

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF MAIN MODIFICATIONS

The main modifications listed in this document also, for the most part, require sustainability appraisal under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A Sustainability Appraisal assesses the environmental, economic and social effects of plans and proposals, by appraising them against a set of sustainability objectives. Reading Borough Council's 20 sustainability objectives are set out below. These were initially derived from the Revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, published in 2014 and updated in 2024.

There are no changes to the habitat regulations assessment or equality assessment of the LPPU due to the Main Modifications.

Living within Environmental Limits (Environmental Objectives)

1	To address the climate emergency and its impact by minimising CO2 emissions and other greenhouse gases, through ensuring that development adheres to the specific policies set out in the Local Plan.
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, the environment and the economy.

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, sustainable housing of a type and cost appropriate to the needs of the area.

EN13 Major landscape features and National Landscapes				✓✓			✓✓		✓✓										
EN14 Trees, hedges and woodlands	✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓		✓✓										
EN18 Flooding and sustainable drainage systems	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓			✓✓	✓✓												
New Policy EN19 Urban greening factor	✓✓	✓✓					✓✓		✓✓										
EM1 Provision 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: Renewal and regeneration of residential areas												✓✓							
New Policy H15 Purpose-built shared accommodation												✓✓							
TR1 Achieving the transport strategy	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓		✓✓				✓✓		
TR2 Major transport projects													✓✓				✓✓	✓✓	
TR4 Cycle routes and facilities													✓✓						
TR5 Car and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging													✓✓						
RL2 Scale and location of retail, leisure and culture development															✓✓	✓✓			
RL3 Vitality and viability of smaller centres																			
RL4 Betting shops and payday loan companies																		✓✓	
OU2 Hazardous installations											✓✓								

OU3 Telecommunications development									✓✓	✓✓									
LP1 Preparation of the Next Local Plan																			
CR2 Design in Central Reading							✓✓		✓✓	✓✓									
CR6 Living in Central Reading												✓✓		✓✓					
CR7 Primary frontages in Central Reading																			
CR10 Tall buildings																			
CR11 Station/River Major Opportunity Area																			
CR12 West Side Major Opportunity Area																			
CR13 East Side Major Opportunity Area																✓✓			
CR14 Other sites for development in Central Reading																			
CR15 The Reading Abbey Quarter									✓✓							✓✓			
SR1 Island Road Major Opportunity Area																			
SR4 Other sites for development in South Reading																			
SR5 Kennet Meadows	✓✓	✓✓					✓✓		✓✓							✓✓			
WR3 Other sites for development in West Reading and Tilehurst																			
CA1 Sites for development and change of use in Caversham and Emmer Green																			
ER1 Other sites for development in East Reading																			
ER2 Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading																	✓✓		✓✓
ER3 Royal Berkshire Hospital																			
Site CR14g: The Oracle Riverside East				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓				✓✓		
Site CR14n: Reading Central Library, Abbey Square				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓			✓✓			
Site CR14o: 100 Kings Road				✓✓								✓✓	✓✓						

Site CR14p: Queens Wharf, Queens Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14q: Havell House, 62-66 Queens Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14r: John Lewis Depot, Mill Lane				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14s: 20-22 Duke Street				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14t: Aquis House,49-51 Forbury Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓				✓✓		
Site CR14u: 33 Blagrove Street				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14v: 2 Norman Place				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14w: Reading Bridge House, George Street				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
SiteCR14x: Tesco Extra, Napier Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14y: Kennet Place, Kings Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14z: Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street and Royal Court, Kings Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14aa: Part of Reading College, Kings Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site CR14ab: 160-163 Friar Street				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site SR4g: Reading Link Retail Park				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site SR4h: 11 Basingstoke Road				✓✓									✓✓	✓✓						
Site SR4i: 85-87 Basingstoke Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site SR4j: Land at Warwick House, Warwick Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site SR4k: Former Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way				✓✓									✓✓							
Site SR4l: Land at Drake Way				✓✓									✓✓							
Site WR3u: Land at 132-134 Bath Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site WR3v: Former Southcote Library, Coronation Square																✓✓				

Site WR3w: Part of Tesco Car Park, Portman Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site WR3x: 1-15 St Georges Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site WR3y: 72 Berkeley Avenue				✓✓									✓✓							
Site CA1h: Hemdean House School, Hemdean Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site ER1l: Princes House, 73A London Road				✓✓									✓✓							
Site ER1m: Land adjacent to 17 Craven Road													✓✓							
Site ER1n: 51 Church Road, Earley				✓✓									✓✓							

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

In general, the options assessed in the following tables are specific to each site or policy. However, in all cases, a “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

MM1—changes to paragraph 1.5.2 to refer to updated Planning Practice Guidance and to align housing figures with policy H1

This change is intended to update references to national policy and the standard method. It also changes the stated housing figure within the introductory text to align with the H1 figure following the Inspector's letter following Stage 1 hearings [EX030] to make the Plan sound. These changes do not affect the operation of housing policies and therefore do not require sustainability appraisal. The sustainability effects of the figure itself are addressed by the appraisal of Policy H1.

MM2—changes to paragraph 3.1.3 to update due to recent completions and to clarify the scale of developments

This change is intended to account for recent completions and clarify the relative scale of developments on Reading's boundary. As it simply provides further detail and does not change the spatial strategy, there is no change to the assessment.

MM3—Insertion of new paragraph following 3.1.4 to provide context for Figure 3.1

This modification inserts a new paragraph providing contextual information about the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for AWE Burghfield, which is illustrated on Figure 3.1. It directs applicants and decision-makers to Policy OU2 (Hazardous Installations) for further detail. As this change simply adds context to explain a figure outline the extent of the DEPZ, it does not require sustainability appraisal.

MM4—significant changes to restructure policy CC2, particularly to include all energy efficiency elements of H5

This modification reflects a major change to substantially restructure Policy CC2 and H5 for clarity. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal was revisited to ensure that it includes assessment of sustainable design and construction requirements for residential development which were previously assessed under H5. Because the Sustainability Appraisal of CC2 already acknowledges as "significant positive effect" with regard to climate change objectives, it would not be appropriate to amend this further as it is not possible to assign an even higher positive effect. Nonetheless, because residential sustainability standards are being removed from H5 and incorporated into CC2, the assessment of H5 requires significant amendments as outlined below.

MM5—changes to the supporting text in paragraphs 4.1.2 - 4.1.5 to align with MM4

These changes restructure and update the supporting text to Policy CC2, including updating references to the Reading Climate Emergency Strategy (2020-25) and providing additional guidance on energy hierarchy demonstration. They reflect the policy changes made through MM4 and do not create new policy requirements. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM6—addition of footnote to CC3 to provide reference for applicants

This change amends the third bullet point of Policy CC3 to add a specific footnote reference to the Good Homes Alliance Overheating Risk Tool Checklist. It does not alter the policy requirement but provides applicants with a specific resource to demonstrate compliance. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM7—changes to provide further information regarding recent flooding events

This change updates the supporting text to refer to the January 2024 Reading Flood Investigation Report by adding a footnote with a URL. This is a factual update that does not change the policy or how it operates. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM8—amendment to align language with that used in the SFRA in paragraph 4.1.12

This change aligns language with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment by specifying that all types of flooding (fluvial, surface water and groundwater) must be considered. It clarifies rather than changes the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM9—Change policy title to align with language in the NPPF and legislation

This change retitles Policy CC4 from 'Decentralised Energy' to 'Heat Networks' to align terminology with national policy. The policy's content is substantively amended through MM10 and this is assessed below. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM10—changes to CC4 to clarify definitions and align requirements with national guidance

This modification clarifies definitions, refers to national policy standards and aligns terminology with national policy; following the removal of all references to CHP as it is no longer considered to be a suitable technology given its reliance on fossil fuels. This removal was agreed to be an appropriate change as fossil fuels do not represent a suitable form of decentralised energy given carbon emissions and possible localised effects of fossil fuel combustion. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

CC4: Decentralised energy Heat Networks

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 and local energy storage. Clarified definitions around 'Heat Networks'; aligning language with national policy.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	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

There are no changes to the comments supporting the appraisal as there are no changes needed to the anticipated effects.

MM11—changes to the supporting text of CC4 at 4.1.13 to omit reference to CHP

This change replaces outdated text on decentralised energy technologies with updated text on heat networks, including explanations of how environmental heat or waste heat can be captured using heat pumps. This does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM12—changes to supporting text at 4.1.14 to omit reference to CHP and fossil fuels

This change updates the supporting text to reflect changes in the electricity generation mix and transmission network. It does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM13—changes to supporting text at 4.1.17 to update recent work undertaken by the Council

This change updates the supporting text to reflect more recent heat mapping work and feasibility studies produced by the Council. It does not change the operation of the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM14—amendments to supporting text at 4.1.9 to refer to emerging technologies

This change updates the supporting text on energy infrastructure design considerations to reflect current approaches. It does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM15—addition of language to supporting text at 4.1.20 to refer to possible impacts on decentralised energy infrastructure on heritage assets

This change intends to draw an applicant's attention to the possible impacts of decentralised energy on heritage assets, but does not affect the operation of the policy. The requirement for heritage impact assessment is stated within historic environment policies and therefore does not require sustainability assessment here.

MM16—addition of consideration of “safety” to overarching design principles

[This modification is intended to emphasise safety as an overarching principle of design and provide clarification for means of assessment. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:](#)

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 design code requirements and to align design objectives with those stated in the National Model Design Code, addition of safety as an overarching principle	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), [health, safety and well-being \(11\)](#) 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 promote health, safety and well-being \(11\)](#)~~, 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.

MM17—changes to ensure clear assessment guidance for schemes

This modification provides clarification for the means of assessment and its requirement to enhance the site and its surroundings, where possible; and helps avoid undue burden. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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 design code requirements and	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0

	to align design objectives with those stated in the National Model Design Code, changes for clarification																				
CC7(ii) ▼	No reference to the most up-to-date government guidance or local design codes	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	✓	O	O

There is no change to the comments section of this appraisal, as there are no changes to the effects anticipated.

MM18—strike reference to tree requirements within the policy and instead refer to EN14

This change amends the 'nature' bullet point to avoid repetition by cross-referencing Policy EN14 on trees rather than duplicating requirements. It does not change the implementation of the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM19—addition of digital infrastructure to economic development infrastructure requirements

This change corrects an error in which “digital infrastructure” was omitted unintentionally from the policy itself, but was included in the Sustainability Appraisal option. Therefore, there are no changes to the SA as digital infrastructure was already taken into account.

MM20—addition of landscape considerations to EN4 and changes to align language with national policy regarding assessing the scale of loss or harm and the significance of the asset

This modification ensures that language is closely aligned with the NPPF and that protections may be applied to landscape considerations (for instance, a locally listed park or garden). Additionally, it also ensures alignment with paragraph 4.2.24. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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; state that protections may be applied to landscape considerations	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 [significant](#) 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.

MM21—changes to the supporting text to account for changes in MM21

This change updates the supporting text to refer to a 'List of Locally Important Assets' (rather than Buildings) to reflect that the list may include parks, gardens and landscapes as well as buildings. It does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan. Changes to include parks and gardens as assessed above under MM21.

MM22—clarification of the scope of EN4

This change clarifies that Policy EN4 is not intended to apply to nationally designated heritage assets or to identified buildings of townscape merit in conservation areas. This provides clarity without changing the substance of the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM23—changes made to EN12, bullet point b) for clarification and to ensure alignment with recent changes to national policy

This modification seeks to account for changes to legislation that have been made to BNG at the national level since the LPPU was submitted.

EN12: Biodiversity

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) ❖	10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement with off-site compensation mechanism.	✓	✓	0	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Specific consideration for important soils, light spillage, native planting, and wildlife friendly design. (except for householder sites; refer to regulations “as amended”)																				
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
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

As there are no changes to the anticipated effects themselves and any alternative which deviates from national policy is not a reasonable alternative, there are no changes to the appraisal’s comments.

MM24—to correct terminology regarding swift boxes in the fifth bullet point of criterion c)

This change amends the biodiversity enhancement bullet to specify swift bricks and integrated bat boxes/tiles as examples of wildlife-friendly features to be incorporated within new buildings. This provides additional clarity without changing the application of the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM25—to replace the term “cover” with “culvert” within EN12 point d)

This change improves the clarity of the watercourse bullet by replacing 'not cover over watercourses' with 'not culvert watercourses' and adding 'de-culvert watercourses wherever possible', in line with guidance from the Environment Agency. This does not change the substance of the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM26—Additional sentence in paragraph 4.2.66 of the supporting text

This change clarifies that the Statutory Metric should also be used to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity even where BNG does not apply. This is a change for clarification that is consistent with MM24. As such, there is no associated change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM27—amendment to paragraph 4.2.72 to refer to the BLNRS, to correct errors and to account for the forthcoming replacement of SPDs with Supplementary Plans

This change updates the supporting text on off-site BNG provision to reflect that the BLNRS is now published and to remove references to an SPD that will no longer be produced. It does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM28—removal of reference to the review of the Chiltern’s National Landscape Boundary in supporting paragraph 4.2.76

This change removes a sentence that refers to a possible Chilterns National Landscape boundary change that has since been cancelled. This does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM29—change to point 5 of Policy EN14 to make clear that tree planting should consider heritage assets

This modification is to make clear that tree planting should consider heritage assets. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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) ❖	Update policy to refer to Tree Strategy, NPPF, BNG, and consideration of impacts on the historic environment and any affected heritage assets	✓✓	✓✓	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
EN14(iii)	Alternative option: Require a minimum canopy cover level	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓X	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), [the historic environment \(10\)](#) 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.

MM30—change to EN18 to clarify that SuDS requirements will only apply to major development

This modification clarifies that SuDS requirements do not apply to minor development and are only for major developments. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

EN18: Flooding and sustainable drainage systems

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
------------	--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

EN18(i) ❖	Update policy wording to reflect changes in national planning policy guidance and the SFRA, including reference to sewer flooding and associated risk to watercourses, and strengthened support for SUDs for major developments.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN18(ii) ▼	Retain as existing	?✓	?✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As there are no anticipated sustainability effects of this clarification, there is no change needed to the comment section.

MM31—change to supporting paragraph 4.2.113 regarding flood risk allowance guidance

This change clarifies the climate change allowances that must be taken into account within a Flood Risk Assessment, removing specific SFRA model allowances of 25%, 35% and 70% and replacing with “the appropriate allowance” based on comments from the Environment Agency. This provides clarity without changing the policy itself. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM32—specification of which applications will be subject to UGF within EN19

This modification clarifies that UGF requirements apply only to certain types of application as listed in the policy table, removing potential ambiguity about whether the requirements applied universally. This provides clarity for applicants and decision-makers but does not change the application of the policy as assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft. Therefore, no change is needed.

MM33—deletion of the third row of the table within EN19 to account for recent change to national policy

Since the submission of the LPPU, national legislation has changed with regard to certain BNG exemptions. In order to ensure the policy is compliant with national policy, the third row of the table no longer applies. There are no effects on the SA.

MM34—addition of footnote within EN19 to clarify procedures for reserved matters

Following discussions at the examination hearing, a footnote is proposed to clarify that for outline permissions a condition will be attached requiring final UGF calculations at Reserved Matters stage. This does not change the operation of the policy and simply provides additional clarification. Therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM35—additional sentence regarding “double-counting” of BNG elements in supporting paragraph 4.2.125

This additional sentence clarifies that any greening elements used to meet BNG requirements can also be used to meet UGF requirements. This does not change the operation of the policy and simply provides additional clarification. Therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM36—amendment of economic development figures in supporting text paragraph 4.3.4

This change corrects the study referenced to correct an error. This is a correction that does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM37—changes to supporting text at 4.4.2 and 4.4.3 to refer to the standard method and planning practice guidance

This change adds a sentence to 4.4.2 to refer to the transitional arrangements in the NPPF and deletes an explanation of need to instead outline the steps of the standard method calculation. This modification reflects a change requested by the Inspector in paragraphs 8 and 9 of Inspector’s letter following Stage 1 hearings [EX030] to make the plan sound. This modification to the supporting text does not change policy H1 itself, rather provides further background information as to how the figure is calculated. Therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM38—addition of detail regarding later viability reviews in H3

This change specifies that a later viability review will be “required at an agreed level of occupancy.” A high level of detail is contained within the Affordable Housing SPD, but it is considered that further detail is required in the Plan itself in order to comply with Planning Practice Guidance. Because the terms of engagement regarding deferred contributions is already within the SPD, this change does not change the operation of the policy but rather provides clarity. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM39—amendments to supporting text paragraph 4.4.21

This change adds a sentence to 4.4.2 to refer to the transitional arrangements in the NPPF and deletes an explanation of need to instead outline the steps of the standard method calculation. This modification reflects a change requested by the Inspector in paragraphs 8 and 9 of Inspector’s letter following Stage 1 hearings [EX030] to make the plan sound. This modification to the supporting text does not change policy H1 itself, rather provides further background information as to how the figure is calculated. Therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM40—additional language in supporting text paragraph 4.4.28

This change provides additional detail as to how a deferred contributions mechanism will work in practice in line with the Planning Practice Guidance. This does not introduce a new policy requirement but is intended to provide detail and incorporate language from the adopted Affordable Housing SPD. As such, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM41—deletion of sustainability standards from H5

This change deletes all sustainability standards from H5 for incorporation into Policy CC2 for clarity. As such, it significantly narrows the scope of the policy to only space and accessibility standards. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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) ❖	Net zero carbon homes with specific limits for space heating demand and total energy use, specific requirements with regard to embodied carbon, demolition, waste, wheelchair users and water neutrality <u>Restructured policy with carbon requirements moved into CC2, H5 requires space standards, accessibility and adaptability.</u>	✓✓ 0	✓✓ 0	✓✓ 0	0	✓✓ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	0
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	X	0	0	0	0	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
H5(iii)	Omit policy and rely on updates to Part L of the Building Regulations	✓	✓	✓	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O
H5(iv)	Update the policy, but with less ambitious requirements for target emissions rate reduction	✓	✓	✓	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O

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 5 as requirements relating to construction waste would be omitted, and 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 5 as requirements relating to construction waste would be omitted, and 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 5 as requirements relating to construction waste would be omitted, and 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, [following the move of all sustainability standards from H5 into Policy CC2 for clarity.](#)

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.

MM42—amendments to the supporting text at 4.4.39 - 4.4.50

This change deletes the supporting text under H5 that deals with sustainability standards due to MM42. It does not change the operation of the policy as this has been assessed above. As such, there are no changes to the sustainability appraisal.

MM43—changes to the supporting text at 4.4.62 - 4.4.78

These changes seek to restructure the supporting text for Policy H7 to provide clarity for applicants, but do not change the policy itself. Although these changes will make implementation more effective, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM44—change to the supporting text at 4.4.104

This change updates figures associated with the need for student accommodation as provided by the University of Reading. It also adds that this need will be kept under review. This change simply updates figures for accuracy and does not affect the application of the policy. As such, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM45—changes to supporting text at paragraph 4.5.8

This change updates the supporting text on pedestrian and cycle routes to reflect the current version of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). This is a factual update that does not change the policy. As such, there is no change from the assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.

MM46—deletion of the second paragraph within TR5

Following discussion at the Examination Hearings and paragraph 14 of the Inspector's Post Stage 2 Hearing Letter (EX101) in which it was concluded that the second paragraph of TR5 was not justified as it has not been subject to viability testing and there is no detailed evidence available as to how the 20% requirement was reached. As such, Policy TR5 is modified to remove the second paragraph in respect of 20% of spaces having active vehicle charging points. Therefore the Sustainability Appraisal should be amended as follows:

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	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	?X	O	O	O	?X	O	O
TR5(iii)	Seek a higher proportion of non-residential parking to include charge points	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O	O	?	O	O

As there are no anticipated sustainability effects of this removal, there is no change needed to the comment section.

MM47—amend supporting text at 4.5.23 to account for MM47

This change deletes a sentence within the supporting text of TR5 that refers to the requirement deleted under MM47. It does not change the policy itself and the policy change has been assessed above. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM48—changes to supporting paragraph 4.6.9

This change simply updates the identified retail figures to refer to the most up-to-date evidence base and to clarify that the floorspaces provided are net figures. This does not change the policy itself or result in a different conclusion about floorspace needs. Therefore, there is no change to the sustainability appraisal.

MM49—amend second bullet point in criterion a) of RL3

This change adds “as identified on the Proposals Map” when referring to Key Frontages in order to provide clarity and ensure the policy is effective. This change does not affect the application of the policy itself and there is no change needed to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM50—change to the title of policy RL4

This change updates the policy title to include “Gambling Establishments” to make the coverage of the policy clear. This does not change the policy itself or the sustainability performance of the policy. No change is needed to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM51—new paragraphs 4.7.10 and 4.7.11

This modification inserts two new paragraphs into the supporting text for Policy OU1 to explain how primary healthcare provision differs from other community uses. It explains the role of NHS Thames Valley Integrated Care Board (TV-ICB) as primary care commissioner and sets out the expectation that developers of new or extended primary care facilities will carry out pre-project work at their own expense and deliver completed facilities to TV-ICB. This does not change the application of the policy, but rather aims to provide clarity for its application. Therefore, no change is required within the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM52—changes to Policy OU2 with regard to AWE Burghfield

This modification includes amendments to Policy OU2 to strengthen protections related to the AWE Burghfield DEPZ following comments received during Regulation 19 stage from the Office of Nuclear Regulation and the Ministry of Defence. It also provides further detail requiring consultation with ONR. These changes do not have an effect on the SA, as they reflect the intention of how the policy was to be applied as originally assessed, but now provides more details for applicants and decision makers.

MM53—changes to supporting text at 4.7.14

This change to the supporting text under OU2 clarifies the respective roles of ONR and COMAH, as well as refers to “emergency planners.” It does not affect the operation of the policy and therefore there are no corresponding changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM54—changes to supporting text at 4.7.16

This change seeks to accurately reflect consultation arrangements and refer to the appropriate consultation zones as referenced in paragraph 13 of the Post Stage 2 Hearing Letters [EX101]. It does not change the operation of the policy or its sustainability performance and as such, no changes are needed within the SA.

MMX55—addition of wholly new policy LP1 on preparation of the next Local Plan

Sustainability Objectives and Effect

<u>Option No.</u>	<u>Option</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>LP1(i)</u> <u>▼</u>	<u>No policy</u> <u>addressing</u> <u>Inspector's req.</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>?X</u>	<u>O</u>

	regarding to the next local plan																				
LP1(ii) ❖	New policy requiring specific tasks leading to an early review	0	?✓	0	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0	?✓	?✓	0	?✓	0

LP1(i): No policy:

[The absence of a policy brings largely neutral effects, but uncertain negative effects with regard to objectives 2, 6, 7, 13, 16, 17 and 19. The negative effects are uncertain at this time because the further work required by the policy will determine whether or not changes will be made during an early review with regard to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation and water quality. Without this assessment, these issues may be insufficiently addressed.](#)

LP1(ii): New policy:

[The addition of a new policy brings largely neutral effects, but uncertain positive effects with regard to objectives 2, 6, 7, 13, 16, 17 and 19. The positive effects are uncertain at this time because the further work required by the policy will determine whether or not changes will be made during an early review with regard to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation and water quality.](#)

Conclusion:

[Option LP1\(ii\) has 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:

[There may be equality effects if the further GTAA work reveals a material change in circumstances, but this is unknown and therefore unable to be assessed at this time.](#)

MITIGATION: Any loss for the existing school or community uses 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.

MM56—updates to figures within paragraph 5.2.16

This change seeks to update figures for development in Central Reading to take account of completions during 2024-2025. As this simply an updated reference to recent monitoring data, it does not result in a need to change the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM57—deletion of reference to SPDs within paragraph 5.3.8

This modification deletes a paragraph that refers to the preparation of new SPDs in order to account for recent changes to national guidance which will eliminate new SPDs. This does not change the operation of the policy and there is no need to change the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM58—correction to paragraph 5.3.10

This modification corrects a reference to “swift boxes” and instead refers to “swift bricks” based on comments provided by the Swifts Local Network at Regulation 19. As it corrects an error, it does not change the operation of the policy and no change is required within the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM59—change to the sixth bullet point of criterion vii) of CR10

This modification reflects a change within the SOCG with Historic England [EX014] to better align the text with national policy within the NPPF by referring to “revealing the significance” of conservation areas and referring to scheduled monuments. This does not affect the operation of the policy and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM60—change to supporting text at 5.3.50

A new safeguarding map has been produced for Heathrow Airport which requires consultation for buildings over 150m in Central Reading. This is not expected to have any notable impact on the potential for tall buildings but nonetheless requires reference of the airport as a consultee. It does not change the operation of the policy and requires no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM61—change to the lower end of the dwelling range of CR11a

This modification changes the lower end of the dwelling range from 120 to 130 to correct an error as explained in paragraph A1.6 of the Council's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX053]. As this change corrects an error and the change to the lower limit only represents 10 dwellings, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM62—change to refer to listed buildings near CR11b

This modification reflects a change within the SOCG with Historic England [EX014] to highlight the importance of the Grade I listed Greyfriars Church and to refer to other listed buildings in the area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM63—change to reflect the possibility of retained market uses at CR12a

This modification ensures the effectiveness of the policy by reflecting the possibility of retained market uses as CR12a. This may bring additional positive economic benefits, but does not change the appraisal as this is already identified as bringing positive and negative economic effects.

MM64—change to reflect recent application decisions at CR12d

This change seeks to amend the dwelling range as explained in RBC Hearing Statement Matter 10 [EX053] at paragraph A1.156 and to clarify that the dwelling figure relates to the site as a whole. As this simply reiterates existing information, it does not change the operation of the policy and therefore requires no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM65—change to amend reference to heritage assets under CR13

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to add reference to significance and name specific assets within the criterion of the policy. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM66—clarification of intent to convert the existing building at CR13a

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to clarify that any mixed-use development will occur through conversion of the existing building given the significance of Reading Prison. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM67—change to refer to the need for heritage impact assessment at Reading Prison

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to clarify the need for “proportionate heritage impact assessment” given the significance of Reading Prison. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy’s initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM68—change to CR14d to refer to minimising harm, listed buildings within and near the site and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to consider listed buildings both within and nearby the site and to align language with the NPPF for consistency. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy’s initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM69—inclusion of “or appropriate footfall generating town centre uses” at CR14g

This change reflects an amendment following comments received from The Oracle at Regulation 19 to expand references to retail and leisure. This change simply provides additional flexibility for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy’s initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM70— change to CR14g to refer to minimising harm and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to “minimise harm” to align language with the NPPF for consistency, as well as recognise the contribution of the nearby Conservation Area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy’s initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM71—inclusion of “or appropriate footfall generating town centre uses” at CR14g and to correct a site boundary error

This change reflects an amendment following comments received from The Oracle at Regulation 19 to expand references to retail and leisure. This change simply provides additional flexibility for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy’s initial intent. It also seeks to correct an error which initially included the River Kennet. This does not affect the operation of the policy and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM72—change to CR14i to refer to minimising harm, listed buildings within and near the site and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to consider listed buildings both within and nearby the site and to align language with the NPPF for consistency. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM73—change to CR14l to refer to minimising harm and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm and to acknowledge the nearby Conservation Area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM74—change to CR14n to refer to further heritage considerations

This change reflects amendments agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the historic significance of the site, the need for heritage impact assessment and archaeological desk-based assessment, the need to minimise harm and, importantly, the scheme's need to deliver heritage benefits. These changes simply provide additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflect the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM75—change to CR14r to refer to minimising harm and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm and to acknowledge the nearby Conservation Area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM76—change to the indicative dwellings range at CR14r

This change amends the dwelling range to align with a recent resolution to grant permission subject to S106 in order to ensure that the policy is justified. As the figure was found to be suitable in recent development management decisions, there is no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM77—changes to refer to harm and the significance of the Conservation Area; change to highlight flood risk at CR14t

The first two changes reflect amendments agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm and to acknowledge the nearby Conservation Area. These changes simply provide additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

In terms of flood risk, this is already well-covered by EN18 and the modification simply draws attention to this issue for applicants and decision makers. It does not affect the SA.

MM78—change to CR14t to refer to minimising harm and the contributions of Conservation Areas

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm and to acknowledge the nearby Conservation Area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM79—added emphasis regarding contributing positively to the Conservation area and avoiding harm to the Town Hall

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm to the significance of the town hall and to require the scheme to make a contribution to the Conservation Area where possible. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM80—addition of detail regarding floodplain storage at CR14x

This modification ensures that development is delivered in the context of the identified flood risk and is an effective plan by specifically ensuring that sufficient compensatory storage is provided to compensate for any loss of floodplain storage as a result of development or infrastructure provision. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

Site CR14x: 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
CR14x(i)	Residential development of 150-200 dwellings	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	O	?X	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	O	O	?X
CR14x(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	O	O	O	?	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
CR14x(iii)	Additional retail development	✓X	✓X	✓X	?	✓X	✓X	?	O	?	O	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O
CR14x(iv) ❖	Residential development at more typical urban densities, 57-85 dwellings; requirement for compensatory floodplain storage	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	O	?	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	O	O	?X

Although this modification includes a requirement for compensatory floodplain storage, it does not affect the appraisal as the scoring under objective 2 states some positive and some negative effects. This remains the case.

MM81—inclusion of Royal Court, Kings Road within allocation CR14z

This modification follows the Post Stage 2 Hearings Letter (EX101) in which it was agreed that site allocation CR14z Sapphire Plaza, Watlington Street should be modified to include the adjacent Royal Court site. This necessitated altering the site allocation's name, increasing the site's size and capacity to include Royal Court as per the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2024 (EV015 and EV016). It was further agreed that phasing of development to maintain accommodation for existing Royal Court residents should be clearly stated for clarity. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

Site CR14z: 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
CR14z(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	O	O	?	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	X	O	?X
CR14z(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	O	O	O	?	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
CR14z(iii)	Residential development at general town centre densities of 80-135 dwellings (45-100 net gain)	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	O	O	?	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	X	O	?X
CR14z(iv) ❖	Redevelopment of Sapphire Plaza and Royal Court for residential	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	O	O	?	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	X	O	?X

	(approx. 50-85-6- 84 dwellings)																				
Option No.	Option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
CR14z(v)	Conversion of Sapphire Plaza to residential (approximately 70 dwellings)	?✓	?✓	?✓	✓✓	?✓	?✓	O	O	?	O	✓X	O	✓✓	✓✓	?X	O	O	X	O	?X

The changes are limited to changing the title of Option iv and as the increase in dwellings is very modest, there are no changes to sustainability effects.

MM82—amendment to refer to aquifer impacts at CR14aa

This change is proposed in order to reflect a constraint identified by the EA at Regulation 19 stage. It provides additional detail as to what information should be provided by an applicant but does not change the operation of the policy. As such, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM83—amendment to refer to minimising harm to Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area

This change reflects an amendment agreed with Historic England in the SOCG [EX104] in order to highlight the need to refer to harm and to acknowledge the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area. This change simply provides additional detail for applicants and decision-makers and reflects the policy's initial intent. This does not affect the operation of the policy as this is well-covered by EN1 and results in no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM84—amendments to table at 5.4.38

This change updates sites with existing planning permission to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council. It has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM85—amendment to CR15 to refer to heritage benefits

This change reflects language agreed in the SOCG with Historic England [EX104] in order to emphasise the importance of avoiding harm and delivering heritage benefits for consistency with national policy. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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; aim to deliver heritage benefits.	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

As the initial appraisal anticipated significant positive effects with regard to Objective 10 and the framework does not allow for increasing this effect, there is no change to the sustainability effects.

MM86—reference to early engagement with Historic England at 5.4.39

This change reflects language agreed in the SOCG with Historic England [EX104] in order to emphasise the importance of early engagement with Historic England, particularly with regard to the Scheduled Monument. This simply provides further detail for applicants and does not affect the operation of the policy. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM87—amendment to supporting text at 6.1.6 to refer to the location of the DEPZ

This change provides further detail to ensure that the location of the DEPZ is identified in order to ensure the Plan's effectiveness. This amendment is made in response to WBDC's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX082]. It does not change the operation of policies and therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM88—addition of key principle at 6.2.1

This change aims to ensure that the DEPZ is recognised as a high-level issue in South Reading that requires early consideration and engagement. This amendment is made in response to a representation by AWE and MOD and is explained further in the Council's Matter 9 Hearing Statement [EX052] at paragraph 9.2.8. This does not result in any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal as it simply reiterates and emphasises information already stated in other parts of the Plan.

MM89—amendment to map within Figure 6.1

In response to WBDC's Hearing Statement on Matter 10B [EX082] and discussions held at hearings on 10th February 2026, a change is proposed to amend the map at Figure 6.1 in order to ensure that the location of the DEPZ is identified. This does not result in any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal as it simply reiterates and emphasises information already stated in other parts of the Plan.

MM90—update to figures of completed homes in South Reading at paragraph 6.2.4

This change simply updates completion figures to reflect the most recent information held by the Council. It does not affect the operation of the Plan's policies or site allocations and therefore there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM91—addition of text at 6.2.9

This change seeks to ensure that applicants and decision makers are aware that Island Road falls within the DEPZ. This amendment is made in response to WBDC's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX082]. It does not change the operation of policies and therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM92—new paragraph at 6.2.13

This change aims to ensure that the DEPZ is recognised as a high-level issue in South Reading that requires early consideration and engagement. This amendment is made in response to a representation by AWE and MOD and is explained further in the Council's Matter 9 Hearing Statement [EX052] at paragraph 9.2.8. This does not result in any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal as it simply reiterates and emphasises information already stated in other parts of the Plan.

MM93—changes to SR1

These amendments aim to clarify that not all uses must be included to ensure the policy is effective following hearing discussions which revealed the policies may not be interpreted as intended. It also includes additional language to align with OU2 following comments within WBDC's Hearing Statement on Matter 10 [EX082]. These changes reflect the initial intentions of how the policies should operate and therefore there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM94—amendment to supporting text at 6.3.1

This amendment proposes a new sentence within the supporting text of Island Road policies to ensure consideration of evolving market conditions. This will increase the effectiveness of the Plan by providing flexibility. As it does not affect the operation of the policies, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM95—amendment to supporting text at 6.3.2

This change provides further detail to ensure that the location of the DEPZ is identified in order to ensure the Plan's effectiveness. It draws attention to the fact that the area falls within the DEPZ and directs applicants and decision makers to Policy OU2. This amendment is made in response to WBDC's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX082]. It does not change the operation of policies and therefore, there are no changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM96—amendment to map at Figure 6.2

In response to WBDC's Hearing Statement on Matter 10B [EX082] and discussions held at hearings on 10th February 2026, a change is proposed to amend the map at Figure 6.2 in order to ensure that the location of the DEPZ is identified. This does not result in any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal as it simply reiterates and emphasises information already stated in other parts of the Plan.

MM97—clarification of dwelling net-gain figure at SR4b

This change adds "net-gain" to the indicative dwelling range to ensure the policy is clear and effective. This reflects the original intent as assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and therefore no changes are required.

MM98—amendment to final bullet point of SR4e

This change aims to ensure that the DEPZ is recognised within the allocation itself and clearly aligns with OU2 for effectiveness. This amendment is made in response to WBDC's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX082] and discussions at the hearings on 10th February 2026. This does not result in any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal as it simply reiterates and emphasises information already stated in other parts of the Plan.

MM99—amendment to access arrangements at SR4h

This change clarifies that an alternative access arrangement may be justified at this site. This is further explained in the Council's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX053] at paragraph A2.116. Although this amendment will make the policy clearer and more effective, it does not bring any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM100—correction of error within dwelling range

This change simply corrects an error within the indicative dwelling range at SR4i. It is a small error and does not bring any associated changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM101—amendments to table at 6.3.17

This change updates sites with existing planning permission to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council. It has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM102—update to figures of completed homes in West Reading at paragraph 7.2.4

This change simply updates completion figures to reflect the most recent information held by the Council. It does not affect the operation of the Plan's policies or site allocations and therefore there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM103—deletion of allocation WR3b

This modification follows the Post Stage 2 Hearing Letter (EX101) in which it was agreed that site allocation WR3b 2 Ross Road & Part of Meadow Road should be deleted, to ensure that the plan is sound and justified. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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. Remove WR3a, WR3b , WR3c, WR3d, WR3e, WR3m, WR3q. Changes to capacities including residential use for The Meadway Centre (WR3o), potential for ground floor commercial use at Moultsford Mews (WR3j) and respite care use for Amethyst Lane (WR3n)*	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	0	0	0	?	?X	0	0	?✓	0	0	0	0	?✓	0	0
WR3(ii) ▼	Retain as existing	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	?	0	0	0	?	?X	0	0	?X	0	0	0	0	?	0	0

The changes are limited to changing the title of Option i and as the decrease in dwellings is modest within the context of the plan period. As such, there are no changes to sustainability effects.

MM1034—addition of language regarding floodplain storage at WR3i

The addition of language regarding floodplain storage at the request of the EA has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal. It simply adds technical clarification to the bullet point under the allocation that states “address flood risk issues arising from a Flood Risk Assessment, including from surface water.”

MM105—deletion of allocation WR3s and MM105—deletion of allocation WR3t

This modification includes the deletion of site allocation WR3s Land at Kentwood Hill, following the Inspector’s Further Letter following Stage 2 Hearings (EX107). The site allocation is deleted for soundness of the plan due to the designation of the site as a Local Wildlife Site. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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. Remove WR3a, WR3c, WR3d, WR3e, WR3m, WR3q, WR3s and WR3t . Changes to capacities including residential use for	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	O	O	O	?	?X	O	O	?✓	O	O	O	O	?✓	O	O

	The Meadway Centre (WR3o), potential for ground floor commercial use at Moultsford Mews (WR3j) and respite care use for Amethyst Lane (WR3n)*																				
WR3(ii) ▼	Retain as existing	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	?	O	O	O	?	?X	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O	?	O	O

The changes are limited to changing the title of Option i and as the decrease in dwellings is very modest and there were challenges with delivery that resulted in the decision to omit this site from the housing trajectory in the first place, there are no changes to sustainability effects.

MM107—addition of language regarding flood risk at WR3u

The addition of language regarding surface water flood risk at the request of the EA has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal. It simply adds technical clarification to the bullet point under the allocation itself, but surface water flood risk would already require consideration under Policy EN18.

MM108—amendment to access arrangements at WR3w

This change clarifies that an alternative access arrangement may be justified at this site. This is further explained in the Council's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX053] at paragraph A3.150. Although this amendment will make the policy clearer and more effective, it does not bring any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM109—amendment to WR3y

This change clarifies that additional development that is carefully designed is acceptable on this site due to recent development management decisions. This is further explained in the Council's Matter 10 Hearing Statement [EX053] at paragraph A3.167. Although this amendment will make the policy clearer and more effective, it does not bring any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM110—amendments to table at 7.3.18

This change updates sites with existing planning permission to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council. It has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM111—update to figures of completed homes in Caversham and Emmer Green at paragraph 8.2.3

This change simply updates completion figures to reflect the most recent information held by the Council. It does not affect the operation of the Plan's policies or site allocations and therefore there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM112—deletion of site allocation CA1a

This modification includes the deletion of site allocation CA1a Reading University Boat Club, Thame Promenade, following the Post Stage 2 Hearings Letter EX101 from the Inspectorate. The site allocation is deleted for soundness of the plan. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

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. Remove CA1a , CA1b and CA1g. Changes to capacities.	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	?✓	O	O	O	?	?X	O	O	?✓	O	O	O	O	?✓	O	O

CA1(ii) ▼	Retain as existing	?✓	?✓	?✓	?X	?	O	O	O	?	?X	O	O	?X	O	O	O	O	?	O	O
---------------------	--------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The changes are limited to changing the title of Option i and as the decrease in dwellings is very modest, there are no changes to sustainability effects.

MM113—addition of reference to local listing at CR1h

This change aims to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council as the school and lodge buildings were added to the Local List in April 2025. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal is amended as follows:

Site CA1h: Hemdean House School, Hemdean 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
CA1h(i)	Conversion and development for residential use.	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	O	?	<u>O✓</u> <u>?</u>	✓X	O	✓✓	?	?X	O	O	O	O	✓
CA1h(ii) ▼	Do not allocate	O	O	O	?	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	?	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
CA1h(iii) ❖	Retain community use and development of	✓X	✓X	✓X	✓✓	✓X	✓X	?	O	?	<u>O✓</u> <u>?</u>	✓X	O	✓✓	?	?X	O	O	O	O	✓

	additional residential use																				
--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

COMMENTS:

CA1h(i): Option 1:

Converting the existing buildings 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 site 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 borough's 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 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 school and community uses could result in reduced access to essential services and facilities (15). In addition, it may result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). [As a couple buildings on-site has been included in the Local List as of April 2025, redevelopment may bring somewhat positive effects with regard to objective 10 as any conversion would be required to be sensitive to heritage and would bring the buildings back into use.](#)

CA1h(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.

CA1h(iii): Option 3:

Retention of the existing community use and additional development on 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, and indeed conversion of the existing site 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 borough's 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 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 school could result in adverse effects to health due to stress on existing school places and GP surgeries (15,20). [As a couple buildings on-site has been included in the Local List as of April 2025, redevelopment may bring somewhat positive effects with regard to objective 10 as any conversion would be required to be sensitive to heritage and would bring the buildings back into use.](#)

Conclusion:

Option CA1h(iii) has 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 loss for the existing school or community uses 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.

MM114—amendments to table at 8.3.5

This change updates sites with existing planning permission to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council. It has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM115—update to figures of completed homes in East Reading paragraph 9.2.4

This change simply updates completion figures to reflect the most recent information held by the Council. It does not affect the operation of the Plan's policies or site allocations and therefore there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM116—clarification of “net gain” at ER1c

This change clarifies that the 14-20 dwellings range is for net gain and that the total capacity of the site is 18-26 dwellings. This reflects the initial intent of the allocation as assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal. No changes to the Sustainability Appraisal are necessary.

MM117—amendments to table at 9.3.6

This change updates sites with existing planning permission to reflect the most up-to-date information held by the Council. It has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM118—change to student figures at 9.3.8

This change seeks to amend the number of students stated within the supporting text based on discussions at the examination hearings on 10th February 2026. This simply reflects the most up-to-date factual information and does not affect the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM119—additional language to highlight on-going review of the University’s needs

Following representations received at Regulation 19 Stage, this additional text is proposed to be added within the supporting text of ER2 in order to reiterate that floorspace needs on campus will be kept under review and that these may change over the course of the plan period. This will ensure that the policy is sufficiently flexible and effective. It does not require any changes to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM120—deletion of sites within figure 10.2 (delivery timescales) or change in anticipated delivery dates

This change simply seeks to align the delivery timescales table with the main modifications listed above which result in the deletion of a site allocation or the change in an anticipated delivery date given the most up-to-date information held by the Council. The impacts of the deleted allocations are assessed above and the amendment of the table itself has no effect on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM121—Insert new paragraph following 10.3.4

A new paragraph is proposed to be added here which outlines details with regard to the Sewage Treatment Works. This aims to ensure that the results of an amended Water Quality Assessment are reflected within the Plan and will ensure that it is effective. As Policy EN16 already requires that adequate sewerage and wastewater treatment infrastructure be in place prior to occupation, this supporting text does not affect the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM122—removal of reference to ‘housing shortfall’ at 11.1.4

In order to ensure the Plan is effective, this change removes reference to a “housing shortfall” that no longer exists and instead refers to general housing provision. This paragraph is in reference to monitoring and therefore there are no effects on the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM123—addition of monitoring targets for EN14

This change inserts two further indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of Policy EN14, namely the number of new planning permissions that meet the relevant UGF score. This change simply refer to monitoring rather than the requirements of EN19 itself which have been assessed separately. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM124—addition of monitoring target for EN19

This change inserts an indicator for monitoring the effectiveness of Policy EN19, namely the number of trees planted and the amount of canopy cover within the Borough. These changes simply refer to monitoring rather than the requirements of EN19 itself which have been assessed separately. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM125—change to monitoring framework with regard to Policy H13

This change seeks to align the monitoring framework to reflect identified needs within Policy H13 as highlighted in Inspector's Action List at the conclusion of Stage 1 hearings [EX036]. These changes simply refer to monitoring rather than the requirements of H13 itself which have been assessed separately. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM126—change to monitoring framework with regard to Policy H14

This change seeks to align the monitoring framework to reflect identified needs within Policy H14 to ensure the Plan is effective. These changes simply refer to monitoring rather than the requirements of H14 itself which have been assessed separately. Therefore, there is no change to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM127—amendment to the glossary

This change seeks to align language within the glossary with the NPPF and the intent of Policy EN4 which seeks to protect locally important heritage assets, not simply buildings. This also allows for protections to be applied to landscape considerations such as a park or garden. As this is simply a change to the glossary, there are no effects to the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM128—insertion of new Housing Trajectory to reflect most recent monitoring data

Since submission, the results of 2024-25 monitoring [EX034] have been completed. There have also been a number of other additional major permissions granted since 1 April 2025 that need to be taken into account. This change replaces the existing Housing Trajectory to ensure that the Plan is effective. There are no implications for the Sustainability Appraisal.

MM129—amend criteria for locally listing to include assets more generally

Following discussions on Matter 5, a change is proposed to amend the criteria for the Local List to ensure language is inclusive enough to explicitly allow for the listing on assets that are not buildings, such as a park or a garden. The effects of this are assessed under EN4 and there is already a local park and garden on the Local List as this has always been the Council's intent. Therefore, there is no change to the sustainability appraisal.