN7(ii): Option 2:

This option could risk greenfield land coming forward for development in the future, if this site that comprises previously developed land is not brought forward for housing (4). However, this effect is unknown at this stage. Similarly, it would tend towards a negative effect in relation to housing delivery (13).

CEN7(iii): Option 3:

This option would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. The impact on undeveloped land is unknown at this stage. Although it would have a positive effect as it would use existing brownfield land for retail development, if housing is not allocated here, then additional greenfield land may be required to come forward elsewhere to meet housing needs, bringing negative effects in relation to this objective (13). The impact on townscape and landscape character (9) as well as biodiversity (7) is unknown at this stage. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature.

CEN7(iv): Option 4:

This option would have similar effects to CEN7(i). It would result in both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any redevelopment may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Consideration would be required in relation to managing flood risk (2) given that the part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2/3. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as building here would enable some of the borough's housing needs to be situated on previously developed land. There are existing protected trees within the site, the impact of which is unknown at this stage but would need to be carefully thought out to avoid negative effects (7). The impact on landscape and townscape is also unknown (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Careful consideration is required to ensure that would be no implications on the Thames Valley Major Landscape Feature. The redevelopment of this site for residential

would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its relative proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a peripheral town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Options CEN7(i) and CEN7(iv) would both have the same number of positive effects and therefore one of these options should be pursued.

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: Any negative effects on landscape, townscape, health, heritage and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN8(i)	Conversion to approximately 70 apartments	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	?	✓X	?	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?	?	X	0	?X
CEN8(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN8(iii)	Redevelopment for residential at typical town centre densities, approximately 60-100 dwellings.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	?	✓X	?	✓✓	✓✓	?X	?	?	X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

CEN8(i): Option 1:

Conversion to residential would tend towards positive effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). Any repurposing may have environmental costs, but these would hopefully be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change, and it is noted that conversion would be preferable to redevelopment in terms of its impact on the environment. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, and caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on the nearby listed buildings nor archaeology. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel

(14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN8(ii): Option 2:

The land currently comprises office space. Retaining the existing use could risk residential development coming forward elsewhere, i.e., on land that is not previously developed (4). However, this effect is still unknown at this stage. It could result in a negative effect in respect of housing delivery (13) as it would not help to meet any of the borough's housing needs. It would have a neutral impact on the economy (18) as it would continue with its existing office use.

CEN8(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on surrounding heritage (10) is unclear, and caution would be required to ensure any redevelopment has no adverse impacts on the nearby listed buildings nor archaeology. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

Conclusion:

Option CEN8(i) would have the most positive and least negative effects in relation to the sustainability objectives and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, heritage and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN9(i)	Residential development of 250-400 dwellings (215-365 net gain) and c.3,000 sq. m of commercial space	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
CEN9(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN9(iii)	Residential development at general town centre densities of 80-135 dwellings (45-100 net gain)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
CEN9(iv)	Redevelopment of Sapphire Plaza for residential (approx. 50-85 dwellings) with refurbishment of Royal Court.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN9(v)	Conversion of Sapphire Plaza to residential (approximately 70 dwellings) together with refurbishment of Royal Court.	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	X	0	?X

COMMENTS:**CEN9(i): Option 1:**

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN9(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use (office and residential) as it could risk land coming forward elsewhere to help meet any unmet housing needs, i.e., on undeveloped land. The impact on housing delivery (13) could tend towards negative effects as it may miss an opportunity to maximise the site's capacity for residential, failing to deliver the required level of housing needs within the borough.

CEN9(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout, however, achieving lower densities that are more appropriate to the general town centre densities may result in an appearance that respects the existing character more positively than CEN9(i). It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN9(iv): Option 4:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Furthermore, partial refurbishment of the site would help to minimise negative environmental effects. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space.

CEN9(v): Option 5:

Conversion of Sapphire Plaza to residential together with the refurbishment of Royal Court would tend towards positive effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6) as it would entail conversion and retrofitting rather than demolition and rebuilding. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic

growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout.

Conclusion:

Option CEN9(v) would result in the most positive effects on the sustainability objectives, coupled with the least negative effects. As such, this option is the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CEN10(i)	Mixed use or residential (c. 45 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	?✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	?✓	✓	✓X	0	XX	?	0	✓X
CEN10(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEN10(iii)	Residential development of site excluding the part occupied by the theatre	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓X	0	0	0	0	✓X
CEN10(iv)	Development for continued education use	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

CEN10(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land (unless the site is allocated for mixed-use) The impact on biodiversity, including trees within the site that are subject to TPOs, is unknown at this stage (7) and care would be needed to avoid any adverse impact on these. In addition, the impact on landscape and townscape is uncertain without further detail on scale and design of the proposed development. It would have positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14)

given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs, should residential be allocated here (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on leisure and culture (17) as well as access to skills and knowledge (20) would be significantly negative as it could result in the loss of the existing theatre on site. The impact on the economy is generally neutral however if mixed use development is added to the site, then this could result in positive effects in respect of objective 18, depending on what type of mixed use this was.

CEN10(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use as it could risk land coming forward elsewhere to help meet any unmet housing needs, i.e., on greenfield land. The impact on housing delivery (13) is unknown but could tend towards negative effects as it may miss an opportunity to maximise the site's capacity for residential, failing to deliver the required level of housing needs within the borough.

CEN10(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on biodiversity, including trees within the site that are subject to TPOs, is unknown at this stage (7) and care would be needed to avoid any adverse impact on these. In addition, the impact on landscape and townscape is uncertain without further detail on scale and design of the proposed development. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is within a town centre location may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). Neutral effects would be felt in respect of leisure (17) and economy (18) if the existing theatre continues to be used.

CEN10(iv): Option 4:

The impact on climate change objectives (1,2,3,5,6) are difficult to assess at this stage without further information on the extent of development proposed. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity, landscape and townscape (7, 9) cannot be appropriately assessed. The impact on undeveloped land (4) and housing (13) is unknown at this stage should the site be developed for educational use. It would have positive effects on sustainable transport (14) as well as access to leisure and culture (17), sustainable economic growth (18) and providing access to education (20).

Conclusion:

CEN10(iii) would bring the most positive effects mixed with the least negative effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, culture/leisure and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SOU1(i)	Residential and retail development for 200 homes and 2,300 sq. m of retail use.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	✓	0	?X
SOU1 (ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOU1(iii)	Residential development only (estimated similar number of dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
SOU1(iv)	Residential development only with particular focus on family housing (estimated 100 to 150 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	✓	0	X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

SOU1(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site to residential and retail would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its partial siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site (7) that are subject to TPOs. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is on the edge of the town centre may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). The impact on economic growth (18, 20) would be positive if the existing retail space is retained, albeit modernised and upgraded.

SOU1(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use as it could risk land coming forward elsewhere to help meet any unmet housing needs, i.e., on undeveloped land. The impact on housing delivery (13) is unknown but could tend towards negative effects as it may miss an opportunity to maximise the site's capacity for residential, failing to deliver the required level of housing needs within the borough.

SOU1(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its partial siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site (7) that are subject to TPOs. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links, as well as meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is on the edge of the town centre may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). In addition, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) could be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing retail space.

SOU1(iv): Option 4:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. Care would be required to ensure flood risk is mitigated appropriately, given its partial siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site (7) that are subject to TPOs. It would have significant positive effects on encouraging sustainable travel (14) given its proximity to nearby transport links. A residential development that is on the edge of the town centre may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). It would have a positive effect on individuals who are in need of family-sized housing (16), particularly as there is a shortage of this type of housing within the borough. Similarly, a significant effect would be felt in respect of housing delivery (13) that is of a type and size appropriate to the needs, if it has a specific focus on family housing. It would have a negative effect on the economy (18) as a result of existing retail loss.

Conclusion:

Option SOU1(i) would result in the least negative effects (besides the existing approach). As such, this is the preferred option.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SOU2(i)	Residential development of 72-96 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
SOU2(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOU2(iii)	Development for employment uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

SOU2(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). Impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to its envelopment by commercial and industrial uses on all sides, which would have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise,

contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). Furthermore, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) would be negative as it would result in the loss of a large existing employment space which comprises part of the Core Employment Area.

SOU2(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development elsewhere. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

SOU2(iii): Option 3:

Developing the existing site for employment use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. The impact of development taking place on undeveloped land (4) is unknown, should the site be developed for employment use. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have a significant positive effect on contributing to sustainable economic growth (18) and a positive impact on access to skills (20). Impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14).

Conclusion:

Option SOU2(iii) would have the least negative effects (besides the existing approach) and is therefore the preferred option.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SOU3(i)	Residential development of 23 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	0
SOU3(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOU3(iii)	Residential development of 14 dwellings in line with expired permission.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?X	0	?X	0	?X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

SOU3(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, the impact on biodiversity (7) and landscape (9) could tend towards negative effects as a result of loss of landscape entranced and existing habitat. It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). The impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to its proximity to the A33 which would have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise) and any potential

contamination would need to be addressed before housing was located here (although it is arguable that in light of the existing housing situated adjacent to the site/A33, that these effects can be appropriately mitigated). In addition, development could place further stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

SOU3(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

SO34(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, the impact on biodiversity (7) and landscape (9) could tend towards negative effects as a result of loss of landscape entranced and existing habitat. It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). Impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to its proximity to the A33 which would have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise) and any potential contamination would need to be addressed before housing was located here (although it is arguable that in light of the existing housing situated adjacent to the site/A33, that these effects can be appropriately mitigated). In addition, development could place further stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Both SOU3(i) and SOU3(iii) have the same level number of positive effects (as well as negative). Therefore, one of these options should be carried forward. It is difficult to assess in more detail which option would have a more positive impact on housing, biodiversity, landscape and townscape without more information at this stage, however more detail further down the line may result on one option being preferred over the other.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
SOU4(i)	Residential development of 50 dwellings including affordable housing	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	✓✓	?X	0	0	0	0	0	?X
SOU4(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOU4(iii)	Development for office and commercial uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓	

COMMENTS:

SOU4(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. Care would be required to mitigate against any flood risks due to the site's siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on biodiversity, landscape and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13) and the impact on sustainable and active transport would similarly bring significant positive effects

(14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is a significant health risk due to the site's siting within AWE Burghfield's Detailed Emergency Planning Zone. Any development here could place further stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

SOU4(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

SOU4i(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. The impact on undeveloped land as well as housing delivery (4, 13) is unknown at this stage, as well as the impact on biodiversity, wildlife and landscape (7, 9). Commercial and office use would, however, have a significant positive impact on facilitating sustainable economic growth (18) and a positive impact on access to skills (20).

Conclusion:

SOU4(iii) would result in the least negative effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Sou5: Hexham Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SOU5(i)	Residential development	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
SOU5(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOU5 (iii)	Development for community uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓	✓	?	?	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	0

COMMENTS:

SOU5(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site to residential and retail would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site (7). It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being

and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

SOU5(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

SOU5(iii): Option 3:

Developing the site for community uses would result in mixed positive and negatives with respect of climate change policies (1,2,5,6). The impact on housing delivery and building on undeveloped land is unknown (4, 13), as is the impact on sustainable and active transport modes (14). The impact on biodiversity, trees, landscape, and townscape (7, 9) cannot be assessed at this stage without further detail on the design and scale of the development. It would have a positive impact on promoting human health, safety and wellbeing (11), promoting strong and vibrant communities and enhancing community cohesion (12), as well as positively serving individuals, for example, the elderly (16), and significant positive effects on enhancing opportunities for all to engage in leisure (17).

Conclusion:

Option SOU5(iii) would have the most positive effects combined with the least negative effects and is therefore the preferred option.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
WES1(i)	Residential development for circa 70 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	X	0	?X
WES1(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WES1(iii)	Residential development of only vacant land, approx. 10-15 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	?X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
WES1(iv)	Redevelopment for employment uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	0	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

WES(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. Care would be required to ensure that any flooding risk would be mitigated, given it's siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have

significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). Impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to its proximity to commercial and industrial uses nearby (and existing industrial use on the site itself), which would have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise, contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). Furthermore, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) would be negative as it would result in the loss of existing employment space which comprises part of the Core Employment Area.

WES1(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development elsewhere. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

WES1(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the existing site for residential use within the vacant land area would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. Care would be required to ensure that any flooding risk would be mitigated, given it's siting within Flood Zone 2. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout, however, at such a low density, it is not considered to have a significant impact. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). The impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to its proximity to commercial and industrial uses nearby (and existing industrial use on the site itself), which would have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise, contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

WES1(iv): Option 4:

Redeveloping the site for employment use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. In addition, the impact on undeveloped land (4) and housing delivery (13) is unknown, however, there is a risk that greenfield land could come forward elsewhere to meet the unmet housing needs. It would have a significant positive effect with respect of employment growth and a positive effect on access to skills (18, 20).

Conclusion:

WES1(iv) would have the fewest negative impacts on the sustainability objectives and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
WES2(i)	Residential use	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES2(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WES2(iii)	Residential conversion only (10-12 dwellings)	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES2(iv)	Residential redevelopment (estimated at 25-35 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?X	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES2(v)	Conversion plus additional development (20-30 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	?	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X

COMMENTS:

WES2(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on partially previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. The impact on heritage (10) could be negative if it would result in the loss or affect the setting of a building that could be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site that are subject to TPOs (7). It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being and health (11), however, the loss of the nursery could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15), as well as an employment use (18), subject to the delivery of Yeomanry House. In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

WES2(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

WES2(iii): Option 3:

Conversion of the existing property would result in positive effects in respect towards the environment (1,2,3,5,6). It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being and health (11), however, the loss of the nursery could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15), as well as an employment use (18), subject to the delivery of Yeomanry House (15). In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

WES2(iv): Option 4:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on partially previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and

would be subject to design, height, and layout. The impact on heritage (10) could be negative if it would result in the loss or affect the setting of a building that could be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site that are subject to TPOs (7). It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being and health (11), however, the loss of the nursery could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15), as well as an employment use (18), subject to the delivery of Yeomanry House (15). In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

WES2(v): Option 5:

Converting the existing building as well as developing the site would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change, and indeed conversion of the existing building is welcomed. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on partially previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. The impact on heritage is also unknown (10) and care would be required to ensure there would be no negative effects in relation to the setting of the existing building. The impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site that are subject to TPOs (7). It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being and health (11), however, the loss of the nursery could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15), as well as an employment use (18), subject to the delivery of Yeomanry House (15). In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Option WES2(iii) would have the least negative impacts and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
WES3(i)	Residential development (44 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES3(ii)	Mixed use commercial and residential	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	0
WES3(iii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WES3(iv)	Residential development at typical suburban densities	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES3(v)	Redevelopment for employment uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	✓

COMMENTS:

WES3(i): Option 1:

Residential development would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on biodiversity (7) and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). The impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to the site's existing industrial use and proximity to the Bath Road, which could have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise, contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). Furthermore, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) would be negative as it would result in the loss of existing employment space.

WES3(ii): Option 2:

Redeveloping the site for both mixed use commercial and residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on biodiversity (7) and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). The impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to the site's existing industrial use and proximity to the Bath Road, which could have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise, contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). A neutral effect would be felt in relation to the economy if commercial use is also allocated at this site as it would continue to fulfil the employment function at this site.

WES3(iii): Option 3:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

WES3(iv): Option 4:

Residential development would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. It would

have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, the result of the development is likely to be less imposing at lower densities that reflect typical suburban densities in comparison to WES3(i). It would have a significant positive effect on meeting housing needs (13). The impact on sustainable and active transport is unknown (14). Although additional housing could result in positive effects on well-being and health in a general sense, there is also a risk of adverse effects to health due to the site's existing industrial use and proximity to the Bath Road, which could have amenity implications for any residents (e.g., air quality, noise, contamination) as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). Furthermore, the impact on economic growth (18, 20) would be negative as it would result in the loss of existing employment space.

WES3(v): Option 5:

Employment development would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site be redeveloped for employment, however, there is a risk that it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development elsewhere. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need. The impact on biodiversity (7) and townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. There would be significant positive effects in relation to employment growth and positive effects with regards to access to skills if the site was developed for such uses (18, 20)

Conclusion:

Option WES3(ii) would result in the most significant positive effects combined with the least negative effects and is therefore the preferred option.

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: Any negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
WES4(i)	Residential development	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	X	0	0	?X	0	?X
WES4(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WES4(iii)	Development for community uses	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓	✓	?	0	✓	✓✓	0	0	✓	0

COMMENTS:

WES4(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site to residential would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on partially previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. The impact on biodiversity and trees is uncertain and caution would be required to ensure that it would not impede on the existing trees within the site (7). It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13), whilst the impact on sustainable/active travel is unknown at this stage (14). A residential development in this location may result in benefits to well-being

and health (11), however, the loss of a community use could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15), as well as an employment use (18). In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

WES4(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use; however, it could result in greenfield land coming forward for development. Similarly, the impact on housing delivery (13) is not known without confirmation on whether other sites proposed can meet the local need.

WES4(iii): Option 3:

Developing the site for community uses would have mixed impacts on the sustainability objectives (1,2,3,5,6). The impact on landscape, biodiversity and townscape (7,9) is unknown. Similarly, the impact on undeveloped land (4) and successfully delivering housing (13) is unknown and would be subject to other sites coming forward to meet the local housing need. It would have a positive effect in respect of promoting human health, safety and wellbeing (11), promoting strong communities (12), ensuring good access to services and facilities (15), serving all individuals within the community (16), and reducing deprivation (19). It would have a significant positive effect on increasing access to leisure uses (17).

Conclusion:

Option WES4(iii) would have the most significant positive effects coupled with the least negative effects and is therefore the preferred approach.

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: Any loss for the existing library would need to be sufficiently justified. Negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

Site Eas1: Land at 9 Upper Crown Street

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
EAS1(i)	Residential development for approx. 46 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	?X
EAS1(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EAS1(iii)	Residential development at typical urban densities (25-40 dwellings)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	0	?	0	✓X	0	✓✓	?	?X	0	0	0	0	?X

COMMENTS:

EAS1(i): Option 1:

Redeveloping the site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. Similarly, the impact on biodiversity is uncertain (7). It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is on the edge of the town centre may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, possible contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

EAS1(ii): Option 2:

The impact on undeveloped land (4) is unknown at this stage should the site remain in its current use (a car park) as it could risk land coming forward elsewhere to help meet any unmet housing needs, i.e., on undeveloped land. The impact on housing delivery (13) is unknown but could tend towards negative effects as it may miss an opportunity to maximise the site's capacity for residential, failing to deliver the required level of housing needs within the borough.

EAS1(iii): Option 3:

Redeveloping the site for residential use would have both positive and negative effects in respect of the environment (1,3,5,6). However, it is hoped that the environmental impacts can be mitigated through adherence to other updated policies that seek to address the impact on climate change. In addition, it would ensure the long-term longevity of the site. It would have significant positive impacts on undeveloped land (4) as some of the boroughs housing needs would be situated on previously developed land. The impact on townscape is unknown at this stage (9) and would be subject to design, height, and layout. However, housing numbers between 20-40 would likely have a more positive effect on the townscape in comparison to numbers proposed under option EAS1(i). Similarly, the impact on biodiversity is uncertain (7). It would have significant positive effects on meeting housing needs (13). A residential development that is on the edge of the town centre may result in benefits to well-being and health, however, it may result in adverse effects to health due to poor air quality, possible contamination and noise (11), as well as place stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20).

Conclusion:

Option EAS1(i) and EAS1(iii) would both have the most significant positive effects coupled with the least negative effects. Therefore, one of these options should be pursued.

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: Negative effects on townscape, landscape, health, amenity and environment that would occur as a result of redeveloping the site should be carefully mitigated.

APPENDIX 4: HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN

The following abbreviations are used in this appendix for types of effect:

- Nd & v – Noise, disturbance and vibration
- Ap & q – Air pollution and quality
- Wp & q – Water pollution and quality
- Wf – Water flows
- Cc – Climate change
- HI & d – Habitat loss and degradation
- Le – Landscape effects
- L - Lighting

The following abbreviations are used for sites:

- AR – Aston Rowant SAC
- CB – Chilterns Beechwoods SAC
- HW – Hartslock Wood SAC
- KLF – Kennet & Lambourn Floodplain SAC
- LW – Little Wittenham SAC
- RL – River Lambourn SAC
- TBH – Thames Basin Heaths SPA
- WFG – Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC

A summary of the impacts on the designated sites of each policy (together with alternatives) is below:

- **CC2: Sustainable design and construction** - Update seeks to reduce impacts on climate change. Whilst reduced climate change will be broadly positive for many sites, the effects of the policy cannot be said to have a clear measurable effect on individual sites.
- **CC3: Adaptation to climate change** - Policy seeks to adapt individual developments. Impacts on sites several kilometres away will be minimal.
- **CC4: Decentralised energy** - As for CC2, update aims to reduce impacts on climate change. Whilst reduced climate change will be broadly positive for many sites, the effects of the policy cannot be said to have a clear measurable effect on individual sites.
- **CC7: Design and the public realm** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites.
- **CC9: Securing infrastructure** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites.
- **EN4: Locally-important heritage assets** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites.
- **EN7: Local green space and public open space** – Whilst failing to protect key open spaces could mean loss of space and increased reliance on the closest designated areas for recreation, the marginal updates proposed to the policy will be highly unlikely to have any perceptible effect on designated sites.
- **EN12: Biodiversity and the green network** - Whilst these policy update options have clear impacts on local wildlife importance within Reading, there is no known significant relationship with the biodiversity value of the designated sites.
- **EN13: Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites. No visual connection to designated sites.
- **EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites.
- **EM1: Provision of employment development** - 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. These sites are Hartslock Wood, Chilterns Beechwoods and Thames Basin Heaths.
- **EM2: Location of employment development** – the proposed update includes reassessing boundaries of Core Employment Areas as a result of a needs assessment. It is not likely to result in any additional employment land or any significant changes in travel patterns into Reading and therefore no additional impacts on protected sites.
- **H1: Provision of housing** – All options provide for either a maintenance or an increase in housing provision. The need for housing must be seen at a sub-regional level, because if unmet needs arise in one authority they must be met elsewhere. Meeting housing needs in

the most accessible locations in the area such as Reading, more remote from the designated sites, will minimise any effects on the designated sites.

- **H2: Density and mix** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H3: Affordable housing** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H4: Build to rent schemes** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H5: Standards for new housing** - Update seeks to reduce impacts on climate change. Whilst reduced climate change will be broadly positive for many sites, the effects of the policy cannot be said to have a clear measurable effect on individual sites.
- **H6: Accommodation for vulnerable people** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H7: Protection of the existing housing stock** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H8: Residential conversions** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **H14: Suburban regeneration and renewal** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **New policy on Co-living** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **TR1: Achieving the transport strategy** – whilst this policy has importance for travel patterns including car use close to some of the designated sites, the areas of potential update are unlikely to make a difference to the designated sites on the scale that would result in a measurable effect.
- **TR2: Major transport projects** - Not having the updated 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.
- **TR4: Cycle routes and facilities** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **TR5: Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging** – Whilst increasing the proportion of EV charging for non-residential development will help to combat climate change which will be broadly positive for many sites, the effects of the policy cannot be said to have a clear measurable effect on individual sites.
- **RL2: Provision of retail, leisure and culture development** – Providing high levels of retail floorspace, if identified need indicates that it should be accommodated, could lead to increased travel to central Reading 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. These sites are Hartslock Wood, Chilterns Beechwoods and Thames Basin Heaths.

- RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- RL4: Betting shops and payday loan companies - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- OU2: Hazardous installations - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- OU3: Telecommunications development - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- CR2: Design in Central Reading - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- CR3: Drinking establishments in Central Reading - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- CR6: Living in Central Reading - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- CR11: Station/River Major Opportunity Area – Any changes to development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- CR12: West Side Major Opportunity Area – Any changes to development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- CR13: East Side Major Opportunity Area – Any changes to development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- CR14: Other sites for development and change in Central Reading – Any changes to development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- CR15: The Reading Abbey Quarter - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area – Changes to the policy are unlikely to be of a scale significant enough to increase road travel close to the designated sites.
- SR4: Other sites for development in South Reading - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.

- **SR5: Leisure and recreation use of the Kennetside areas** - No clear link between this policy and effects on designated sites. The areas are connected to two of the designated sites by water but are downriver and some way away.
- **WR3: Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **CA1: Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **ER1: Sites for development in East Reading** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital** - No clear link between this policy update and effects on designated sites.
- **Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrove Street** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.

- **Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road** - Development would be too distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts, and traffic generation is not expected to affect the sites due to the accessible nature of the development and limited changes to travel patterns.
- **Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Sou5: 2 Hexham Road** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.
- **Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane** - Development would be too small scale and distant from any of the sites to result in any direct impacts.

APPENDIX 5: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN

CC2: Sustainable design and construction

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets sustainable design and construction requirements for non-residential developments.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? To ensure that non-residential buildings meet the highest level of sustainability possible in light of RBC's aim to be net-zero by 2030.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	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 sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CC3: Adaptation to climate change

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to ensure that new developments adapt to the effects of climate change, e.g., through orientation, shading, ventilation, planting and drainage.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Greater proportion of new developments incorporating measures to maximise resistance and resilience to climate change.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to the matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CC4: Decentralised energy

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy requires developments to consider decentralised energy sources.	N/A
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 emissions.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Greater energy efficiency, reduced costs, reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 their age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CC7: Design and the public realm

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy promotes high quality design outcomes through development management that maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the area.	N/A
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 good design.	N/A
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	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CC9: Securing infrastructure

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy ensures that development in Reading is accompanied by appropriate provision of infrastructure, services and facilities.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants of the development site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from new transport infrastructure, open space, education, employment etc.	N/A
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. It also looks to future-proof the policy for the forthcoming Infrastructure Levy and incorporate existing elements of the Employment, Skills and Training SPD.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the wider community, surrounding authorities.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EN4: Locally important heritage assets

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Conservation of locally important heritage assets and their setting, and ensuring that any replacement building would take cues from historical qualities that made the previous building significant	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, nearby residents, occupiers of locally important heritage assets, the wider community	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 disability	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EN7: Local green space and public open space

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy protects defined areas as either Local Green Space or Public Open Space, which will be protected from development.	N/A
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.	N/A
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 through insensitive adjacent development.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, nearby residents, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	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 religious belief.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EN12: Biodiversity and the green network

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To ensure that biodiversity in Reading is protected and enhanced wherever possible.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All residents will benefit from increased and enhanced biodiversity.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Protection of sites identified as importance, establishment of green networks across the town, ensuring mandatory BGN on development sites, ensuring that development sites incorporate the actions set out within the Reading Climate Emergency Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Biodiversity and 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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EN13: Major landscape features and areas of outstanding natural beauty

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Retention of the character and appearance of Major Landscape Features and AONB.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people, developers, homeowners within the designations.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 racial groups	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EN14: Trees, hedges and woodlands

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to protect existing trees, hedges and woodlands where they are of importance and ensure that new tree planting takes place within development sites.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Increased tree, hedge and woodland cover.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The protection 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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to the above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EM1: Provision of employment development

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To identify the level of employment development required and deal with the impacts that a higher level of employment than planned could have on the demand for housing.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, future commercial occupants and future employees will benefit directly, plus the wider community will benefit from economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? To identify the appropriate level of employment development within the borough without creating additional housing needs.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, employers, workers, all people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

EM2: Location of employment development

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy identifies the main locations for major office and industrial or warehouse development, identifying a number of Core Employment Areas.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of employment development in order to fulfil identified needs in the appropriate locations.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, employers, workers, all people.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

H1: Housing provision

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets out the amount of housing to be provided in Reading over the plan period and identifies the scale of the shortfall and how it will be addressed.	N/A
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 sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified housing needs.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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 their religious belief.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

H2: Density and mix

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets out guidance for the most appropriate residential density in different areas and on different sites.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development site will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
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 are available for all ages.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? Not providing the appropriate mix of dwellings would disproportionately affect residents with specific needs based on their age. For example, growing families may require larger homes, while older residents may wish to downsize.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If the Proposed Approach is implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H3: Affordable housing

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of affordable housing to meet Reading's needs	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, all people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Affordable housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Affordable housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Affordable housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Affordable housing may have a differential impact in relation to age, since age can be a factor in the ability for an individual to get on the property ladder. This policy aims to ensure that a sufficient supply of discounted homes are provided, whilst ensuring that this does not compromise the delivery of other types of affordable housing. It also aims to provide the appropriate affordable housing tenure split based on local needs.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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? Not providing the appropriate affordable housing provision would disproportionately affect residents with specific needs based on age. For example, younger persons who are struggling to buy or rent a property.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H4: Build to rent schemes

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets out criteria for considerations of proposals for build to rent housing.	N/A
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 type and tenure.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of rental housing to meet Reading's needs.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, all people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to their age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Build to rent schemes is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to their religious beliefs.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

H5: Standards for new housing

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy ensures that new build housing within Reading meet standards pertaining to internal space, water efficiency, carbon emissions and accessibility and adaptability.	N/A
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 net zero carbon development and water neutrality.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Ensure that new housing meets the latest standards in relation to total energy use and space heating demand, requirement for on-site renewables to match total energy use, to deliver zero-carbon homes, to cater for wheelchair using dwellings based on the latest data.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, individuals with disabilities, older residents, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	Y
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 dwellings with sufficient wheelchair access.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
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 dwellings with sufficient wheelchair access.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? Not providing the appropriate mix of accessible and adaptable dwellings would disproportionately affect older residents and individuals with disabilities.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H6: Accommodation for vulnerable people

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly those older residents and individuals with disabilities.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	Y
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 the appropriate type and number of dwellings for vulnerable residents.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
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 the appropriate type and amount of accommodation for vulnerable residents.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? Not providing the appropriate amount or type of dwellings suitable for accommodating vulnerable individuals would disproportionately affect older residents and individuals with disabilities.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H7: Protecting the existing housing stock

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy ensures that the existing housing stock within Reading is not reduced as a result of development that would result in a net loss of homes.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Current occupants and the wider community since the number of dwellings available will not decrease.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, residents, all people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Protection of existing housing stock could have a differential impact in relation to age as reducing the number of family-sized dwellings within the borough could disadvantage certain people groups.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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 their religious belief.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? Not providing the appropriate amount of family-sized accommodation within the borough would disproportionately affect families within the borough.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H8: Residential conversions

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy prescribes standards for HMOs and aims to prevent the proliferation to avoid harm to amenity and to preserve the amount of family housing.	N/A
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. In addition, families will benefit from the controls placed on the numbers of HMOs, whilst nearby residents and the wider community will benefit from preventing harm to amenity.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, particularly housing, the retention of local character, and the retention of appropriate housing mix.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	Y
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Regulation of HMO conversions could impact age, as it may limit the number of HMOs that are available to younger populations. On the other hand, it could also impact families by ensuring that limits are placed on conversions to HMOs, thereby retaining a level of family-sized accommodation within the borough.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? Not providing the appropriate number of HMOs or family-sized accommodation within the borough would disproportionately affect younger populations as well as families within the borough.	Y
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? If implemented successfully, adverse impacts are unlikely to occur.	Y

H14: Suburban renewal and regeneration

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets out the approach to proposals for renewal and regeneration of Reading's suburban residential areas to improve the environment and housing stock and deliver more homes.</p>	N/A
2	<p>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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified needs, and to make a positive contribution to character and community facilities.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Suburban renewal and regeneration is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

New Policy: Co-living

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To set out the criteria for determining future proposals for co-living accommodation within the borough.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Future occupants who benefit directly, plus the wider community as a result of affordable housing financial contribution requirements and protection of sites already earmarked for housing.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? To ensure that future planning applications for co-living can be appropriately determined.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, occupants, all people.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living housing is not expected to have a differential impact due to disability. Developments should be built to the required building regulations standards.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living housing is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age. Although evidence points to the fact that co-living is primarily geared towards younger people, the policy as proposed would be worded such that any proposals for co-living to sites that have already been identified as residential would not be allowed, and any co-living developments would require a financial contribution towards affordable housing. This would ensure that there is no adverse impact on the provision of housing for those who are of an age in which co-living may be less appealing/appropriate for various reasons.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Provision of co-living 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

TR1: Achieving the transport strategy

No.	Question	Y/N
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 latest Transport Strategy.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Achieving 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

TR2: Major transport projects

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to deliver the major transport projects identified in the latest Transport Strategy.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Delivery of new projects as set out within the Draft Transport Strategy.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

TR4: Cycle routes and facilities

No.	Question	Y/N
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, including the cycle network from the LCWP.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? New facilities for cycling, improvements to existing cycle infrastructure.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, cyclists, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Cycle routes and facilities 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

TR5: Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to provide car parking, EVCPs and cycle parking.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? All people and organisations will benefit from reduced congestion, greater public transport participation, and greater provision of EVCPs	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A balance of car parking, encouragement of public transport use, discouragement of less sustainable travel choices, provision of electric vehicle car users.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, road users, public transport providers, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Car, cycle parking and EVC 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

RL2: Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy Identifies the amount of retail, leisure and cultural development that is planned for and where it should be located.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants will benefit directly, and the wider community will benefit from an expanded retail, leisure and cultural offer.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The provision of development in order to fulfil identified retail, leisure and cultural needs.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Retail, leisure and cultural development is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious beliefs.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

RL3: Vitality and viability of smaller centres

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to manage uses within the identified district and local centres.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Accessible and viable small centres throughout the Borough	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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 beliefs.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? The vitality and viability of smaller centres is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

=

RL4: Betting shops and payday loan companies

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy prevents clustering of betting shops, payday loan shops (all gambling establishments).	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Less concentration of payday loan and betting shops	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, shop owners, residents, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious beliefs.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? Limiting the concentration of gaming establishments is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

OU2: Hazardous installations

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy ensures that proposals that would involve hazardous substances, or development within the vicinity of hazardous sites, would not pose adverse health and safety risks.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of adverse health and safety effects as a result of hazardous installations.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

OU3: Telecommunications development

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to deliver telecommunications infrastructure and increase digital connectivity throughout the Borough while mitigating the negative effects of installations on amenity.	N/A
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.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Avoidance of adverse impact on visual amenity cause by telecommunications development	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Telecommunications developers, residents, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR2: Design in Central Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To ensure that development within Central Reading is designed to contribute and respect the character of the central area, including the historic character, fine grained grid structure, high-quality townscape, waterspaces, biodiversity, open spaces and public realm.	N/A
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 good design and biodiversity improvements.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Creation of high-quality placemaking, biodiversity and a diversity of uses that reflect the local character, adoption of local design codes, respect and building upon the historic grid character.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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 beliefs.	
17	Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR5: Drinking establishments in Central Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to set out the approach to proposals involving pubs, bars, clubs and takeaways in Central Reading.	N/A
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, night-time uses and takeaways in the most accessible location within the Borough. Neighbouring residents and local populations would also benefit from more cautious approaches for proposals for licencing premises.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? To avoid adverse impact on amenity and character of the area as a result of all licenced premises including takeaways.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR6: Living in Central Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To deal with specific matters that affect residential proposals in the centre of Reading, including the mix of unit sizes, noise and air quality issues, specific requirements for affordable housing tenure and the issue of serviced apartments.	N/A
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.	N/A
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	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR7: Primary frontages in Central Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development site will benefit directly, the wider community would benefit from a vibrant town centre with high quality frontages.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A vibrant town centre reflective of overall retail character.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? All people	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? No, there is no reason to believe that this policy will have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR11: Station/River Major Opportunity Area

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy</p> <p>This policy allocates various sites in 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.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way?</p> <p>Developers, and future occupants of development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from sustainable development and economic growth.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?</p> <p>A well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?</p> <p>Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified?</p> <p>N/A</p>	

CR12: West Side Major Opportunity Area

No.	Question	Y/N
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.	N/A
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 sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Well-designed, sustainable development that complies with local policy, functions well for its intended use and reflects the character of the area.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

CR13: East Side Major Opportunity Area

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>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.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? 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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

CR14: Other sites for development in Central Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites within central Reading for development. The aim is to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the sites.</p>	N/A
2	<p>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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

CR15: The Reading Abbey Quarter

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy sets guidance for development within or in the vicinity of the Reading Abbey Quarter (including Reading Prison), which will be a major area for heritage and cultural life within the Borough, offering educational, economic and open space opportunities.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? The wider community will benefit from a defined heritage courtier with tourism, education, economic and open space opportunities.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? Protect and enhance the historic setting of the Abbey, for Reading Prison to be a part of this and link into this space, to create a cohesive heritage destination.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? The wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

SR1: Island Road Major Opportunity Area

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way?</p> <p>Developers and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?</p> <p>Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This site is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified?</p> <p>N/A</p>	

SR4: Other sites for development in South Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites within South Reading for residential development. The aim is to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the sites.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

SR5: Leisure and recreation use of the Kennetside areas

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy To support the use of the areas around the River Kennet for low-intensity leisure and recreation, and to support works to create a resilient wetland.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and the wider community who would benefit from sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? A well designed, low-intensity leisure and recreation site that also functions as a resilient wetland and has no adverse impacts on biodiversity or flood risk.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, infrastructure providers, the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

WR3: Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites for development within West Reading and Tilehurst. The aim is to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the sites.</p>	N/A
2	<p>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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

CA1: Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green. The aim is to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the sites.</p>	N/A
2	<p>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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

ER1: Other sites for development in East Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy allocates sites for development in East Reading. The aim is to ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the sites.</p>	N/A
2	<p>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.</p>	N/A
3	<p>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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowner, developer, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

ER2: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy guides development at the University of Reading's Whiteknights Campus. The aim is to ensure beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, students and future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	N
6	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.	
7	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?	N
8	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.	
9	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?	N
10	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.	
11	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	N
12	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.	
13	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?	N
14	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This policy is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.	
15	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N
16	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This 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? There is no reason to believe that this policy would have an adverse effect on any groups due to matters set out above.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

ER3: Royal Berkshire Hospital

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy aims to guide development for RBH, either on or off site, and ensure a beneficial, efficient and well-designed use of the site.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers, users of RBH, future occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from sustainable development, healthcare expansion and economic growth.	N/A
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, reflects the character of its area and serves its residents in the best way possible.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Developers, users of RBH, future neighbours and occupants of the development sites will benefit directly, and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen1: Aquis House, 49-51 Forbury Road and 33 Blagrove Street

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Aquis House for residential, office, and/or mixed use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen2: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Reading Central for residential, commercial, and/or mixed use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen3: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at the John Lewis Depot for residential or retail use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen4: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at the Crowne Plaza for hotel redevelopment, residential, care home, and/or a EVCP station/garage.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What 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.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What 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.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What 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.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What 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.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What 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.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What 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.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? Although the provision of a care home on site may positively impact vulnerable individuals with disabilities or those who are of a certain age, should the site be allocated and specialist accommodation <i>not</i> be delivered, it is not considered to result in an adverse impact for these people groups as the delivery of such accommodation is monitored through Policy H6.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

Site Cen5: 2 Norman Place

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Norman Place for residential redevelopment or conversion.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen6: Reading Bridge House, George Street

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Reading Bridge House for residential redevelopment or conversion.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen7: Tesco Extra, Napier Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Tesco Extra for residential development or retail use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen8: Kennet Place, Kings Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Kennet Place for residential redevelopment or conversion.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen9: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Sapphire Plaza and Royal Court for residential/office redevelopment/refurbishment.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Cen10: Part of Reading College, Kings Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy</p> <p>This policy looks at potential allocation options at Reading College for residential development or educational use.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way?</p> <p>Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?</p> <p>The outcome, if allocated, 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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?</p> <p>Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to race.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to gender.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to disability.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to age.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>This allocation is not expected to have a differential impact in relation to religious belief.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy?</p> <p>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.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified?</p> <p>N/A</p>	

Site Sou1: Reading Link Retail Park

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Reading Link Retail Park for residential/retail re-development.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Sou2: Tunbridge Jones, Cradock Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Tunbridge Jones Business Park for residential or employment development.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Sou3: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at the Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way, for residential development.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Sou4: Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at the Site at Green Park Village, Flagstaff Road, for residential development or office/commercial use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Sou5: 2 Hexham Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	<p>Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at 2 Hexham Road for residential development or community uses.</p>	N/A
2	<p>Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.</p>	N/A
3	<p>What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.</p>	N/A
4	<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.</p>	N/A
5	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	N
6	<p>What 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.</p>	
7	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	N
8	<p>What 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.</p>	
9	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	N
10	<p>What 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.</p>	
11	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	N
12	<p>What 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.</p>	
13	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	N
14	<p>What 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.</p>	
15	<p>Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	N
16	<p>What 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.</p>	
17	<p>Based on the answers given in 5-16 is there potential for adverse impact in this function/policy? 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.</p>	N
18	<p>Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A</p>	

Site Wes1: Land west of Milford Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Land West of Milford Road for residential development or employment uses.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Wes2: 72 Berkeley Avenue

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at 72 Berkley Avenue for residential development and/or conversion.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Wes3: Land at 132-134 Bath Road

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at 132-134 Bath Road for residential, mixed use/commercial or employment uses.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Wes4: Southcote Library, 234 Southcote Lane

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at Southcote Library for residential development or community use.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	

Site Eas1: Land at 9 Upper Crown Street

No.	Question	Y/N
1	Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy This policy looks at potential allocation options at 9 Upper Crown Street for residential development.	N/A
2	Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way? Developers and future occupants of the development sites would benefit directly, and the wider community would benefit from a sustainable development and economic growth.	N/A
3	What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy? The outcome, if allocated, 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.	N/A
4	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy? Landowners, developers, future neighbours and occupants, infrastructure providers and the wider community.	N/A
5	Are there concerns that the function/policy does or could have a differential impact on racial groups?	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 could have a differential impact due to gender?	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 could have a differential impact due to disability?	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 could have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	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 could have a differential impact due to their age?	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 could have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	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? 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.	N
18	Can this adverse impact be justified? N/A	