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3.1 Issues 11-14: Development Limits (Settlement Boundaries) and Separation of Settlements

3.1.1 This section considers how the Council seeks to set the Development Limits (settlement boundaries) around the Borough’s identified settlements and within the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs). Within development limits there is a presumption for development whereas in areas of countryside (outside of development limits) there is a presumption against development. It also explains how the areas of Settlement Separation shown on the Core Strategy Key Diagram (listed in policies CP18-21) will be defined.

Issue 11 – Development limits

3.1.2 Wokingham Borough comprises a number of settlements of different sizes separated by areas of countryside. This natural environment is highly valued by the Borough’s residents. The countryside contributes to the Borough’s attractiveness as a place to work, live and visit and provides social and economic benefits to the Borough. The vision laid down in the Core Strategy is to protect the key features of the Borough’s landscape and environment whilst ensuring residents have good access to services.

3.1.3 The Core Strategy therefore concentrates development in those towns and villages that either have a good range of facilities or will have once the development is completed.

3.1.4 To ensure this the Council needs to review and set development limits to prevent development from gradually extending into the surrounding countryside and to direct development to appropriate sustainable areas of existing settlements across the Borough.

3.1.5 The Council also needs to define the Development Limits and Settlement Separation areas around and within the Strategic Development Locations (Arborfield Garrison SDL, South of M4 SDL, North WokinghamSDL and South Wokingham SDL). Land outside of the development limits set in the SDLs will have a countryside designation. In addition the Core Strategy Key Diagram (page 128 of the Core Strategy) shows areas of where settlement separation should be applied. The Core Strategy Inspector considered these were “critical gaps” (paragraph 7.6 of the Inspector’s Report). These areas of settlement separation are necessary to prevent the coalescence of towns and villages and should be protected to meet that purpose.
3.1.6 Due to the vulnerability of some areas of settlement separation (for example between Shinfield and Spencers Wood) the Council is unlikely to re-visit the settlement separation designation once in place in any future review. Further development will not be expected to take place within the area designated as settlement separation. Land identified as areas of Settlement Separation will also have a countryside designation with a presumption against development.

3.1.7 The Council also needs to define development limits and the associated settlement separation for the Science and Innovation Park (see also issue 34) to be delivered under Core Strategy policy CP16. The latter is necessary since the site where the Council has granted planning permission (O/2009/1027) for phase 1 of the Science Park on a site which is located within the area diagrammatically shown (on the Core Strategy Key diagram) for maintaining the separation of Shinfield from Shinfield (North of M4).

Context

3.1.8 PPS1 (paragraph 5) recognises the important role of planning in facilitating and promoting sustainable development in urban and rural areas, whilst protecting and enhancing the countryside. This is amplified in PPS7 (paragraph 9) which highlights the importance of providing housing in villages on sites either within or adjoining them whilst strictly controlling new house building (including single dwellings) in the countryside, away from established settlements.

3.1.9 Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy allows most forms of development on sites within the Borough’s defined development limits, subject to complying with other policies contained in the Development Plan. Areas outside of development limits are automatically within designated countryside or Green Belt and are therefore subject to Policies CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy which restrict development.

3.1.10 Taking account of national policy, Core Strategy policies CP9 and CP11 indicate how the authority in general will consider applications in the Borough’s towns and villages compared to the wider countryside. It is necessary to define settlement boundaries to confirm where the two policies apply. The Core Strategy requires the MDD DPD to set the development limits for settlements in the Borough.

3.1.11 The MDD DPD will also set the development limits for the SDL’s to take account of the adopted SDL Masterplan SPD’s.

Need to review Development Limits (Settlement Boundaries)

WDLP Inspector’s Report

3.1.12 The Part 2 Local Plan Inspector (Mr Hollis) (paragraph 1.42) recommended that before the Council started work on reviewing the Wokingham District Local Plan 2004 (WDLP), it should undertake a thorough review of all settlement boundaries. This was because he was concerned that the Council had not undertaken a rigorous reassessment of the boundaries in line with

---

28 Permission granted 27/5/10 for phase 1 development of Science & Innovation Park
government guidance (former PPG7, paragraph 4.16). The review of settlement boundaries has been progressed through the MDD DPD.

Approach to reviewing Development Limits

3.1.13 The Council in late 2004 consulted upon a potential approach (LPS1: Settlement Boundary Review Consultation) to reviewing settlement boundaries and was agreed by Council in October 2005.

3.1.14 The approach to reviewing development limits was based on their sustainability in line with that confirmed through the Core Strategy. In the least sustainable locations, the Council applied a more restrictive approach to defining development limits than in the more sustainable areas. The approach was based on density and character methodology.

3.1.15 Consultation responses indicated that development limits should only be applied to areas where the character is unlikely to be significantly harmed by future development proposals. This may limit development potential on back gardens on the edge of settlements.


Approach to applying Development Limits

3.1.17 The Council considers that changes to national planning policy guidance (PPS3) with regards to applying a less rigid density approach and the removal of gardens from the definition of brownfield land together with the application of Policies CP1, CP3 and CP9 of the Council’s Core Strategy means that the methodology used in the review is not as appropriate.

3.1.18 Having applied the approach laid down in the review methodology it has become clear that some significantly developed areas within established smaller settlements would be placed in the countryside. This would result to having the more restrictive countryside policy (CP11) applied to areas within the centre of settlements. The implication of this would be a presumption against development in parts of those settlements.

3.1.19 Land outside of Development Limits, including land designated as such within SDLs, will also have a countryside designation with a presumption against development in these areas.

### Issue 11: Boundaries for Development Limits – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

| To carry forward the existing development limits (settlement boundaries) taking into account any development proposals completed or with outstanding planning permission since the preparation of the WDLP and any sites allocated through the Managing Development DPD. |
| Have Development Management Policies which guide matters such as character and transition between towns and villages and the wider countryside. |
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Amending the draft development limits to reflect planning permissions that have taken place since the preparation of the WDLP to March 2011, sites that will be allocated through the MDD DPD and the development limits arising from the outcome of issues 12 and 13.

- Amending the draft development limits to remove any inconsistencies (such as the development limit going through existing buildings).

- Ensuring that regard also be given to Development Management Policies in the MDD DPD and Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3, CP9 and CP11 on matters such as character and transition between towns and villages and the wider countryside.

Maps of the draft development limits, showing the suggested and alternative option can be found at Maps 2.1-2.24.

**Issue 11: Boundaries for Development Limits – Alternative Option**

Apply the approach for reviewing development limits the Council previously proposed and consulted on. Development limits to reflect planning permissions that have taken place since the preparation of the WDLP to March 2011 and sites that will be allocated through the MDD DPD.

Development limits will also be defined to reflect the outcome of the consultation on issues 12 and 13 together with sites allocated through the MDD DPD.

Regard to also be given to Development Management Policies on matters such as character and transition between towns and villages and the wider countryside.

*This approach would not accord with the Core Strategy Vision. This alternative option could result in some of the Borough’s smaller settlements (Limited Development Locations) consequently being subjected to restrictive countryside policy that may not allow limited development or extensions to properties.*

*The approach may also restrict the opportunities for small scale allocations/additions (which could include affordable housing to meet local needs) to these smaller settlements (Limited Development Locations) (Core Strategy paragraph 3.31).*

Maps of the draft development limits, showing the suggested and alternative option can be found at Maps 2.1-2.24.
**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development)  
| Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development)  
| Policy CP9 (Scale and Location of Development Proposals)  
| Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)) |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

**WDLP Inspector’s Report: Part 2 Local Plan (Mr Hollis) (paragraph 1.42)**

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) | Paragraph 5  
| PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) | Paragraph 9 |

**Q. Are you aware of an alternative approach?**

**Q. Do you have any comments on the draft development limit boundaries?**

**Issue 12: Need to define Development Limits (Settlement Boundaries) within SDL**

3.1.20 Whilst issue 11 examined the review of development limits outside of the SDL, the Council also needs to define them within the boundaries of these allocated sites. This would provide further clarification regarding where the development envisaged within each SDL would occur. In defining the development limits the Council will have regard to the guidance in the SDL Masterplan SPD’s

**Issue 12: Boundaries for Development Limits (within SDL) – Suggested Option**

**Our approach is:**

To define development limits having regard to the areas shown for development within the masterplan for each SDL.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Having regard to the Masterplan SPDs

**Issue 12: Boundaries for Development Limits (within SDL) – Alternative Option**

The Council considers that there is no alternative.
Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development)</th>
<th>Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CP9 (Scale and Location of Development Proposals)</td>
<td>Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies CP18-21 (Strategic Development Locations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Are you aware of an alternative approach for development limits around within the SDL?

Issue 13: Need to define Development Limits (Settlement Boundaries) around the Science and Innovation Park

3.1.21 The Council also needs to define the development limits for the Science and Innovation Park. This will need to take account of the phase 1 scheme already approved (application number O/2009/1027), together with the outcome of consultation with respect of development limits for the South of the M4 SDL and the policy area for the Science Park

Issue 13: Boundaries for Development Limits (around Science and Innovation Park) – Suggested Option

Our approach is:
To define the limits of the Science and Innovation Park

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Define the development limit having regard to the whole scheme layout for the Science Park and having regard to the need to maintain separation of settlement between the Site and Reading (Separation between Shinfield and Shinfield (north of the M4))

The proposed development limit is shown on Map 2.14.

Issue 13: Boundaries for Development Limits (around Science and Innovation Park) – Alternative Option

The Council considers there is no reasonable alternative.
Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CP9 (Scale and Location of Development Proposals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies CP16 (Science Park)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)</th>
<th>Paragraph 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas)</td>
<td>Paragraph 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Are you aware of an alternative approach for development limits around the science park?

Q. Do you have any comments on the draft development limit boundaries for the science park?

Issue 14: Settlement Separation around SDL

3.1.22 The Core Strategy identifies four Strategic Development Locations (SDLs). The specific policies in the Core Strategy which deal with these SDLs (CP18-CP21) include specific requirements to maintain the separation of settlements in that specific SDL area. The Core Strategy Key Diagram illustrates the broad location of those SDL settlement separation areas.

3.1.23 The MDD DPD needs to further define the settlement separation areas in and around the SDL’s. The Core Strategy Inspector in his report (paragraph 7.4 and 7.6) recognised the importance of preventing the coalescence of settlements within the Borough and that the issue of identifying any other key areas of separation should be addressed as part of the MDD DPD. The MDD DPD will take account of neighbouring local authority’s development plans.

3.1.24 Settlement Separation Areas (as shown in Maps 3.1-3.4) take account of the Inspector’s comments on both the WDLP and the Core Strategy regarding the importance of maintaining settlement separation around the SDL.

3.1.25 The definition of settlement separation would include those gaps and green wedges defined by former WDLP policy WCC2 relevant to Core Strategy policies CP18-21 adjusted to take account of the Chris Blandford “Review of Gaps and Green Wedges” (June 2006) and the Landscape Capacity Study (July 2008). They would be further revised to take account of the finalised
approach for development limits in SDL (see issue 12) and for the Science & Innovation Park (issue 13)\(^\text{29}\).

### Issue 14: Settlement Separation – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

Further define those areas in and around the SDL’s and the Science Park as detailed in the relevant policies and illustrated on the Key Diagram.

See maps 3.1-3.4 for the draft settlement separation areas.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Ensuring the further defined areas reflect the relevant areas formerly covered by WDLP Policy WCC2 adjusted to take account of The Review of Gaps and Green Wedges, the Landscape Capacity Study, the approach arising from the development limits within each SDL (issue 12) and the Science Park (issue 13) and neighbouring Local Authority Development Plans.

### Issue 14: Settlement Separation – Alternative Option

Only to use the Core Strategy Key Diagram and Council’s Landscape Capacity Report.

*Council considers that the Core Strategy Key Diagram does not provide the right level of detail. This approach would not show all those areas of separation of settlements surrounding the SDLs.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP11 (Proposals Outside of Development Limits (including countryside)); Policy CP16 (Science Park); Policy CP18-21 (Strategic Development Locations); Paragraphs 4.57, 7.4 and 7.6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

N/A

### National Policy Linkage

N/A

---

\(^{29}\)As noted in issue 13, location of approved phase 1 Science Park is within area diagrammatically shown on key diagram as forming part of separation of Shinfield from Shinfield (N of M4).
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CHAPTER 4: ISSUES 15 TO 55: BOROUGH WIDE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

4.0.1 This chapter considers what Development Management Policies are required to help residents, landowners and developers in putting forward planning applications and for the Borough Council as Local Planning Authority to make decisions on development that will take place within the Borough until 2026. Development Management policies in the MDD DPD will both enhance policies in the Core Strategy and replace some of the saved policies from the WDLP. In some cases it will also be necessary to set boundaries of areas to which specific policies will apply. These are in addition to the Development Limit Boundaries and Areas of Settlement Separation Boundaries which were discussed in Chapter 3 of this options consultation.

Issues 15 to 55

4.0.2 Development will take place within the Borough to meet the needs of all its residents. To ensure that development promotes sustainable development, reflects, and in some cases protects, the character and landscape of an area, has regard to the impact of the development on neighbouring uses and provides or contributes to necessary facilities the Council needs to have Development Management policies in place. These policies can then be applied to development proposals to take these issues into account. The policies can help mitigate the impact of development whilst providing the range of types of dwellings and other facilities to meet the needs of residents and the community.

Context

4.0.3 The Core Strategy at Appendix 1 indicates which saved policies from the WDLP will be replaced by policies in the MDDDPD.

4.0.4 The Borough Council consider that the following topics may require Development Management policies to meet the Spatial Vision of the Core Strategy of protecting the key features of the Borough’s landscape and environment whilst ensuring residents have good access to services. This section gives options and their justification for the proposed policies.

4.0.5 This Chapter includes the following issues:

- **Policies for residential uses** (housing mix, internal space standards, housing density, provision of car parking, affordable housing on rural exception sites, loss of existing residential uses, conversion/sub division of housing (including HMO’s and Hostels) and new provision, caravan and
mobile homes and provision of community facilities within residential development)

- **Sustainable Development and Climate Change** (reducing carbon in new development, renewable energy development, on site recycling and development and flood risk)

- **Green Infrastructure** (outside of the SDL's) (open space, new public open space in developments, outdoor play and recreational space, country parks and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, moorings, Green Routes and wildlife corridors, ancient hedgerows, biodiversity and geological sites, burial grounds)

- **Economy:** Employment (core employment areas, South of the M4 Science Park, Whiteknights Campus (University of Reading), sites for business and industrial uses within development limits but outside Core Employment Areas, employment in the countryside including rural diversification).

- **Economy:** Retail (town, district and village centres including their boundaries and primary and secondary frontages, local centres and neighbourhood and village shops, garden centres and other retail units in the countryside and petrol filling stations).

- **Economy:** Tourism

- **Character and Heritage Assets** (Historic environment and heritage assets, archaeology, assets of local significance, public art, shopfront design and traditional shopfronts).

- **Green Belt** (Green Belt boundary, major developed sites in the Green Belt, development adjoining Green Belt)

- **Landscape** (Special Landscape Areas, river corridors and valleys, Sites of Urban Landscape Value, landscaping, trees, woodlands, ancient hedgerows and new development)

- **Transport and Movement** (strategic transport network, public transport provision and improvement, Rights of Way and footpath cycleway networks)

4.0.6 With regard to boundaries the Council is proposing options for applying boundaries for the following uses: These boundaries will be shown on maps which accompany this consultation document. The Council is also seeking views on these boundaries.

- New open space associated with development
- Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement Areas
- Country Parks and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) outside of Strategic Development Locations
- Local wildlife sites
- Core Employment Areas
- Science and Innovation Park
- Bad Neighbour Uses
• Town and District Centres
• Primary Shopping Areas
• Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages
• Local Centres
• Areas of Special Character
• Local Historic Parks and Gardens
• Archaeology
• Green Belt and Major Development Sites in the Green Belt
• Special Landscape Areas
• Sites of Urban Landscape Value
• The Thames Valley
• Loddon and Blackwater Valley Area
• Protected Road Lines and Transport Improvements
4.1 POLICIES FOR RESIDENTIAL USES

Issue 15: Housing mix and Internal Space Standards

Issue

4.1.1 The Council has to ensure that new housing reflects the needs of Wokingham Borough’s existing and future residents and communities. The housing needs of the Borough’s residents are changing. The 2001 Census indicated that the Borough’s population is gradually ageing. Needs data also shows that there is an increasing need for homes with fewer bedrooms in the Borough. The Council considers that to meet the changing needs there should be a flexible approach to the size of smaller (with fewer bedrooms) homes provided. There are also changes in the way that people work, with home working increasing as a sustainable option both from a business and environmental perspective (Wokingham Borough Economic Development Strategy 2010-2013).

4.1.2 To meet the housing needs of the whole community including families with children together with older people and those with disabilities a mix of the type of dwellings with sufficient internal space is required.

Housing Mix

Context

4.1.3 PPS3 (paragraph 22) indicates that Local Development Documents should set out “the likely profile of household types requiring market housing e.g. multi-person, including families and children (x%), single persons (y%), couples (z%).” PPS3 (paragraph 23) states “Developers should bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect demand and the profile of households requiring market housing, in order to sustain mixed communities. Proposals for affordable housing should reflect the size and type of affordable housing required.”

4.1.4 Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy indicates that residential development should provide a mix of dwellings. Paragraph 4.35 of the Core Strategy states that further information on housing mix will be provided in the MDD DPD. The MDD DPD therefore needs to build on this, taking into account the design and character of the area.

4.1.5 Paragraph 5.41 and Policy WH10 of the WDLP identifies the then current requirement for housing mix in residential development which the Council would aim to achieve. This mix reflected the Council’s Housing Requirements Study (HRS) (2002). This mix was up to 2 bed 47%, 3 bed 21% 4 or more beds 32%.

4.1.6 The Council’s Housing Strategy 2010-13 (page 8) indicates that “as a guide, based on current needs information, the Council will aim to achieve the following mix of sizes overall for affordable housing:

- 20% 1-bedroom flats and houses;
- 15% 2-bedroom flats;
- 30% 2-bedroom houses;
• 20% 3-bedroom houses (to include some 3-bedroom bungalows for families with physical disabilities)
• 15% 4-bedroom + houses."

Policies in the MDD DPD may reflect further Housing Need Work where carried out by the Council.

4.1.7 Depending on the character and needs of the area, it may not be necessary or desirable to include a mix of dwellings in every residential scheme, especially smaller ones (paragraph 4.30 of the Core Strategy).

Internal Space Standards

Context

4.1.8 Policy CP2 requires new development to contribute to the provision of sustainable and inclusive communities to meet long term needs including for an ageing population, children, young people and their families and people with special needs. Lifetime Homes standards incorporates design features which help to make them adaptable to meet the varying needs of different occupiers or changing needs through a family’s lifetime occupancy. It is important to build in flexibility to accommodate both visitors and carers.

4.1.9 The Council expects all new housing to have sufficient internal space to cater for a variety of different household needs with the aim of promoting high standards of liveability, accessibility and comfort (Section 6 of draft Affordable Housing SPD). Sufficient internal space can also help achieve Lifetime Homes Standards and also help to facilitate homeworking to help minimise the need to travel in line with Policy CP2 and CP6.

3. The draft Affordable Housing SPD (at Section 6) states that the Council expects all new housing to have sufficient space standards to cater for a variety of different household needs. The draft SPD (at Section 6) also states that the Council plans to develop local space standards for new dwellings as part of its planning policies. The Council (in the draft SPD) recommends the minimum space standards contained within the Homes and Communities Agency’s Draft Housing Design and Sustainability Standards (2010) for all new affordable housing, which can be viewed in Appendix 6 (Homes and Communities Agency’s draft Internal Space Standards). The recommendation can only be mandatory when included within a DPD which is subject to Examination in Public. This could also be made applicable to all new housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 15: Housing Mix and Internal Space Standards – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers should bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect the character of the area and the needs of households. Any scheme that requires the provision of affordable housing in line with Core Strategy policy CP5 should provide an appropriate mix of accommodation which reflects the Council’s Housing Strategy (adopted 2010) and the draft Affordable housing SPD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Details of which can be accessed via http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/pages/design-criteria.html.
Internal space standards in line with HCA standards for all (private and affordable) residential schemes.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Ensuring the policy is inline with requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP2, the Council’s Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing Strategy.
- Ensuring a character and design led approach to residential development on each site.

**Issue 15: Housing Mix and Internal Space Standards – Alternative Option 1**

1. Housing mix based on Policy WH10 of the WDLP and internal space standards in line with HCA standards for all (private and affordable) residential schemes of 10 or more units whilst ensuring a character and design led approach to residential development on each site.

4. To apply mix of dwellings based on Policy WH10 of the WDLP and internal space standards in line with HCA standards for all (private and affordable) residential schemes on sites of more than 1 hectare. The mix on small schemes to be character led.

*This approach will not ensure a character led approach on small schemes.*

**Issue 15: Housing Mix and Internal Space Standards – Alternative Option 2**

5. To apply mix of dwellings based on Policy WH10 of the WDLP and internal space standards in line with HCA standards for all (private and affordable) residential schemes.

*This approach may undermine a character led approach.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP2 (Inclusive Communities); Policy CP5 (Housing mix, density and affordability); Policy CP6 (Managing Travel Demand) Paragraph 4.30, 4.35 |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| Policy WH10 | Variety of Housing |

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS3 (Housing) | Paragraph 22 |
Issue 16: Housing density

Issue

4.1.11 In recent years there has been considerable pressure for the intensification of existing sites in Wokingham Borough, in particular the use garden land, to provide residential development. From March 2000 (PPG3) to June 2010 (PPS3), national guidance indicated that residential development had to achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. This has resulted in some cases of development having limited regard to the character or individuality of the surrounding area. The June 2010 changes to PPS3 removed both gardens from the definition of previously developed land (or brownfield) and the national minimum density requirement. This provides the opportunity for the Borough Council to develop policies to reflect the approach of the Core Strategy which requires new residential development to ensure that the character of the Borough is maintained and enhanced. This approach to development should have regard to and reflect the long standing character of the area.

Context

4.1.12 PPS3 (paragraph 47) recognises that local authorities can (where justified) adopt density policies that deliver development below 30 dwellings per hectare. The Borough is made up of 17 parishes and towns, each with their own distinctive character. Wokingham Borough’s housing stock is characterised by more detached properties and relatively few smaller properties (46.4% detached; 29.4% semi-detached; 14% terraced, 7.6% purpose built flats; 2.6% other – Census 2001). The need to protect the character of the Borough requires a character-led approach which could lead to the application of different densities in different areas. Specific guidance for development proposals within the SDL’s can be found within the Masterplan SPD’s.

4.1.13 The Core Strategy (paragraph 2.68 (vii) in line with the findings of Local Plan Surveys 2, 3 and 8 emphasise the importance of protecting the character of the Borough. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (criteria a) recognises the importance of development being appropriate to the character of an area.

4.1.14 The Core Strategy does not set density targets for residential development outside of the SDL’s. Within the SDL’s, the Core Strategy indicates that a density of between 30 and 35 dph should be achieved.

4.1.15 Setting strict density targets for residential development outside of the SDL’s is likely to result in planning applications being target led rather than reflecting the character of the area. The MDD DPD therefore needs to consider this and take into account the design and character of the area.

Issue 16: Housing Density – Suggested Option

Our approach is:
To not set a housing density target for residential development outside of the SDL’s but to have a design and character-led policy.

31 Local Plan Survey 2: Results of New Homes Survey (2004); Local Plan Survey 3: Results of the Developing Land Use Vision Survey (2004); Local Plan Survey 8: Response to Core Strategy Initial Options (2005).
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Assessing proposals on a site-by-site basis.
- Ensuring development is of high quality.
- Ensuring the character approach will not be led by developments which have not reflected the long standing character of the area.
- Ensuring that the policy refers to the updated Borough Design Guide which is being produced and the Core Strategy, in particular Policy CP3.
- Specific guidance for development proposals within the SDL’s can be found within the Masterplan SPD’s.

**Issue 16: Housing Density – Alternative Option 1**

1. Development in major development locations must achieve a minimum of 30 – 35 dwellings per hectare.

*This approach will not ensure a design and character led approach in major development locations.*

**Issue 16: Housing Density – Alternative Option 2**

2. 30 – 35 dwellings per hectare on all applications.

*This approach will not ensure a design and character led approach throughout the Borough.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP5 (Housing mix, density and affordability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**National Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS3 (Housing)</th>
<th>Paragraph 47, 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Issue 17: Provision of Car Parking for residential development**

**Issue**

4.1.16 Wokingham Borough has one of the highest car ownership rates of any English local authority (Core Strategy paragraph 2.16 and 4.36). Applying national maximum standards to some new residential developments has led to issues regarding off-site and on street parking and potential highway safety issues.
Context

4.1.17 PPS3 allows a more flexible approach to parking standards and paragraph 51 states that Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.

4.1.18 Policy CP1 (1) of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to maintain or enhance the high quality of environment. In addition, Policy CP3 c) requires proposals to provide an accessible, safe and secure scheme.

4.1.19 Paragraph A8.2.1 of Appendix 8 of the WDLP states that the Council wishes to retain flexibility in the way in which the parking standards are applied to ensure that they are appropriate to the specific location. Parking provision will have regard to the size of each dwelling proposed, the need for visitor parking, the likely ownership/ use of vehicles and the availability of high quality alternatives (as recognised in Core Strategy Policy CP6).

4.1.20 The Core Strategy (paragraph 4.38) states that a SPD will replace the current vehicular parking standards in Appendix 8 of the WDLP. This SPD will be the updated Borough Design Guide SPD. It will include further detail (in addition to the MDD DPD) on the application of new development and associated car parking in the updated Borough Design Guide SPD.

4.1.21 The MDD DPD could include a policy to ensure that the provision of car parking for residential development is appropriate in the amount provided and appropriate to the housing mix and character of the area.

| Issue 17: Provision of Car Parking for residential development – Suggested Option |
| Our approach is: |
| To include a policy on provision of car parking for residential development. |
| We consider that this can be achieved by: |
| • Ensuring the provision of car parking (including visitor parking) for residential development is appropriate in the amount provided and appropriate to the housing mix, size of each dwelling, the likely ownership/ use of vehicles and the character of the area. |
| • Reflecting the needs of specific types of housing development. |
| • To have minimum car parking standards |
| • Reflecting the updated Borough Design Guide SPD. |

| Issue 17: Provision of Car Parking for residential development – Alternative Option |
| Do not include a policy on the provision of car parking for residential development. |

*This will not ensure a more flexible approach to take into account expected levels of car ownership (PPS3).*
Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 1) (Sustainable Development); CP3 b) (General Principles for Development). Paragraph 4.38. |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| Appendix 8 | Parking Standards |

National Policy Linkage

| PPS3 | Housing |
| PPG13 | Transport |

Issue 18: Affordable Housing on rural exception sites

Issue

4.1.22 National policy (PPS7) and local policy (CP11) seek to protect the character of the countryside by restricting development in the countryside, including housing. This means that there are very limited opportunities to deliver affordable housing in rural areas to meet the needs of that community (Core Strategy Policy CP2 on Inclusive Communities). One way of addressing this is to have a rural exceptions site policy to enable small sites to be used specifically for affordable housing to meet a local need (e.g. young families, older people and people with special needs) as recognised by Core Strategy Policies CP9 and CP11.

Context

4.1.23 Affordable housing within settlements is covered by Core Strategy Policy CP5. The Managing Development Delivery DPD will not have a policy on this issue.

4.1.24 The aim of affordable housing on rural exception sites is to deliver high quality housing that contributes to the creation and maintenance of sustainable rural communities in villages and hamlets. Core Strategy Policy CP9 indicates that affordable housing on rural exception sites can be delivered to meet a demonstrated need on sites adjoining the development limits of modest or limited development locations.

4.1.25 The authority on 22 June 2009 resolved to grant planning permission for the first rural exception scheme within the Borough 32.

4.1.26 The Council considers that the MDD DPD needs to provide further guidance to applicants on how need should be assessed and occupation controlled. Policy CP11 also refers to affordable housing on rural exception sites.

4.1.27 The Borough Council has not previously consulted on this specific issue and has no earlier public feedback to base options upon. This consultation affords an opportunity for feedback on this issue.

32 Planning application F/2008/2293 for the erection of 10 dwellings at Kings Field, Blakes Road, Wargrave.
**Issue 18: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites – Suggested Option**

Our approach is:

To provide further policy guidance to assist in bringing forward affordable housing on rural exception sites, outside of defined development limits (including countryside), to meet demonstrated need.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Ensuring the policy adds to policy CP9 and CP11 of the Core Strategy

**Issue 18: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites – Alternative Option**

Do not include further policy on affordable housing on rural exception sites (outside of defined development limits (including countryside) and rely on Policy CP9 and CP11 of the Core Strategy and PPS3.

This approach will not provide further guidance to applicants on how need and occupation should be addressed.

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP9 (Scale and location of development proposals), CP11 (Proposals outside development limits (including countryside).) |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

N/A

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS3 (Housing) | Paragraph 30 |

**Issue 19: Loss of Existing Residential Uses**

**Issue**

4.1.28 Retention of the existing housing stock is important in helping to meet the overall housing requirements of the Borough. The Council considers that net loss of residential uses should only occur in exceptional circumstances, i.e. to ensure long term use of a listed building or to meet the needs of a community service.

**Context**

4.1.29 Policy CP3 i) of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for proposals that do not lead to a net loss of dwellings and other residential accommodation. Policy CP3 h) relates to provision of community facilities. Saved Local Plan Policy WH6 includes exceptions involving the loss of existing residential accommodation to other uses such as community services.

4.1.30 The Council consider that the net loss of residential dwellings should be considered on a site-by-site basis and that Policy CP3 (criteria i and h) and
legislation (The Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act 1990) provide sufficient level of detail to consider this issue.

**Issue 19: Loss of Existing Residential Uses – Suggested Option**

Our approach is:

Not to have a specific policy in the MDD DPD on the loss of existing residential uses.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Ensuring that exceptions are assessed on a site-by-site basis against the Core Strategy, in particular Policy CP3
- Legislation (such as the Listed Buildings and Conservation Act 1990)

**Issue 19: Loss of Existing Residential Uses – Alternative Option**

To include a policy which reflects saved Local Plan policy WH6.

*Consider that the loss of existing residential uses is already sufficiently covered in policy and legislation.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>CP3 i) (General Principles for Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WH6</th>
<th>Existing Residential Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**National Policy Linkage**

| N/A |

**Issue 20: Conversion/ sub-division of housing, including Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO’s) and Hostels**

**Issue**

4.1.31 The Government has made changes (on 6 April 2010) to the Planning Use Class Order which means a family dwelling (Class C3) may change to a small house in multiple occupation up to 6 people (Class C4) as “permitted development” without the need for planning permission. No planning permission is required to move from a Class C4 HMO to a family dwelling house (Class C3).

4.1.32 In introducing the changes, the Government have indicated that, where Local Authorities consider that there is a local need to control the spread of HMO’s, they can use existing powers in the form of Article 4 Directions to remove this form of permitted development and thereby require the submission of a planning application for such a change between a family dwelling house and HMO.

4.1.33 If Article 4 Directions are applied then the MDD DPD could include further policy guidance or planning applications can be assessed on a site-by-site basis against the Core Strategy.
Context

4.1.34 The Council recognises the contribution that conversion/ sub-division of existing housing and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO’s) and Hostels make to the local housing market in terms of potentially providing lower cost accommodation. HMO’s refers to residential property where common areas such as bathrooms and kitchens are shared by more than one household. HMO’s consist of a variety of property types such as bedsits, shared houses, purpose-built HMOs.

4.1.35 Factors to take into account in determining whether or not a property is suitable for conversion/ sub-division include the size and character of the property, and the effect on residential amenity (including the availability of parking).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 20: Conversion/ sub-division of housing, including HMO’s and Hostels – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our approach is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a policy on proposals (for when planning permission is required) for the conversion or sub-division of housing and some non-residential buildings for residential uses (including HMO’s and Hostels) subject to certain criteria regarding local amenity (such as parking) and do not impact on the local character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring sufficient space for all anticipated residents and appropriate levels of car parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring that the policy adds to Policy CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflecting saved Local Plan policies WH8 and WH16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring the policy takes into account any recent government guidance on this matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 20: Conversion/ sub-division of housing, including HMO’s and Hostels and new provision – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To rely on Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council consider that this Policy does not provide the right level of detail in considering applications for these uses.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP2 (Inclusive Communities); CP3 (General Principles for Development) |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| WH8 | Conversions/ sub-division of housing, including bedsits/ multi-occupation. |
| WH16 | Hostels |

National Policy Linkage

| • The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010 |
| • Housing Act 2004 |
### Issue 21: Caravans and Mobile Homes

#### Issue

4.1.36 Caravans and mobile homes contribute to the total housing provision in the Borough. They are also useful when allowed on a temporary basis, for the assessment of other, permanent proposals such as buildings on agricultural holdings. There can be issues surrounding the removal of caravans and mobile homes that have been allowed on a temporary basis. Such development can however have many of the implications and requirements of permanent dwellings. This issue does not include Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites (see Chapter 2).

#### Context

4.1.37 Saved Local Plan Policy WH13 provides guidance on caravans and mobile homes. The MDD DPD could include further policy guidance. However, the Council consider these uses could now be assessed on a site-by-site basis against existing policies in the Core Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 21: Caravans and Mobile Homes – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To not have a Policy in the MDD DPD on caravans and mobile homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring that proposals are assessed against the same criteria by which the Council judges applications for permanent dwellings. These include policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP9, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 21: Caravans and Mobile Homes – Alternative Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To develop a new specific policy which reflects saved Local Plan policy WH13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Council considers such a policy is not required as proposals can be assessed against Core Strategy policies.*

#### Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development); CP2 (Inclusive Communities); CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP9 (Scale and Location of development proposals); CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)); CP12 (Green Belt) |

#### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| WH13 | Caravans and Mobile Homes |
Issue 22: Provision of Community Facilities with residential development

Issue

4.1.38 New residential development can impact on existing facilities and resources. The Borough’s vision in the Core Strategy is to seek sustainable development which either provides or is accessible to a range of services and facilities.

4.1.39 The Council considers that there already policies in the Core Strategy that can ensure that development either provides or contributes to the provision of services and facilities, including community uses. Therefore it is not proposed to have further policies within this document or to carry forward polices saved in the WDLP.

Context

4.1.40 Development outside of the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs) will be delivered in line with policies of the Core Strategy and will be required to contribute towards/ provide community facilities. The SDLs will provide the necessary community facilities in line with Polices CP18-21 and Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy.

4.1.41 Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy requires new development to contribute to the provision of sustainable and inclusive communities (including the provision of community facilities). The Core Strategy at paragraph 4.17 states that community facilities include development for health (including preventative social care and community support services), education, play and leisure or culture together with libraries, village/ community halls and religious buildings.

4.1.42 Policy CP3 requires that development proposals do not lead to a loss of community or recreational facilities/ land or infrastructure unless suitable alternative provision is available.

4.1.43 Policy CP4 states that planning permission will not be granted unless appropriate arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure, services, community and other facilities required for the development.

Our approach is:

To not carry forward Saved WDLP Policies WIC5 (Community halls within residential development) and WIC8 ( Provision of school facilities with new residential development).

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Relying on Policies CP2, CP3, CP4, CP18-21 of the Core Strategy.
- SDL Masterplan SPD’s and the Infrastructure Delivery and Contributions SPD provide detailed guidance on the community facilities required for the SDL’s
Having regard to Council’s Community Infrastructure Strategy, including community hubs

### Issue 22: Provision Community Facilities with residential development – Alternative Option

To carry forward Saved WDLP Policies WIC5 and WIC8. The Council considers such a policy is not required as proposals can be assessed against Core Strategy policy.

#### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP2 (Inclusive Communities), Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development), Policy CP4 (Infrastructure Requirements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WIC5</th>
<th>Community halls within residential development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WIC8</td>
<td>Provision of school facilities with new residential development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.2 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

4.2.1 This section considers the approach that could be taken to meeting the challenge of climate change. It covers reducing carbon in new developments (including energy efficiency), renewable energy developments (on-site and stand alone schemes), energy efficiency, electric and plug in vehicles and onsite recycling.

Issue

4.2.2 Climate change can have an impact on a number of areas which are important to the Borough, including habitats, landscape, safety and water resources. The Council recognises that mitigating and adapting to climate change will be a significant factor in considering future development within the Borough.

4.2.3 In developing policies in the MDD DPD the Council will seek to try and address some of the issues around climate change, such as seeking to reduce CO₂ emissions.

Context

4.2.4 The Aspirations and Spatial Issue (ii) for the Borough, as indicated in paragraph 2.68 of the Core Strategy, promote sustainable use and disposal of resources while mitigating and adapting to climate change. The principle of sustainable development is embedded within Core Strategy Policy CP1 and is supported by additional policies such as Policy CP3.

4.2.5 Policy CP1 and supporting text (paragraph 4.8) refers to key measures that can help towards addressing climate change and set the rationale for seeking renewable energy from development proposals.

4.2.6 The Core Strategy (paragraph 4.8) states that the Council will seek over and above the minimum national and regional targets for construction standards and energy efficiency through the MDD DPD. The targets within the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD are aspirational. Such targets can only be mandatory when included within a DPD which is subject to Examination in Public.

4.2.7 The Council is committed to adapting and mitigating to climate change and has:

i. An adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted May 2010). This includes aspirational targets for exceeding statutory regional and national requirements. The SPD (at paragraph 1.6) encourages new development in the Borough to not just meet current mandatory sustainable design and construction standards but exceed them and set new standards for excellence.

ii. An adopted Sustainable Environment Strategy (2010-2020) (adopted in June 2010). The aim of the strategy is to improve the quality of life, now and for future generations, by respecting the Borough’s environment and protecting it from the impact of our activities.
iii. An adopted Economic Development Strategy (2010-2013) (adopted in March 2010). The strategy identifies green technology as an area of significant growth for our economy (i.e. electric cars, renewable energy technologies).

iv. Nottingham Declaration (signed in November 2007). It demonstrates a strong corporate commitment and political leadership in confronting the issues of climate change.

v. The Affordable Housing Thresholds in the Core Strategy were agreed following evidence that demonstrates the targets could be achieved, even if all new homes are built to at least Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (see paragraph 2.29 of the Affordable Housing Viability Study – June 2008).

**Issue 23: Reducing Carbon in New Development**

**Issue**

4.2.8 One of the most cost-efficient means of reducing carbon emissions is to maximise energy efficiency. Examples of this would include passive solar design, high levels of insulation and the use of energy efficient appliances. Carbon emissions can be further reduced by having heat and electricity generated through the use of low carbon and renewable technologies (this will be discussed later in this document).

**Context**

4.2.9 The Climate Change Act 2008 puts into statute the government's target to reduce CO\textsubscript{2} emissions through domestic and international action to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

4.2.10 PPS1 Supplement (Planning and Climate Change) encourages Local Authorities to set policy requirements that go beyond Building Regulations, where opportunities exist.

**Construction Standards and Energy Efficiency**

4.2.11 There are also nationally set tools and targets that deal with energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction. The Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) are certified tools which measure the overall sustainability of a development.

4.2.12 The tightening of Building Regulations would be sufficient to ensure new development meets Code Level 3's mandatory energy requirements in 2010, and Code Level 4's energy requirements in 2013. However the changes to Building Regulations do not require compliance with any of the CfSH's other criteria (such as water consumption).

**Code for Sustainable Homes**

4.2.13 The sustainability of residential development is measured by the CfSH. This covers nine criteria, including CO\textsubscript{2} reduction, water use, ecology and waste and includes a number of mandatory elements (for energy and water) which can be combined with a range of voluntary credits to achieve a rating level.
4.2.14 The Code levels are to be applied through the tightening of the Building Regulations. The Code levels should achieve the following reductions in carbon emissions when compared to Building Regulation requirements in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CfSH</th>
<th>Carbon Improvement as compared to Part L of the Building Regulations (2006)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>100 % - A ‘zero carbon’ home</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.15 The timetable highlights that zero carbon homes will be legally required by 2016. In July 2007, the Government’s ‘Building a Greener Future: Policy Statement’ announced that all new homes will be zero carbon from 2016. In December 2008, the Government published “Definition of Zero Carbon Homes and Non-Domestic Buildings: Consultation”. This proposed an approach, subsequently confirmed in a Written Ministerial Statement (by the Minister of Planning) in July 2009. It defined zero carbon homes.

4.2.16 The Affordable Housing Viability Study (June 2008) undertaken for the Council assumed that homes would be built to (Full) Code Level 4. The study states that development (of 5 or more units) would be viable taking into account Code Level 4 housing and all other assumptions indicated in Section 2 of the study (also see paragraphs 7.3 to 7.5 of the Wokingham Borough Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. Schemes of up to 4 dwellings (built at national densities) would not need to deliver affordable housing under Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy. Therefore they do not have the affordable housing requirement (i.e the associated costs) and should still be viable to deliver at least Code Level 4.

Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM)

4.2.17 The design standard currently used to assess the sustainable construction of commercial buildings is BREEAM. The requirements have not yet been translated into carbon emissions savings or targets, but revisions to Building Regulations, to be introduced, set out an overall reduction of 25% for non-residential buildings. At the current time, the best practice standards for commercial development are the BREEAM ‘very good’ or ‘excellent’ standards. The zero carbon standards are likely to be applied to non-residential development from 2019.

On-site decentralised and renewable or low carbon generation

4.2.18 The use of decentralised energy can help in reducing carbon in new developments. This includes a diverse range of technologies, including micro-renewables, which can locally serve an individual building, development or wider community and includes heating and cooling energy.

33 A zero carbon home is one whose net carbon dioxide emissions, taking account of emissions associated with all energy use in the home, is equal to zero or negative across the year. Our definition of ‘energy use’ will cover both energy uses currently regulated by the Building Regulations and other energy used in the home [...] The net emissions of the home, taking account of its energy efficiency and on-site energy supply (including, where relevant, connections to heat networks) will meet a minimum “carbon compliance” standard - in effect a regulatory level of carbon reduction to be achieved on-site compared to today’s regulations”. See: [http://www.communities.gov.uk/statements/corporate/ecozerohomes](http://www.communities.gov.uk/statements/corporate/ecozerohomes)
4.2.19 The use of renewable energy technology (including photovoltaic's, ground source heating/cooling, air source heat pumps and biomass) and low-carbon technologies, such as combined heat and power and district heating schemes can also help reduce carbon in new developments.

4.2.20 Policy NRM11 (Development design for energy efficiency and renewable energy) of the South East Plan requires residential development of more than 10 dwellings and non-residential development of 1000m$^2$ or greater to secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised, renewable or low-carbon technologies. The Core Strategy Planning Inspector endorsed the Council’s position with reliance on Policy NRM11 in achieving the aims of PPS1/PPS1 Supplement.

4.2.21 The approach of Policy NRM11 was for the proportion of energy that should be generated from on-site rather than carbon emission reductions. The latter is more in line with current and emerging government policy and the CfSH and changes to building regulations.

### Issue 23: Reducing Carbon in New Development – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

**Residential:**

All residential development involving the creation of a new dwelling (including replacement dwellings where this involves substantial, or complete demolition of the existing house) will be required:

- To meet **full** CfSH Level 4 or whatever higher Code is mandatory at the time of construction. This includes developments to achieve internal potable water consumption targets (105 litres or less per person per day).
- To use decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources to deliver a minimum 10% reduction in carbon emissions, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable.

**Non-residential (proposals outside use class order C3 - including nursing homes and residential institution):**

All developments involving the construction of 1000m$^2$ or more gross non-residential floorspace will be required:

- To meet BREEAM (or any future national equivalent) Very Good or whatever higher level is mandatory. Exceed statutory requirements for water resource management.
- To use decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources to deliver a minimum 10% reduction in carbon emissions, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable.

If decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources are not technically feasible seek the possibility to make a financial contribution towards a Carbon Buyout Fund (through Section 106 planning obligations). Where an applicant considers that a specific requirement is not viable (based on reasonable market assumptions) on a particular site, the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate the reasoning behind this.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Ensuring proposals are consistent with Sustainability Issues in Sustainable
Design and Construction SPD.

- Highlighting the Affordable Housing Viability Study (June 2008) which assumed that homes would be built to (Full) Code Level 4. The study states that development (of 5 or more units) would be viable taking into account Code Level 4 housing and all other assumptions indicated.
- Supporting the evidence base behind former Policy NRM11 of the South East Plan.

**Issue 23: Reducing Carbon in New Development – Alternative Option**

1. Allocated sites and major, modest or limited development locations could have specific requirements for sustainable buildings and decentralised and renewable or low carbon generation

*Although this approach would allow the Council to set higher targets for specific developments where local circumstances warrant this, it would mean all other developments are not required to meet higher targets or may be unlikely to incorporate renewable energy technology.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>CP1 (12) (Sustainable Development); CP3 (General Principles for Development);</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

N/A

**National Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1 Supplement</td>
<td>Planning and Climate Change Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q:** Should a target for a reduction in carbon emissions be set instead of setting a target for the proportion of energy that should be generated from on-site using renewable energy?

**Q:** Do you think the Council should set a higher target than the minimum 10% reduction in carbon emissions?

**Q:** Should a potential non-residential threshold remain at 1,000 m² for construction standards/ energy efficiency and renewable energy production? Yes or no? If no, please state why and suggest an alternative threshold?

**Q:** Should renewable and low carbon technology be allowed to be used as part of reaching the CfSH/ BREEAM Level?

**Q:** Do you think the Council should consider a policy in improving energy efficiency in existing dwellings i.e when a planning application for a house extension is made?
Issue 24: Renewable energy developments

Issue

4.2.22 The Core Strategy at paragraph 4.11 states that the Council will need to make provision for implementing the renewable energy generation targets and strategy set out in the South East. The Borough includes examples of renewable energy development such as the 85m high wind turbine in Green Park and also production of biogas at Star Works, Knowl Hill and the Wargrave Sewerage Treatment Works.

4.2.23 The MDD DPD could include further policy guidance on stand alone renewable energy developments (e.g solar farms, energy from waste, wind). If further policy guidance is not included in the MDD DPD, planning applications can be assessed on a site-by-site basis against the Core Strategy.

Context

4.2.24 National planning guidance on renewable energy is set out in PPS22 (Renewable Energy). Paragraph 4.9 of the Core Strategy states that development for the generation of energy from renewable energy resources will be permitted unless there are unacceptable locational or other impacts that could not be outweighed by wider environmental, social and economic or other benefits.

4.2.25 The former South East England Partnership Board undertook research to identify where there is the most potential for developing Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and Distribute Heat systems in the South East of England. The opportunities identified are based on an assessment of waste heat sources and potential heat demand.

4.2.26 As part of the work programme for Climate Berkshire (the Berkshire Climate Change Partnership) Thames Valley Energy were commissioned to complete ‘Climate Berkshire Report: Phase 1 of a strategy regarding future investments for renewable and low carbon power generation across Berkshire’. The report completed in March 2009 maps the existing opportunities for renewable and low carbon power within the Berkshire authorities. Phase 2 (not yet complete) will explore the opportunities and potential issues in more detail.

4.2.27 The Council may undertake/ commission an Energy Feasibility Study to understand the opportunities and constraints for renewable energy in the Borough.

### Issue 24: Renewable energy developments – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

To include a policy generally supporting renewable energy development in the Borough. This would be applied to such things as Renewable energy development at the large scale, Combined Heat and Power and district heating, solar farms, wind, energy from waste (including anaerobic digestion), hydro-electric power units and Energy Service Companies (ESCO’s).[[34]](footnote)

---

[[34]] Business that develops, installs and arranges financing for projects designed to improve the energy efficiency of buildings.
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Including rigorous criteria such as avoiding conflict with wildlife conservation and in keeping with the landscape character. Outside of these designated areas, particularly in the rural parts of the Borough, Local Character Assessments could form the basis for considering which technologies at which scale may be appropriate in different types of location.
- Referring to a potential Borough wider Energy Feasibility Study.

**Issue 24: Renewable energy developments – Alternative Option**

Do not include a policy on renewable energy development

*The Council will need to rely on national planning policy and would therefore not be locally distinctive.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (12) (Sustainable Development); CP3 (General Principles for Development). Paragraphs 4.9, 4.11 |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| N/A |

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS1 Supplement Planning and Climate Change Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 |
| PPS22 Renewable Energy |

**Q.** How should we best encourage the development of renewable energy (standalone) in the Borough? How can we ensure that renewable energy development does not adversely impact on the local environment?

**Q:** Do you know of any other evidence for the potential for renewable energy and low carbon power generation in the Borough? Yes/ no. If yes, please specify.

**Micro domestic installations**

4.2.28 Changes to permitted development rights for renewable technologies have removed the requirements for planning permission for most domestic microgeneration technologies. At present certain small scale renewable/low carbon technologies are permitted development (subject to certain limitations/conditions) on domestic premises (e.g. photovoltaics and solar thermal). Permitted development rights currently do not extend to non-domestic premises. Small scale projects make a valuable contribution to the
overall outputs of renewable energy both locally and nationally (paragraph 4.10 of the Core Strategy).

Q. Do you think the Council should consider a policy on micro domestic installations? Yes or no.

Infrastructure: electric and plug-in vehicles

4.2.29 The use of alternative fuels for vehicles, like electricity, can help reduce emissions. The Committee on Climate Change (The CCC) has set a target of 1.7 million electric/plug-in hybrid cars by 2020. The Government proposes to introduce a new class to the General Permitted Development Order to permit the installation of infrastructure for charging points within both public and private car parking areas. A policy could require the provision of the charging infrastructure/cabling for electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles in new residential and non-residential developments. Also, see Policy SCDM12 (Low Carbon Technology) of the adopted Local Transport Plan (LTP3) (2011-2026) which states that “the Council will actively support and plan for the uptake of low carbon technology such as electric vehicles and bio-fuels”.

Q. What can the Council do to ensure opportunities for electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles?
Q. Do you think the provision of charging infrastructure/cabling for electric and plug-in vehicle should be required for developments over a particular size? Yes or no. If yes, please stipulate what the threshold should be?

Issue 23: On-site recycling

4.2.30 In 2009/10, Wokingham Borough residents and businesses produced 75,272 tonnes of waste, of which 45% was landfill, 40% recycled/composted and 15% energy from waste (incinerated) (source: The Berkshire Unitary Authorities’ Joint Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2010). Generally, the landfill figures for Wokingham Borough have decreased over the last few years, with recycling percentages increasing accordingly. This is despite a steady increase in the Borough’s population (Sustainable Design and Construction SPD paragraph 14.2).

4.2.31 The Council currently operates a kerbside waste and recycling scheme for its residents as part of the Re336 programme with Reading and Bracknell Forest Borough Council’s. The kerbside green waste collection scheme has been expanded to cover 53,000 properties (85% of the Borough).

35 LTP3 can be viewed at http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/council/plans/transport-policy/local-transport-plan-3-2011-2026/
36 Re3 is the name given to the partnership between Bracknell Forest, Reading and Wokingham Borough Councils. In October 2006 the re3 councils signed a £600m, 25 year PFI contract with the Waste Recycling Group. This contract will deliver new waste management infrastructure and manage the waste arising from three councils throughout the lifetime of the contract.
### Issue

4.2.32 It is important that new developments (residential and commercial) are provided with, or have access to, on-site recycling facilities including the possible provision of home composters or sink macerators (food waste disposers) and appropriate facilities for the storage and collection of waste and for signage. Green waste should generally be composted on-site. Where on-site recycling is considered inappropriate, regard should be given to alternatives such as communal collection facilities (e.g. bottle banks).

4.2.33 The sorting and reuse of waste at source is the most efficient and sustainable treatment method and minimises the transportation of waste to landfill, recycling plants or incinerators.

4.2.34 The MDD DPD could include policy for on-site recycling to ensure development proposals incorporate such facilities.

### Context

4.2.35 Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) criteria 5 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to minimise the consumption and use of resources and provide for recycling. Section 14 of the Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provides guidance on waste, recycling and composting facilities. Sustainability Issue 7 of the SPD states that all development are required to provide, or have access to, appropriate facilities for storage and collection of waste.

4.2.36 An Environmental Impact Study of Food Waste Disposers for Herefordshire Council and Worcestershire County Council (June 2007) found that sink macerators (food waste disposers) provide a convenient and hygienic means for householders to separate kitchen food waste at source; they divert it from municipal solid waste landfill. There is no reason that sink macerators (food waste disposers) should discourage home composting since sink macerators are not designed to take garden waste and indeed exclusion of cooked kitchen food waste from home composting might encourage home composting (Sustainable Design and Construction SPD paragraph 14.10).

4.2.37 On-site recycling will help achieve the action of the Sustainable Environment Strategy (2010-2020) to increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill and will help to achieving the target of at least 50% of household waste is being recycled or composted by 2020.

### Issue 25: On-site Recycling – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

Include a policy which requires appropriate new development (residential and commercial) proposals to incorporate on-site recycling facilities (such as home composting or sink macerators (food waste disposers)) and appropriate facilities for the storage and collection of waste.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Ensuring where on-site recycling is considered inappropriate, regard should be given to alternatives such as communal collection facilities (e.g. bottle banks).
Issue 25: On-site Recycling – Alternative Option

Do not include policy for on-site recycling in the MDD DPD.

Rely on Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy, the Sustainable Development and Construction SPD and other local and national guidance.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP1 5) (Sustainable Development); Appendix 7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

N/A

Other Wokingham Borough Council Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (May 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Environment Strategy 2010-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS10</td>
<td>Planning for Sustainable Waste Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development and Flood Risk

4.2.38 Flooding can result not only in costly damage to property, but can also pose a risk to life and livelihood. It is essential that future development in planned carefully, steering it away from areas that are most at risk from flooding and ensuring that it does not exacerbate existing flooding problems.

4.2.39 The Wokingham Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (July 2007) observes that climate change will represent an increasing risk to flooding in low lying areas and the frequency and severity of flooding will change measurably within a generation. This means that the extreme weather events could become more frequent. More intense downpours may lead to more flooding from rivers, surface water, sewers, groundwater and a combination of these sources. An update to the Council’s SFRA is currently underway and is due to be completed in Summer 2011.

4.2.40 The MDD DPD is not intending to include additional policy on development and flood risk. The following provides the Council with comprehensive policy, guidance and research and are summarised in Appendix 7:

1. Core Strategy Policy CP1
2. Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
3. Updated Wokingham Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
4. Emerging Blackwater Valley Water Cycle Scoping Study
5. Emerging Surface Water Management Plans
6. Statutory requirements of Flood and Water Management Act 2010
7. Statutory requirements of Flood Risk Regulations 2009
8. PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) and its Practice Guide
9. Environment Agency and Water Companies

The Council work with the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies (including adjacent Local Authorities and local residents associations) on flood risk matters. This is inline with paragraph 25 of PPS25. The Council may consider a borough wide flood plan.

Local and Winter Storage

4.2.41 The Council will consider working with landowners and other stakeholders with regards options for local water storage reservoirs and other sustainable farming practices. This could help reduce summer abstraction, diffuse pollution and runoff and increase flood storage capacity.

Q. No sites for flood alleviation/ storage and flood defence have been promoted to the Council. Are you aware of any sites that could be suitable for flood alleviation/ storage/ defence purposes? Yes/ No. If yes, please provide further information.
4.3 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE (OUTSIDE OF THE SDL’S)

4.3.1 This section considers the approach to addressing how green infrastructure can be protected, maintained and enhanced and how new development can provide or enhance green infrastructure. Green Infrastructure covers such areas as open space in development, Green Routes between areas, local wildlife sites and wildlife corridors, biodiversity, recreational and play space, riverside footpaths, country parks and burial grounds. This section will also consider impact of moorings on the green infrastructure of the Thames. Specific guidance for development proposals within the SDL’s can be found within the Masterplan SPD’s.

Issue

4.3.2 The character of Wokingham Borough is that of settlements separated by areas of countryside, containing river valleys and enhanced by green infrastructure. The Borough also contains nationally and locally important wildlife sites. These assets are greatly valued by the Borough’s residents and communities.

4.3.3 Green infrastructure plays an important role in delivering the Borough’s diverse biodiversity of plants and animals by providing valuable wildlife corridors. It also provides health benefits by enabling access to opportunities for recreation and exercise.

4.3.4 Development can impact on the overall character of an area either by the removal of green infrastructure or by increased use. Development also creates opportunities for creating new green infrastructure or enhancing existing.

4.3.5 The MDD DPD will enable the Council to plan for any appropriate green infrastructure in those areas outside of the Strategic Development Locations (SDL’s). SDLs will provide green infrastructure in line with Policies CP18-21 and Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy.

Context

4.3.6 The approach proposed reflects the Core Strategy Spatial Vision of respecting the Borough’s character and ensuring a sense of place is retained.

4.3.7 Planning policy at national level (PPS12 Para 2.4) supports having local policies on green infrastructure.

4.3.8 The importance of protecting, conserving and also enhancing biodiversity in the environment is a key principle of PPS9.

4.3.9 The South East Green Infrastructure Framework also seeks to establish green infrastructure as an integral and essential component of sustainable communities, develop a common understanding of the role and importance of green infrastructure, help implement the green infrastructure policy and

---

37 See the South East Green Infrastructure Framework – From policy into practice (2009) published on behalf of a partnership in the South East to aid the delivery of Green Infrastructure.
provide detailed guidance on how green infrastructure can be delivered through the planning system and local partnerships.

4.3.10 Open space is based on the definition given in the annexe to PPG17 which sets out a broad range of types including parks and gardens, natural and semi natural urban green spaces, outdoor sports facilities, green corridors, amenity green space, provision for teenagers and children, allotments and community gardens, cemeteries, civic spaces and accessible countryside.

4.3.11 Policies CP3, CP7, CP8 and CP18-21 of the Core Strategy will aid the delivery of green infrastructure within the Borough. Policy CP3 (g) and Appendix 4 of the Core Strategy indicates the open space requirements for residential development proposals. These polices will be enhanced by information in the update Open Space and Sports Assessment Report.

4.3.12 Paragraph A4.1 of the Core Strategy indicates that the Council’s open space requirements will be amplified in the MDD DPD.

Open Space

Open Space and Sports Assessment Report Refresh

4.3.13 The Council is currently refreshing an earlier Open Space and Sports Assessment Report (2005)\(^\text{38}\) to take into account changes in open space provision since 2005 and to help inform the Community Infrastructure Strategy. The Open Space and Sports Assessment is a survey which looks at the amount of Public Open Space there is in the Wokingham Borough. This includes parks, sports pitches, indoor sports facilities and play areas and makes recommendations for future levels of provision. The MDD DPD document will provide further guidance for development management decision making in conjunction with the Core Strategy. Policy CP3 g) and Appendix 4 (Guidelines for the provision of Public Open Space associated with residential development) of the Core Strategy summarise the Council’s open space standards. The results of the refreshed Open Space and Sports Assessment Report will influence policies in the MDD DPD.

Core Strategy Policy CP3 criteria g) requires development proposals to provide for a framework of open space in secure community use achieving at least 4.65Ha/ 1,000 population provision with recreational/ sporting facilities in addition to private amenity space. This standard is higher than the national standard requirement (of 4.3Ha/ 1,000).

Issue 26: New public open space associated with development

Issue

4.3.14 Policy WR4 (Increasing existing Public Open Space Provision) of the WDLP identified a number of areas of public open space which were to be delivered as part of a residential development on adjoining land. Where these residential sites are retained following the re-appraisal of all sites (Issue 5), the MDD DPD will also continue the allocation of the associated open space.

4.3.15 In addition, the Amen Corner SPD\textsuperscript{39} was adopted by Bracknell Forest Borough Council (BFBC) on 16\textsuperscript{th} March 2010. This SPD provides guidance for developing the Amen Corner site, to the south of London Road and west of Binfield Road in Bracknell Forest Borough (the site is on the boundary of Wokingham Borough). Land at Amen Corner, is identified in Policy CS4 of the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy for a comprehensive, well designed mixed-used development. Within the adopted Amen Corner SPD, the area of land illustrated on map 2 of the document is referred to as the “Wokingham countryside strip”. The Council will identify the area within Wokingham Borough as passive open space\textsuperscript{40}. This is to be defined on the subsequent proposals map (see map 4.2 or appendix 1). This reflects the approach of the Council to cross boundary working.

4.3.16 Areas of open space within the SDL’s will also need to be identified in line with the SDL Masterplan SPD’s having regard to the setting of development limits (See Chapter 3, Issue 12: Need to define Development Limits (Settlement Boundaries) within SDL).

\textbf{Context}

4.3.17 Those areas that have yet to be delivered are:

- Land at Hatch Farm Dairies
- Land off Poplar Lane, Winnersh
- Land at Plough Lane, Wokingham
- Sandford Farm, Woodley

4.3.18 These areas will be shown on the proposals map which will form part of the MDD DPD (as illustrated on maps 4.1-4.3).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Issue 26: New public open space associated with development – Suggested Option} \\
\hline
\textbf{Our approach is:} \\
To carry forward Policy WR4 and those sites and their boundaries identified in Policy WR4 of the WDLP (and shown in the WDLP Proposals Map) that have yet to be delivered. \\
To identify the area of land illustrated on map 2 referred to as the “Wokingham countryside strip” within Wokingham Borough as passive open space (see Bracknell Forest Borough Council Amen Corner SPD). This is to be defined on the subsequent proposals map as illustrated on map 4.2. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textbf{We consider that this can be achieved by:}

- Using monitoring information to identify which open spaces have been

\textsuperscript{39} The Amen Corner SPD can be viewed at: \url{http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/environment/env-planning-and-development/env-planning-policy/env-supplementary-planning-documents/env-amencorner/env-amencorner-library.htm#amen_corner_spd_documents}

\textsuperscript{40} This approach was agreed by Wokingham Borough Council on 16 March 2009.
implemented.

- Ensuring consistency with the adopted Bracknell Forest Borough Council Amen Corner SPD.

**Issue 26: New public open space associated with development – Alternative Option**

Do not carry forward those sites and their boundaries in Policy WR4 of the WDLP that have yet to be delivered.

To identify the area of land illustrated on map 2 referred to as the “Wokingham countryside strip” within Wokingham Borough as passive open space (see Bracknell Forest Borough Council Amen Corner SPD). This is to be defined on the subsequent proposals map as illustrated on map 4.2.

*This could result in necessary public open space not being carried forward into the MDD DPD*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development); CP3 (General Principles for Development). |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| Policy WR4 | Increasing Existing Public Open Space Provision |

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |

**Issue 27: Outdoor play and recreational space**

**Issue**

4.3.19 The Council recognise the role that recreation can play in promoting healthy individuals and communities. The Council and its partners have an important role to play in promoting public health.

4.3.20 The Council’s current approach to play and recreational areas is to seek the provision of children’s equipped play areas, playing pitches and recreation grounds as part of new development or as a contribution to existing. It does not specifically meet the needs of all the Borough’s residents including the needs of the elderly or youth.

4.3.21 To address this, the MDD DPD could include a policy on outdoor play and recreational space which takes a more flexible approach to its delivery. Such a policy would take into account the findings of the emerging Open Space and Sports Assessment Report.
Context

4.3.22 PPG17 (Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) encourages the provision of a wide range of opportunities for recreation which should, wherever possible, be available for everyone, including those with disabilities and the elderly.

4.3.23 Core Strategy Policy CP3 (g and j) requires proposals to provide for a framework of open space in secure community use achieving at least 4.65 ha/1,000 population provision together with recreational/sporting facilities in addition to private amenity space and for proposals not to lead to a loss of recreational facilities. Also, Policy CP3 (j) requires proposals do not lead to a loss of community facilities or land.

4.3.24 Appendix 4 of the Core Strategy also provides guidelines for the provision of public open space.

4.3.25 Saved WDLP Policy WR7 provides guidance on the delivery of open space. The Open Space standard is now set in Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Issue 27: Outdoor play and recreational space – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To have policy which provides guidance on:
- open spaces, school greens and playgrounds;
- the provision of outdoor play and recreational space to provide opportunities for all members of the community.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Seek the provision of outdoor play and recreation space in line with the revised Fields in Trust Standards (FIT)\(^ {41} \). FIT seeks to provide outdoor play and recreational place which can provide a number of functions, including informal and formal recreation. This includes providing Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play (NEAPS) and multi use games areas which could help meet the needs of all groups.
- Ensuring appropriate flexibility to reflect the evidence included in the emerging refreshed Open Space and Sports Assessment Report.
- Development proposals must take account of the availability of existing outdoor play facilities and recreational space in the vicinity of the site. Development proposals will be required to make full provision in the absence of any spare capacity (if identified through the refreshed Open Space and Sports Assessment Report).
- Updating relevant parts of saved policy WR7 of the WDLP.

Issue 27: Outdoor play and recreational space – Alternative Option

To not include a policy on outdoor play and recreational space.

*The Council considers that this issue is not adequately covered by other policies at a local or national level.*

\(^{41}\) Fields in Trust (FIT) is the only independent UK wide organisation dedicated to protecting and improving outdoor sports and play spaces and facilities.
Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development); CP3 (General Principles for Development). |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| Policy WR7 | Provision of public open space in new residential development. |

National Policy Linkage

| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |

Issue 28: Country Parks and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) outside of SDLs

Issue

4.3.26 The WDLP indicated that new Country Parks could be delivered at Whistley Mill and within the Blackwater Valley. These country parks have not yet been delivered and the Borough Council needs to consider whether saved polices in the WDLP should be carried forward into the MDD DPD. In addition the Borough Council opened Rooks Nest Farm as an Area of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on 8 March 2011. This will provide further accessible greenspace for walking.

Context

4.3.27 PPG17 indicates that Local Authorities should encourage the creation of sports and recreational facilities in such areas and the development of areas of managed countryside, such as Country Parks (PPG17 paragraph 25).

4.3.28 The WDLP identified the following proposed country parks:
   - Whistley Mill (saved Policy WR14) – Charvil/ Twyford and proposed extension.
   - Within the Blackwater Valley (saved Policy WR15).

4.3.29 Map 4.1-4.3 shows the boundaries for the Country Parks and the Rooks Nest Farm SANG.

Our approach is:

To have policy which will seek to protect and enhance the Country Park and SANG network.

Show the boundaries for the Country Parks and the Rooks Nest Farm SANG on the MDD DPD proposals map. See maps 4.1-4.3.
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- To have policies which reflect saved WDLP Policies WR14 and WR15 and their boundaries identified in the WDLP Proposals Map.

### Issue 28: Country Parks and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) outside of SDLs – Alternative Option

Focus on the existing Country Park and SANG network.

Show the boundaries for the Country Parks and the Rooks Nest Farm SANG on the MDD DPD proposals map. See maps 4.1–4.3.

*This may lead to increased pressure on the existing Country Park network.*

#### Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development), CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP7 (Biodiversity); CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside); |

#### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| WR14 | Country Park at Whistley Mill |
| WR15 | Country Park in the Blackwater Valley |

#### National Policy Linkage

| PPS7 | Sustainable Development in Rural Areas |
| PPS9 | Biodiversity and Geological Conservation |
| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (Paragraph 25) |

#### Issue 29: Moorings

**Issue**

4.3.30 The River Thames provides opportunities for recreational and tourist use and the Council recognises the importance that short term and other leisure mooring on the River Thames can have to the local economy. However, the presence of too many permanent moorings on the Thames can have an impact on the visual amenity of the river. It is important that a balance is maintained between the use of the river and its conservation.

4.3.31 Services such as boatyards and boat hire facilities provide an important role in maintaining the recreational and tourism uses associated with the River and once lost, are difficult to replace. The protection of existing boat yards could help to maintain the current provision of these facilities on the river.

4.3.32 The MDD DPD could include a policy on Permanent Moorings on the River Thames and the retention of boatyards.
Context

4.3.33 Saved WDLP Policy WR19 laid down criteria for recreational use of the Thames and had regard to both permanent and transient moorings. Saved policy WR20 specifically related to transient moorings at Thames Valley Park. The Environment Agency has produced a Thames Waterway Plan (2006-2011)\(^{42}\). This was produced in consultation with members of the River Thames Alliance (RTA) including riverside local authorities, river user groups, businesses and landowners. The plan aims to achieve coordinated planning between Councils on several matters including moorings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 29: Moorings – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a policy which reflects both saved Policies WR19 (Recreational Use of the Thames) and WR20 ( Provision of transient mooring facilities) of the WDLP and the Thames Waterway Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring consistency with the Thames Waterway Plan (2006-2011) and policy approach of neighbouring authorities (South Oxfordshire Local Plan: Policy R9 (River Thames)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting the character of the river and the area, the physical condition of the riverbank and habitats and mitigate such impacts where necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 29: Moorings – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach that only reflects saved policy WR19 of the WDLP.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Council considers that this issue is not adequately dealt with by Saved WDLP Policy WR19 and is not covered by other policies at a local or national level.**

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development); Policy CP11 (Proposals Outside Development Limits (including countryside); Policy CP12 (Green Belt). |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WR19</th>
<th>Recreational Use of the River Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WR20</td>
<td>Provision of Transient Mooring Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |

Non Wokingham Borough Policy and Guidance

| South Oxfordshire Local Plan: Policy R9 (River Thames) |
| Thames Waterway Plan |

Issue 30 Green Routes and Wildlife Corridors

Issue

4.3.34 Many of the main routes into the towns and villages of the Borough are characterised by trees and other vegetation that act as a Green Route into these towns and village.

4.3.35 These routes help define the character of the area and also contribute to the Borough’s wildlife corridors. Wildlife corridors are important because they provide a link to the wider countryside from built-up areas.

4.3.36 Green Routes and wildlife corridors have an important role to play in maintaining both the character and biodiversity of an area.

4.3.37 Development can have an impact on these routes, it can also provide opportunities for enhancing existing routes by the use of conditions and planning obligations. The MDD DPD could include policy on Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement areas.

4.3.38 Some Green Routes have already been included in saved policies in the WDLP however there are also other routes throughout the Borough that could be included, particularly those which link existing Green Routes

Context

4.3.39 The importance of protecting, conserving and also enhancing biodiversity in the environment is a key principle of PPS9. Green Routes contribute to biodiversity as well as landscape quality.

4.3.40 Policy WBE6 of the WDLP currently provides local planning guidance on Green Routes which states that development will not be permitted that would detract from the visual quality of a Green Route. Where appropriate, it also required contributions towards the improvement of Green Route Enhancement areas through landscape and planting schemes.

Issue 30: Green Routes and Wildlife Corridors – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WBE6 and the Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement areas and their boundaries identified in the WDLP Proposals Map. Approach to also give more protection of front gardens and other forms of green infrastructure in the Green Routes.
To carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WNC7 on the protection, enhancement or creation of wildlife corridors and to identify where appropriate other routes.

The boundaries for the Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement Areas are on Maps 4.1-4.3.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Ensuring that Green Routes contribute to biodiversity as well as landscape quality.
- Protecting, conserving and also enhancing biodiversity in the environment. This is a key principle of PPS9 and Core Strategy Policy CP7.

**Issue 30: Green Routes and Wildlife Corridors – Alternative Option**

To not carry forward saved Policy WBE6 of the WDLP and to not identify Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement Areas. Instead rely on Policy CP1, CP3 and CP7 of the Core Strategy and PPS9 and assess on a site-by-site basis.

*The Council considers that this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*

**Q.** Are there any other parts of the Borough that should be designated as Green Routes or Green Route Enhancement Areas?

**Q.** Should boundaries for Wildlife Corridors be identified in the MDD DPD?

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development), CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP7 (Biodiversity); |

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| Policy WNC7 | The Protection, Enhancement or Creation of Wildlife Corridors |
| Policy WBE6 | Green Routes |

### National Policy Linkage

| PPS9 | Biodiversity and Geological Conservation |
| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |

**Issue 31: Biodiversity and Geological sites**

**Issue**

4.3.41 Wokingham Borough contains a variety of wildlife habitats and species that adds to its character, biodiversity and environment. Some of these habitats are protected by international or national legislation because of their importance. These include Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and, adjacent to the Borough, the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (see Issue 7). Alongside these habitats the Borough also contains a number of other important habitats which include Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites (these were previously known as Wildlife Heritage Sites). These are of great importance to local residents.
4.3.42 In order to ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on these sites the MDD DPD could include policy on nature conservation to ensure that development proposals do not harm them. It could also include a policy on creating wildlife habitats in new developments.

**Context**

4.3.43 The Government’s policy for Biodiversity and Geodiversity is contained within PPS9. Core Strategy Policy CP7 also provides guidance on biodiversity.

4.3.44 Saved WDLP Policies WNC3 (New Nature Reserves) and WNC5 (Protection and Management of Wildlife Heritage Sites) seek the improvement of existing sites or creation of new nature reserves in conjunction with new development. Saved WDLP Policy WNC8 (Creating new habitats through development) requires development proposals to seek the creation, management and interpretation of nature reserves and new wildlife habitats in the settlements and countryside areas. These policies help promote the implementation of the Wokingham District Biodiversity Action Plan 2003-12 (and any subsequent Wokingham Biodiversity Action Plan after 2012).


### Issue 31 Biodiversity and Geological sites – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

To have policy on new nature reserves; protection and management of local wildlife sites; and creating new habitats through development.

Maps 4.1-4.3 shows the boundaries of the Local Wildlife Sites.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Protecting, conserving and also enhancing biodiversity in the environment. This is a key principle of PPS9 and Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy.
- Reflecting Saved WDLP Policies WNC3, WNC5 and WNC8.
- Reflecting Core Strategy paragraph 4.43. The Berkshire Nature Conservation Forum advises on Local Wildlife Sites, including deletions, additions and amendments. Consequently, they may change from the ones identified on Maps 4.1-4.3.

### Issue 31: Biodiversity and Geological sites – Alternative Option

Approach that does not provide local planning guidance on new nature reserves, local wildlife sites and creating new habitats through development.

*The Council considers that this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*
Q: Are you aware of any geological issues that need to be addressed?

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development), CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP7 (Biodiversity), CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)). Paragraph 4.43 |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WNC3</td>
<td>New Nature Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC5</td>
<td>Protection and management of wildlife heritage sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC8</td>
<td>Creating new habitats through development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Wokingham Borough Council guidance**


**National Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS9 and Good Practice Guide</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular 01/2005</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geological conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17</td>
<td>Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue 32: Burial Grounds**

**Issue**

4.3.46 There is a need within the Borough for new burial grounds, to meet the needs of various faith Groups. No burial grounds have been delivered since the submission of the Core Strategy and no burial grounds sites have been promoted to the Council for consideration in the MDD DPD. The Council can only identify and allocate sites for burial grounds if a site has been put forward to the Council for that use.

**Context**

- Wokingham Borough Burial Report

4.3.47 The Core Strategy (paragraph 2.53) states that the MDD DPD will identify sites to increase the provision of cemeteries within the Borough as much of it will be provided in connection with development. These may be in the form of woodland burial grounds as well as more traditional forms. Burial grounds are a community facility as highlighted in paragraph 4.17 of the Core Strategy. Burial grounds for particular faith groups may also be required.
4.3.48 A Burial Report was considered at the Council’s Executive on 25 October 2007. The report provides a working indication of the level of provision that needs to be planned for. It is estimated that that the total number of burials within the Borough is 7,132 in the period from 2007 to 2029. Recommendation 13 of the report states that the Council should seek to identify a new site/sites for a cemetery.

Issue 32: Burial Grounds – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To acknowledge that no sites for burial grounds/cemeteries have been put forward to the Council for consideration in the MDD DPD and to not include a specific policy on burial grounds. The Council will ask for sites to be suggested. Sites suggested for burial grounds will be considered for allocation subject to such issues as suitable ground conditions and highway and amenity.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Asking the following question and seeking views from all, including faith groups:

  “Q. No sites for burial grounds have been put forward to the Council. Do you know of any sites that could be suitable for burial grounds? Yes/No. If yes, please state where and provide details.”

Issue 32: Burial Grounds – Alternative Option

To not allocate sites for burial grounds and to not include a specific policy in the MDD DPD.

To consider planning applications for Burial grounds in line with local planning policy as and when proposed sites are put forward.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside); Appendix 4 (Guidelines for the provision of Public Open Space associated with residential development). Paragraph 2.53, 3.32, 4.17 and 4.58. |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

N/A
National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS7</th>
<th>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPG17</td>
<td>Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. No sites for burial grounds have been put forward to the Council. Do you know of any sites that could be suitable for burial grounds? Yes/ No. If yes, please state where and provide details."
4.4 ECONOMY

4.4.1 This section considers how the Borough’s buoyant economy can be maintained to meet the requirements of businesses and to provide opportunities for training whilst respecting the character of the Borough. It will cover employment, retail and tourism.

Issue

4.4.2 Wokingham Borough provides employment opportunities for a range of businesses ranging from high-tech international and national companies to locally based companies and small businesses. It is not intended to identify land for new employment areas. Therefore it is important that adequate land currently in employment use remains so and that a more flexible approach to its use is considered to meet the needs of business.

4.4.3 Vibrant town and other retail centres also have a role to play in maintaining and building a buoyant economy whilst meeting shopping and other needs.

Context

4.4.4 National policy on sustainable economic growth is set out in PPS4. It indicates that employment should be seen within its broader context so that it includes retail as an economic function. PPS7 also includes national policy on sustainable development in rural areas.

4.4.5 Employment policy for the Borough is set out in the Core Strategy in Policy CP15 (Employment Development) and in the countryside in Policy CP11 (Proposals Outside Development Limits (Including Countryside)). Policy CP15 provides for a range of buildings and sites, promotes the provision of small units and encourages their provision in new development. Provision for these will have to be managed alongside the provision for those business uses that is already located within the Borough.

4.4.6 Core Strategy paragraph 4.73 states that the extent of Core Employment Areas (CEA’s) will be defined in the MDD DPD and will replace the boundaries of the CEA’s defined under WDLP Policy WEM2 (Development in Core Employment Areas). The Core Strategy indicates that the existing boundaries of the CEA’s will largely be retained. Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy identifies these CEAs.

4.4.7 The Council’s Economic Development Strategy (2010 - 2013) promotes smaller, flexible and affordable business premises to reflect a local need. Employment land needs to provide flexibility and be responsive to local economic needs.

4.4.8 The Masterplan SPDs for the Strategic Development Locations identify extensions to the Toutley Industrial Estate (North Wokingham SDL) and the Hogwood Industrial Estate (Arborfield Garrison SDL). The boundaries for these CEA's will need to be updated accordingly and set in the MDD DPD.
EMPLOYMENT

Issue 33: Core Employment Areas (CEAs)

4.4.9 Core Employment Area's tend to be the largest employment areas in the Borough. A CEA is where development for business, industry or warehousing will be permitted and where, the expansion or intensification of existing employment uses is acceptable.

4.4.10 The CEAs contain a range of different business uses. It is important that a range of units is provided to meet the needs of business including small and medium enterprises. Within the larger CEAs there is scope to provide related uses such as a crèche or day nursery, training facilities and small scale recreation and other facilities to meet the day to day needs of those who work on the site.

4.4.11 The CEAs in the Borough are:

- Green Park Business Park, Reading (map 5.1)
- Headley Road East, Woodley (map 5.2)
- Hogwood Industrial Estate, Park Lane, Finchampstead (map 5.3)
- Molly Millars Industrial Estate, Wokingham (map 5.4)
- Ruscombe Business Park, Ruscombe (map 5.5)
- Sutton's Industrial Estate, Earley (map 5.6)
- Thames Valley Business Park, Earley (map 5.6)
- Toutley Industrial Estate, Wokingham (map 5.7)
- IQ Winnersh, Winnersh Triangle Business Park, Winnersh. (map 5.8)

Bad neighbour uses

4.4.12 Parts of some of the CEA's are identified as 'bad neighbour' uses. Ideally ‘bad neighbour’ operations (such as car repairs and scrap yards) should be located in employment areas where they will not result in unacceptable environment nuisance (through noise, smell and fumes), disturbance, traffic impacts or visual intrusion.

4.4.13 Saved WDLP Policy WEM9 (Identified Local Need – ‘Bad Neighbour’ development on identified sites) states that ‘bad neighbour’ uses will be acceptable on the following identified locations.

- Hogwood Lane (parts), Finchampstead (map 5.10)
- Ruscombe Works, Ruscombe (map 5.12)
- Parts of Molly Millars Lane Industrial Estate (north side), Wokingham (map 5.11)
- Toutley Works (parts)/ Depot, Wokingham (map 5.13)
- Kentwood Farm (northern part only), Wokingham (map 5.14)

4.4.14 The MDD DPD could include policy to provide certainty over types, sizes of units and allow for a range of employment related uses (including ancillary uses) whilst maintaining their primary employment use. The policy could
include guidance on bad neighbour uses having regard to other development that has taken place in or adjacent to CEAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 33: Core Employment Areas – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide further policy guidance to Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy in respect of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• size of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• range of employment related uses (including ancillary uses) whilst maintaining their primary employment use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• bad neighbour uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set the boundaries of the Core Employment Areas. See maps 5.1-5.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set boundaries for bad neighbour uses. See maps 5.10-5.14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WEM9 of the WDLP to be carried forward except from Poperinghe Barracks, Arborfield (which has been developed for housing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to carry forwarded Saved Policies WDLP WEM3, WEM4, WEM9 and WEM11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We consider that this can be achieved by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where suitable allowing for new buildings or the ‘sub division’ of larger buildings to include ancillary uses (such as a crèche and cafes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring flexibility to redevelop/intensity CEA’s to meet employment growth forecasts and any shortfalls in office space needs subject to accordance with policies in the Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The boundary for Toutley Industrial Estate CEA and Hogwood Industrial Estate CEA to be amended to reflect Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy and the North Wokingham SDL Masterplan SPD and the Arborfield Garrison SDL Masterplan SPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amending the boundary of the Ruscombe Business Park CEA to reflect planning application F/2003/987043. The Council is suggesting no further changes to the CEA’s in the Borough. Completed development is within CEA and is not a compatible use class for a CEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring employment proposals to include an Employment Impact Statement, which shows the number and type of jobs likely to be generated, how they expect to source their labour and what the wider implications of doing so will be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 33: Core Employment Areas – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include no further policy guidance to Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy. Do not carry forward Policies WEM3 and WEM1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WEM9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set the boundaries of these Core Employment Areas including the amendments to Hogwood Industrial Estate, Toutley Industrial Estate and Ruscombe Business Park) and identified bad neighbour uses. Proposed boundaries are shown on maps 5.3, 5.7 and 5.5 respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 F/2003/9870 – Woods Warehouse, Ruscombe Lane, Ruscombe for the proposed erection of B1 Office building plus erection of 8 x 2 bedroom apartments. Demolition of existing storage buildings plus new site entrance from Ruscombe Lane.
The Council will need to rely on Core Strategy Policy CP15 and national planning policy. This approach may not provide for a more locally applicable policy regarding types and size of units.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP15 (Employment Development); Policy CP18 (Arborfield Garrison SDL); Policy CP20 (North Wokingham SDL). Paragraphs 4.71, 4.72, 4.73, 4.74 and Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| Policy WEM3 | Employment Development at Green Park |
| Policy WEM4 | Land North of St Mary's Church, Shinfield, also known as The Manor. |
| Policy WEM5 | Criteria for Employment Generating Development within Settlements on Unidentified Sites |
| Policy WEM9 | Identified local need – “bad neighbour” development on identified sites |
| Policy WEM11 | Identified local need – general industrial, storage and distribution areas |

National Policy Linkage

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |

Q: Are there any circumstances that could lead to a change in the boundaries of the Core Employment Areas? Such areas could include parts of Molly Millars Industrial Estate and land on the south side of Headley Road, Woodley.

Q: Are there any other sites that could be considered for ‘bad neighbour’ uses? If yes, please provide further information.

Green Park

4.4.15 Saved WDLP Policy WEM3 on the employment development of Green Park will not be carried forward in the MDD DPD. Areas of Green Park within Wokingham Borough are now substantially built. Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy and other policies in the Development Plan provide policy guidance on Green Park.

The Manor, Shinfield (Land north of St Mary’s Church)

4.4.16 Policies WEM2 and WEM4 of the WDLP identified this site for employment. Saved Policy WEM4 of the WDLP states that the land at the Manor, Shinfield will be developed as a mixed use site that incorporates residential development and in the region of 18,750 sq m of B1 (Business) Floor space. The housing element on this site (southern areas) has been completed.
Following the identification of the Science Park in Policy CP16 of the Core Strategy, The Manor was removed from a CEA designation.

4.4.17 Saved WDLP Policy WEM4 (Land North of St Mary’s Church, Shinfield, also known as the Manor) will not be carried forward into the MDD DPD (see map 6.2).

4.4.18 Core Strategy paragraph 4.72 states that the uplift in floor space anticipated through redevelopment leaves scope for The Manor at Shinfield to be used for a wider purpose consistent with the proper planning of the South of the M4 SDL. Any employment provision could be in the form of live/ work units. The Manor site is located within the development limit of Shinfield but is outside of the South of the M4 SDL. A planning application has been submitted (validated on 1 February 2011) for the development of this site.

**Issue 34: South of the M4 Science Park**

4.4.19 Policy CP16 (Science Park) of the Core Strategy states that a Science Park will be developed South of the M4 in Shinfield Parish.

4.4.20 In the period to 2016, a high quality campus of approximately 20,000m$^2$ will be developed which fully reflects the landscape characteristics of its site. Further development will take place in the remainder of the plan period subject to there being identified need and demand together with resolution of any transport, landscape, and design considerations to maintain the exceptionally high quality environment initially developed. It is likely that some 55,000m$^2$ of floor space will have been completed by 2026.

4.4.21 In May 2009, phase 1 of the Science Park received planning permission (O/2009/1027$^{45}$).

4.4.22 Paragraph 4.76 c) of the Core Strategy requires the MDD DPD to confirm the Science Park allocation. The site will be restricted to appropriate uses for a Science and Innovation Park such as research and development, laboratories and high tech uses together with ancillary and related uses such as crèche provided that they do not undermine its key purpose.

4.4.23 The MDD will set the boundary of the Science Park and could also provide criteria based policy for the remaining phases of the Science Park (see Issue 13 – Boundaries for Development Limits (around Science and Innovation Park)).

**Issue 34: South of the M4 Science Park – Suggested Option**

**Our approach is:**

To have criteria based policy on how the remaining phases of the Science Park should be developed and its appropriate uses including ancillary uses provided that they do not undermine its key purpose.

---

$^{44}$ O/2011/0204 - Outline application with some matters reserved for residential development comprising up to 126 dwellings.

$^{45}$ O/2009/1027 - Outline application for phase 1 development of Science & Innovation Park (Access to be considered) plus Full application for the construction of access road foot and cycle ways M4 over bridge and associated works including landscaping and engineering works plus erection of boundary wall and fence adjoining Shinfield Road/Access Road. Part demolition and reformatting of facade of Stable Buildings at Lane End Farm and demolition of existing farm buildings.
To set the boundary of the Science Park. See map 5.9.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Including criteria on high quality environment, transport, landscape and design.
- Ensuring the layout of buildings and ancillary facilities (e.g. parking) need to ensure the visual separation between the Science Park and the settlements of Shinfield North and Lower Earley.
- Ensuring the policy if consistent with Core Strategy Policy CP16.

**Issue 34: South of the M4 Science Park – Alternative Option**

Do not include a policy in the MDD DPD. Detailed guidance to be included within a Development Brief SPD (incorporating a masterplan) for the Science Park (Core Strategy paragraph 4.76).

To set the boundary of the Science Park. See map 5.9.

*The development of this site can be addressed through a criteria based policy in the MDD DPD.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP16 (Science Park)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 4.75, 4.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

N/A

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |

**Issue 35: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading**

**Issue**

4.4.24 The University of Reading’s main campus occupies Whiteknights Park parts of which lie within Earley parish. In addition to development which already has planning permission the campus has potential for change in the next few years.

4.4.25 Much of the physical development proposed at Whiteknights Campus has already received planning permission. Policy in the MDD DPD could be flexible to take account of other proposals as they come forward. Saved policies WEM6 (Whiteknights, University of Reading) and WEM7 (University related research development at Whiteknights) apply to the University of Reading site.
Context

4.4.26 In August 2008, the University of Reading completed its Whiteknights Campus Development Plan. The Campus Development Plan does not form part of the Council’s strategy, but it outlines the changes that are to occur at Whiteknights Campus in the coming years, and will inform policy in the MDD DPD.

4.4.27 It sets out proposals for a number of development projects (including additional bed spaces, waste and catering facilities and changes to the accesses, rationalising the substantial number of vehicle access points around the campus and internal circulation) in the next ten years.

4.4.28 As approximately one third of the 119 hectare campus is within Reading Borough a consistent approach with that authority is required. Reading Borough Council has included in their Site and Detailed Policies DPD revised pre submission draft (February 2011) a draft Whiteknights Policy (policy SA6)\(^\text{46}\) which seeks to ensure that development will accord with:

- criteria on retaining or enhancing wildlife areas and green links,
- maintain and enhance safety to users;
- any development on previously undeveloped areas will need to be weighed against the benefits gained from the development.

4.4.29 It is considered that to ensure the proper planning of the Whiteknights Campus that a similar policy should be included in the MDD DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 35: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach which is consistent with policy SA6 of Reading Borough Council’s Site and Detailed Policies DPD revised pre submission draft and also Saved WDLP policies WEM6 and WEM7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring the policy refers to the Local Wildlife Site (Whiteknights Park), the Local Historic Park and Garden (Whiteknights Park) designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessing proposals against the Council’s Development Plan on matters such as parking, biodiversity, historic environment, residential amenity and character/landscape character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early and effective pre-application discussions with the University will be of great assistance, as will continued joint working with Wokingham Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 35: Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach which only updates saved policies WEM6 and WEM7 of the WDLP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will not ensure a consistent approach with neighbouring Local Planning Authorities (Reading Borough Council) for the development of Whiteknights Campus.**

---

\(^{46}\) The Reading Borough Council Site and Detailed Policies DPD revised pre submission draft (February 2011) can be viewed at: [http://ww2.reading.gov.uk/documents/servingyou/planning/local_development_framework/Revised_PreSub_SDPD_0211.pdf](http://ww2.reading.gov.uk/documents/servingyou/planning/local_development_framework/Revised_PreSub_SDPD_0211.pdf)
Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEM6</td>
<td>Whiteknights, University of Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEM7</td>
<td>University Related Research Developments at Whiteknights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |

Non Wokingham Borough Policy and Guidance

Reading Borough Council Site and Detailed Policies DPD revised pre submission draft (February 2011): draft Whiteknights Policy

Q: Does the suggested policy provide a framework for the development of Whiteknights campus? In particular are all the necessary criteria included in Option1?

Issue 34: Sites for Business and Industrial Uses within development limits but outside Core Employment Areas

4.4.30 There are a number of local employment sites within the Borough’s development limits that are not within Core Employment Areas (CEAs).

4.4.31 Core Strategy paragraph 4.73 requires the MDD DPD to include a criteria based policy on the application of Policy CP15 outside of CEA’s; this will replace Saved WDLP Policy WEM5. This policy would apply to the following:

Identified Sites

4.4.32 Saved Policy WEM1 of the Wokingham District Local Plan identified the following sites for business and industrial use, which are all within development limits:

- Grovelands Avenue, Winnersh (map 5.15)
- Kentwood Farm, Warren House Road, Wokingham (map 5.16)
- Toutley Depot, Forest Road, Wokingham
- Rear of 612 Reading Road, Winnersh (map 5.17)

4.4.33 Toutley Road Depot, Wokingham now forms part of the North Wokingham SDL and is identified by CP15 of the Core Strategy as a Core Employment Area. Boundaries of these sites, except for Toutley Depot are shown on maps 5.15-5.17.
Unidentified sites

4.4.34 There are others sites in the Borough that are in existing employment use but are not identified sites. Saved WDLP Policy WEM5 provides criteria for employment generating development within development limits on unidentified sites. This policy applies to land within development limits and to applications for new development, redevelopment, extension and changes of use.

4.4.35 There are various sites around the Borough that operate as offices, distribution, industrial warehouses and under Sui Generis use (which means they do not fit into a particular criteria, such as Car repairs). These all have a different impact upon their neighbours, yet all help build the economic success of Wokingham Borough.

Bad Neighbour development outside identified areas

4.4.36 Car repairs and other bad neighbour uses such as scrap yards sometimes inappropriately occupy farm buildings or residential properties. Positive planning for these groups of businesses on unidentified employment/ bad neighbour sites could protect the character of rural and residential areas. Saved WDLP Policy WEM10 includes guidance on bad neighbour development outside identified sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 36: Sites for Business and Industrial Uses within development limits (not within Core Employment Areas) – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide further policy guidance to Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy on identified and unidentified sites for business, industrial, distribution and storage uses within development limits (not within Core Employment Areas), including on size of units and bad neighbour uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries for the sites in Saved WDLP Policy WEM1 of the WDLP to be carried forward except Toutley Road Depot, Wokingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consider that this can be achieved by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring appropriate flexibility (as identified in the Economic Development Strategy) to accommodate the needs of local businesses (smaller, flexible and more affordable premises) whilst having regard to the impact of these uses on the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring employment proposals to include an Employment Impact Statement, which shows the number and type of jobs likely to be generated, how they expect to source their labour and what the wider implications of doing so will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflecting the approach of Saved WDLP policies WEM1, WEM5 and WEM10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 36: Sites for Business and Industrial Uses within development limits (not within Core Employment Areas) – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To carry forward Saved policy WEM5.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may not allow the more flexible approach to employment that the Council
Development Plan Policy Linkage

Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)

| Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development); Policy CP9 (Scale and Location of Development Proposals); CP15 (Employment Development). Paragraph 4.73, 4.74 |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WEM1</th>
<th>Identified Sites for Business and Industrial Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WEM5</td>
<td>Criteria for Employment Generating Development within Settlements on Unidentified Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WEM10</td>
<td>Identified Local Need – bad neighbour development outside identified areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |

Q: Should those sites listed in Saved WDLP Policy WEM1 (excluding from Toutley Road Depot, Wokingham) (Option 1) be carried forward into the MDD DPD? Are there any other sites that could be considered for limited employment development?

Q: Are there any other options the Council could consider in encouraging the provision of small or medium enterprises?

Employment related training

4.4.37 Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for employment development to include mitigation of the impact of the development on the demand for labour and skills. Unemployment in Wokingham Borough is low and activity rates are high. This exacerbates the skill shortages which exist in certain fields. If a skill is not available locally then there will be pressure to bring skilled people from elsewhere generating a need for housing or increasing the length of journeys to work.

4.4.38 Outcomes of the Council's Economic Development Strategy are:

- Improve links between businesses and education providers to ensure that young people leave education with the skills that the future economy needs, particularly those of innovation and enterprise.
- Support the wider economy by encouraging apprenticeships, lifelong learning, social enterprise and volunteering.
- Develop a Learning Vision to support a broader range of qualifications, including vocational qualifications, to enable all young people to maximise their potential.
4.4.39 Irrespective of pressures resulting from development, provision for training is important given the potential of skill shortages to constrain economic prosperity. One of the ways in which this can be done is to train the available workforce in the Borough giving them the necessary skills, experience and qualifications.

Q: Are there particular areas of training which should be considered in the MDD DPD?
Q: Are you aware of any sites which may be suitable for training facilities?

Issue 37: Employment in the Countryside (Including Rural Diversification)

Issue

4.4.40 The Borough’s countryside is greatly valued by its residents and it is important that proposals for development in the countryside, including employment do not undermine the character and landscape of the countryside. The Council does however recognise the role of employment in the countryside to the rural economy and to local businesses. It is important therefore to achieve a balance between protecting the countryside and providing for some employment needs to maintain the vitality of the rural economy.

Context

4.4.41 In line with PPS4, the Council should ensure that the countryside is protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. PPS4 is also clear that economic development in the countryside (away from existing settlements) should be strictly controlled.

4.4.42 The Core Strategy (paragraph 3.32) indicates that developments that support the vitality of the rural economy will be considered where they are also sustainable. Redevelopment, minor extension and infilling of existing sites in the countryside can assist the rural economy and enhance the rural environment. However, this needs to be weighed against ensuring the protection of intrinsic character of the countryside.

4.4.43 Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy makes clear that proposals outside of development limits will not normally be permitted except where it contributes to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the Borough or in the case of other countryside based enterprises and activities, it contributes and/or promotes recreation in, and enjoyment of, the countryside.

4.4.44 Suitable sustainable rural enterprise proposals in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP11 and the wider considerations listed in policy CP3, could include tourism, equestrian activities, fishing, leisure and recreation, farm shops, conversion of building for employment and other uses related to an activity that would normally be found in the countryside.

4.4.45 Sustainable rural enterprise proposals can have local impacts such as fragmentation of the holdings, a proliferation of buildings to serve the new
uses, landscape, biodiversity and traffic. PPS4 requires local authorities to set out criteria to be applied for planning applications for farm diversification.

4.4.46 The MDD DPD could include policy on employment development in the countryside including sustainable rural enterprises proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 37: Employment within the Countryside including Rural Diversification – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our approach is: \nTo include a policy in the MDD DPD that provides further guidance to that set out in Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy on new employment development in the countryside including sustainable rural enterprises proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Including policy on replacement buildings and uses, future use of underused or redundant buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Including policy on protecting the character and amenity of the countryside. This could cover issues such as environmental improvements, highways and access, advertisements and signs, noise, opening hours (where appropriate, planning conditions may be used) and size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging opportunities to promote tourism and recreation-based rural diversification (including equestrian uses) where they provide jobs for local residents and are of a scale and type appropriate to their location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring Sui Generis\textsuperscript{47} uses (e.g. petrol filling station and shops selling and/or displaying motor vehicles) to be considered on an individual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preventing separation of the building proposed for non agricultural use from the existing farm or forestry land (as a result of change of use) which could lead to the fragmentation of the holding. This could be achieved through a planning obligation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 37: Employment within the Countryside including Rural Diversification – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To not include policy for employment development in the countryside including sustainable rural enterprises proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rely on Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP9 and CP11 and PPS4 and PPS7.

This approach may not provide for a more locally applicable policy regarding types and size of units

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP2 (Inclusive communities); Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development), Policy CP9 (Scale and Location of development proposals); Policy CP11 (Proposals outside |

\textsuperscript{47} Certain uses do not fall within any use class and are considered ‘sui generis’.
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4.4.47 Wokingham Borough has a number of town, district, village and local centres along with village shops in rural areas. These centres are important in meeting shopping needs and providing a range of other facilities and services to the Borough’s residents, visitors and people who work within these centres.

4.4.48 In planning the future of these centres, consideration should be given to the overall vitality and viability of the centre.

4.4.49 Whilst professional services, leisure activities and places to eat support the main shopping activity the over provision of non-shopping uses can fragment the shopping frontages and affect their retail function and character. The setting of town, district and local centre boundaries and primary and secondary retail frontages for town and district centres can help maintain the balance between retail and other uses.

Context

4.4.50 Town centres function as important service centres, providing a range of facilities and services. District and village centres will usually comprise groups of shops often containing at least one supermarket or superstore, and a range of non-retail services, such as banks, building societies and restaurants, as well as local public facilities such as a library.

4.4.51 PPS4 advises that the boundaries of town, district, village and local centres are shown and that primary (such as retail stores) and secondary shopping frontages (such as bars, restaurants and banks) should be defined. This will be done through the MDD DPD.

4.4.52 Policies CP13 (Town Centres and Shopping) and CP14 (Growth and Renaissance of Wokingham Town Centre) of the Core Strategy indicates the main hierarchies of the town centres.

4.4.53 Table 4.1 below shows the hierarchy of centres which reflects Core Strategy Policy CP13.
The hierarchy of centres within the Borough as identified in Policy CP13 of the Core Strategy is:

a) Wokingham town centre is designated as a major town centre (map 6.8);

b) Arborfield Garrison district centre (proposed through policy CP18), Lower Earley district centre (map 6.4), Shinfield Road district centre* (map 6.5), Twyford village centre (map 6.6), Winnersh village centre (map 6.7) and Woodley town centre (map 6.9) are designated as small town/district centres;

c) Local centres – as to be defined in the MDD DPD.

*The Shinfield Road local centre mainly falls outside of the Borough boundary. It is classified as a district centre by Reading Borough Council within their adopted Core Strategy (policy CS26) with the boundaries shown on the Shinfield Road inset of their revised Pre-submission Site and Detailed Policies DPD.

4.4.54 The Council’s Retail Study (2007) indicates that there is potential for additional floorspace to maintain the roles of the centres and supports this hierarchy. The Council produced its Retail Study Refresh in 2010\(^\text{48}\).

4.4.55 There are also a number of local centres throughout the Borough which have a range of shops serving a small catchment area. The Core Strategy indicates that local centres will be shown in the MDD DPD.

4.4.56 Appendix 8 provides a review of major town, and small town/district centres.

**Wokingham Town Centre Masterplan**

4.4.57 The Council has an adopted Wokingham Town Centre Masterplan (June 2010). The purpose of the Masterplan is to provide a long-term vision for the future of the town centre, building upon policies in the Core Strategy, which focus on the need to regenerate the town centre (Policy CP14 Growth and Renaissance of Wokingham Town Centre).

4.4.58 The Council has recently selected a developer (Wilson Bowden)\(^\text{49}\) to work with it to redevelop significant sites in Wokingham town centre and help to deliver the regeneration of the town.

4.4.59 This means that the following saved WDLP policies will not be carried forward. In some cases the site has already received planning permission (policy WSH17).

- Policy WSH8 – Reinstatement of shopping in Broad Street and Rose Street, Wokingham.
- Policy WSH16 – Sites for Business Use in Wokingham Town Centre
- Policy WSH17 – Redevelopment of Wokingham Cricket Club
- Policy WSH18 – Redevelopment of the Phoenix Plaza and adjoining land, Wellington Road, Wokingham
- Policy WSH21 – Broad Street/Market Place, Wokingham and Policy

---


49 Appointed 4 November 2010
Issue 38: Major Town, and Small Town/ District Centre Boundaries and Primary and Secondary Frontages

4.4.60 In order to maintain and enhance existing uses, the boundaries for the Borough’s major town and small town/ district retail centres could be adjusted to allow some growth and a mix of uses.

4.4.61 Primary shopping areas are where retail uses are concentrated and generally comprises primary and secondary shopping frontages. Primary frontages contain a higher proportion of retail uses (such as retail stores), whereas secondary frontages allow a centre to have a diversity of uses (such as bars, restaurants and banks).

4.4.62 In order to enhance the provision of retail facilities, the council will seek to maintain a predominantly core retail (use class A1) usage within the primary designated frontages. Within secondary frontages, a more flexible approach may be applied – allowing uses such as libraries, employment agencies, health providers, restaurants and public houses to occupy locations in the town centre.

4.4.63 The primary and secondary frontages of town, district and village centres are currently defined on the WDLP Proposals maps. The draft Option MDD DPD provides examples of the revised boundaries based on recommendations within the Retail Study Refresh (2010). These can be viewed at Maps 6.4-6.9.

Service Arrangements

4.4.64 It is important that service access to existing businesses and retail areas are retained and that services areas for new retail units should be integral. In particular rear servicing should be encouraged where possible.

Shop Front Design

4.4.65 Shopfronts are an important element of the commercial street scene, and there is often pressure to update and develop them, particularly in accordance with retailers’ national corporate image. Well designed appropriate shopfronts that fit into the street scene are important to maintaining the overall street character. Proposals for the replacement or alteration of a shopfront will be considered against criteria. The emerging revised Borough Design Guide SPD will include guidance on shopfronts and adverts.

Vacant Floorspace above Shops and Offices

4.4.66 Saved WDLP Policy WH9 states that proposals for residential units in vacant or underused floor space above shops and offices will be acceptable.

4.4.67 Provision of residential units (predominantly above shops and other ground floor town centre uses) can secure the long term vitality and viability of such a centre. This reflects PPS4 to ensure a diverse range of uses within centres and to improve the environment. It can contribute to an ‘18 hour’ economy and increase the type of residential provision within an area. Conversely, there are potential implications of an 18 hour economy on residential units (such as noise pollution).
Issue 38: Major Town, and Small Town/ District Centre Boundaries – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To have a general policy on major town and small town/ district centre uses. This will:

- Define the retail areas.
- Seek retention of essential retail character of shopping areas
- Seek to maintain the diversity of uses to seek to maintain viability and vitality.
- Provide guidance on non – retail uses in primary and secondary frontages in town, district and village centres and vacant floorspace above shops and offices.
- Consider service arrangements for existing and new retail units. This could include issues such as noise pollution.
- Give guidance on how the proposals in Wokingham town centre will contribute towards Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and the Wokingham Town Centre Masterplan SPD

Allocate sites suggested to support the findings of the Retail Study for improving the vitality and viability of the centres. (provided that they are compatible with Core Strategy Policy CP13) (maps 6.1 and 6.3)

Allocate sites suggested to the Council within the Wokingham Town Centre boundary (provided that they are compatible with Core Strategy Policy CP14 and in line with the Wokingham Town Centre Masterplan SPD.

Define the boundaries of town, district and village centres, their primary shopping areas and primary and secondary frontages (maps 6.4-6.9).

The boundary for the Service Road Provision in Wokingham Town Centre, as shown in the WDLP Proposals Map will be carried forward into the MDD DPD (map 10.1).

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Amplifying policy CP13 (a, b and c) of the Core Strategy, Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and Policy CP15 criteria iii).
- Maintaining the character (including shopfront design) in accordance with the updated Borough Design Guide SPD.
- Incorporate location and boundary of the district centre indicated in the Arborfield Garrison SDL Masterplan SPD.
- Reflecting Saved WDLP Policies WH9, WSH5, WSH6, WSH7 and WSH22.

Issue 38: Major Town, and Small Town/ District Centre Boundaries – Alternative Option

To include a specific policy for every centre that is suitable in principle to accommodate town centre uses.

Define the boundaries of major town and small town/ district centres, their primary shopping areas and primary and secondary frontages (maps 6.4-6.9).

The boundary for the Service Road Provision in Wokingham Town Centre, as shown
in the WDLP Proposals Map (saved Policy WSH22) will be carried forward into the MDD DPD (map 10.1).

**The Borough Council consider that a detailed general policy on this issue is sufficient to cover all Town, District and Village centres.**

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP13 (Town centres and shopping); Policy CP14 (Growth and Renaissance of Wokingham Town Centre); Policy CP15 iii) (Employment Development) Paragraph 4.66, 4.67, 4.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Saved Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WH9</td>
<td>Vacant floorspace above shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSH5</td>
<td>Retention of Essential Retail Character of Shopping Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSH6</td>
<td>Non-retail uses in Primary Frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSH7</td>
<td>Non-retail uses in Secondary Frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSH22</td>
<td>Service Road Provision, Wokingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS4</th>
<th>Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Q. Are there any other areas which should be included or excluded from town/ district centres and retail boundaries?

### Q. Should the retail and town centre boundaries be the same?

### Q. Are there any areas which should be included or excluded from primary and secondary frontages

### Issue 39: Local Centres and Neighbourhood and village shops

#### Local centres

**Issue**

4.4.68 Local centres include a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a smaller catchment area. Typically, local centres might include a small supermarket, newsagent, sub-post office and a pharmacy. Local centres are included within the hierarchy set out in Core Strategy Policy CP13. Other facilities could include a hot-food takeaway, launderettes and hairdressers. The Council would like to ensure that the local centres are maintained and enhanced where appropriate to ensure that residents have access to local amenities.

4.4.69 The Council suggests that the local centres shown in Table 4.3 be identified in the MDD DPD. In some cases this includes changes to the existing boundary of a local centre to take account of existing community uses. There
are also some new local centres proposed to take account of retail development that has taken place or to link retail and community uses.

Context

4.4.70 PPS4 seeks that the boundaries of town, district, village and local centres are shown and that primary and secondary shopping frontages should be defined. This will be done through the MDD DPD.

Shinfield Road Centre

4.4.71 The Core Strategy states that the Shinfield Road local centre in Shinfield (North of M4) will be upgraded to a district centre in conjunction with the proposals in Reading Borough Council’s 2008 Core Strategy (Policy CS26). The Shinfield Road local centre mainly falls outside of the Borough boundary. The designation of the boundary of the centre will have regard to those put forward by Reading Borough Council indicated on the Shinfield Road inset of their revised Pre-submission Site and Detailed Policies DPD (associated with policy DM13 of Reading’s document).

Wargrave High Street

4.4.72 In the Wokingham District Local Plan Wargrave High Street, was recognised as an area that had been transforming away from its original retail centre. The bank and convenience shops had been replaced by antique shops and dwellings. Policy WSH13 (Wargrave High Street) of the Local Plan sought that if a change of use back to A1 (retail) was to be requested in an old retail unit, it would be favourably considered.

4.4.73 This specific policy has not led to a major change of premises back to retail use. It is considered that a more detailed general policy applicable to local centres will provide guidance on maintaining and enhancing existing local centres and Wargrave High Street.

Table 4.2: Local centres to be identified in the MDD DPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WDLP Existing Local Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finchampstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Local Centres:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earley and Woodley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowthorne(Pinewood)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.74 The proposed boundaries of these Local Centres can be viewed in Maps 6.10-6.26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood and village shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.75 Neighbourhood and village shops provide a quick stop for local residents wishing to purchase day to day items – such as newspapers and milk. They can also provide important landmarks in residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.76 Village shops in a rural community play a vital role, providing invaluable services to members of the community who would have to travel a great distance to access similar facilities, in particular, those people who find travelling difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.77 The Core Strategy at paragraph 4.67 states that proposals for the loss of convenience stores outside defined centres but within development limits will need to demonstrate that appropriate alternative provision is available or there is no demand for the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.78 Saved WDLP policy WSH9 (Neighbourhood and Village Shops) recognises that any change of use away from day to day retail use (A1 – includes post offices, newsagents, convenience stores, selling food items and pharmacies) would not be permitted, unless it can be demonstrated that the retail character of the area is not affected, and that alternative retail facilities are provided within walking distances (200-300m) within the catchment area of that shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.79 Saved WDLP Policy WSH10 (Alternative uses to support neighbourhood and village shops) states that where heritage permits, the Council will support a part change of use (including the loss of a residential use) in a building containing a free standing shop catering for day to day shopping needs where the alternative use is necessary to secure the retention of that shop. Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shops provide services that ensure local residents do not have to commute far for basic essentials.

**Issue 39: Local Centres and Neighbourhood and Village Shops – Suggested Option**

Our approach is:

To have policy for local centres and neighbourhood and village shops and alternative uses to support neighbourhood and village shops.

To not carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WSH13 on Wargrave High Street but to rely on a more detailed general policy.

To identify and set the boundaries for all existing (WDLP), new and proposed local centres.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Protecting and where possible enhancing local centres whilst maintaining the character (including the shop front design)
- Providing guidance on the loss of convenience stores outside defined centres but within development limits. They need to demonstrate that appropriate alternative provision is available or there is no demand for the unit (Core Strategy paragraph 4.67).
- Providing guidance on the provision for convenience shopping in new development.
- Reflecting (and updating where required) Saved Policies WSH4, WSH9 and WSH10.
- Incorporate locations and boundaries of local centres indicated in the SDL Masterplan SPD’s.

**Issue 39: Local Centres and Neighbourhood and Village Shops – Alternative Option**

To have policy for local centres and neighbourhood and village shops and alternative uses to support neighbourhood and village shops.

To not carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WSH13 on Wargrave High Street

Only identify and set the boundaries for the existing WDLP local centres. Provide guidance for local centres.

*The Council considers that this approach would not take into account changes to existing local centres and the opportunity to define new local centres*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

|--------------------------------------|----------------------|

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WSH4</th>
<th>Provision for convenience shopping in new development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WSH9</td>
<td>Neighbourhood and Village Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WSH10</td>
<td>Alternative Uses to support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 40: Petrol Filling Stations

Issue

4.4.80 In recent years the number of petrol filling stations has reduced. Those that exist normally provide a retail outlet that sells day to day essentials. In this way they add to the provision of local shopping but are not included in the hierarchy in Core Strategy Policy CP13.

4.4.81 The siting of petrol filling stations is subject to a variety of constraints but access which does not impede traffic flow is essential. Petrol filling stations and their associated advertisement signs, late night sale kiosks and car wash facilities, are a highly visible form of development. They can cause disturbance for the occupiers of neighbouring residential property.

Context

4.4.82 Saved WDLP Policies WSH11 (Petrol filling stations in built-up areas) and WSH12 (Retail sales from petrol filling stations) of the WDLP provide policy guidance for Petrol Filling Stations.

Issue 40: Petrol Filling Stations – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To not include a specific policy guidance on petrol filling stations.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Assessing petrol filling station proposals will be assessed against policies in the Core Strategy, including Policy CP1, CP3, CP9 and CP11.

Issue 40: Petrol Filling Stations – Alternative Option

Approach that reflects saved Policies WSH11 and WSH12 of the WDLP.

*The Council considers such a policy is not required as proposals can be assessed against comprehensive Core Strategy policy.*

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development); Policy CP9 (Scale and location of development proposals); Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside). |
Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WSH11</th>
<th>Petrol filling stations in built-up areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WSH12</td>
<td>Retail sales from petrol filling stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |

Issue 41: Garden Centres and other retail units in the countryside

Issue

4.4.81 Garden centres and other retail outlets in the countryside are popular facilities but they can be detrimental to rural character and encourage car travel from towns.

4.4.82 Retail outlets in the countryside include garden centres, farm shops, sales from horticultural and nursery holdings and craft centres. They are not covered by the hierarchy in Core Strategy Policy CP13 and are more principally considered against Core Strategy Policy CP11. All development proposals in the countryside must protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment. New proposals which contribute to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises may be permitted subject to accordance with policies in the Development Plan.

4.4.83 Garden centres have continued to expand within the Borough, notably having cafes, retail shops and even grocery stores attached to them. However, due to their siting in the countryside there are concerns that this type of development may have a detrimental impact on the character of the countryside, and may detract from town centres especially where a wide range of goods is sold and could affect village shops.

Context

4.4.84 In line with PPS4, the Council should ensure that the countryside is protected and that economic development in the countryside (away from existing settlements) should be strictly controlled.

4.4.85 The approach of Core Strategy Policy CP11 is to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of environment in the countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 41: Garden Centre and other retail units in the countryside – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our approach is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To include a policy on the provision and extension of garden centres and other retail units in the countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Ensuring that proposals do not lead to a detrimental impact in terms of size, storage and car parking on the character of the countryside and landscape. Issues such as highways and access, advertisements and
signs, noise and opening hours (where appropriate, planning conditions may be used) should also be considered
- Amplifying Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy.

### Issue 41: Garden Centre and other retail units in the countryside – Alternative Option

To not include a policy in the MDD DPD on garden centres and other retail units in the countryside.

*Rely on policy CP11 of the Core Strategy, PPS4 and PPS7. This may not allow a locally distinctive approach which reflects the pressures on countryside locations in close proximity to large areas of residential development.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

N/A

### National Policy Linkage

| PPS4 | Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth |
Issue 42: Tourism

Issue

4.4.83 South East England comprises the largest tourism market in the UK, outside Greater London. Wokingham Borough is well located for visitors to experience the important built and cultural heritage resources in the Borough and neighbouring areas (such as Windsor) and also one-off major events or annual sporting events.

4.4.84 The River Thames is of considerable importance to tourism. The river provides high quality landscape along its length and is widely used for a range of informal leisure activities. The river as a whole receives 14 million tourist visits a year from walkers, canoeists, rowers and boaters and day-trippers. The annual Henley Regatta focuses national attention on the River Thames.

4.4.85 Large visitor numbers also bring impacts, such as traffic congestion and pressure on local services, which require management and cross-border working in order to maximise the benefits of tourism.

Context

4.4.86 The national ‘Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism’ provides guidance to planners and those involved in the tourism industry on the importance of tourism and the requirement to work together effectively to facilitate, promote and deliver new tourism development in a sustainable way. The Core Strategy does not include specific guidance on tourism.

Visitor Management

4.4.87 One-off major events or annual sporting events can create significant, albeit short term, pressures on local environments. Within the Borough, these events include the Henley Regatta and, outside of the Borough, include Reading Football Club home matches and Ascot Races. More effective management of access to these events can reduce adverse transport impacts associated with them without undermining the benefits of the event to the local economy and visitor experience.

Tourist Accommodation

4.4.88 The visitor accommodation sector has become increasingly demanding and sophisticated with a wide range of provision catering for specific visitor markets. There are many different accommodation sub-sectors required to meet the demand of varied consumer markets. Sub-sectors include:

1. Hotels (guest houses, hotels, country inns)
2. Paying guest (e.g. bed and breakfast)
3. Rented houses (cottages, farms)
4. Caravan and camping parks (static, touring and mixed)
5. Group accommodation.
4.4.89 Hotels are an important component in encouraging sustainable tourism. By providing accommodation for longer tourist visits, the presence of hotels can generate expenditure in an area and increase linkages to other tourism opportunities. As town centre locations offer access from a range of transport modes, ideally new hotel development should be located in town centres, preferably as part of mixed use developments where development can complement other town centre uses.

4.4.90 Unserviced accommodation (e.g. camping and caravan sites, holiday parks, self catering units, farm houses and youth hostels) is a popular and vital component of the leisure accommodation offer in the Borough and provide a particularly valuable role in supporting longer/ stay/ higher value rural tourism.

Sports Facilities

4.4.91 Sport England has identified facilities along the River Thames (Henley Regatta) as facilities for national or international events (e.g Henley Regatta).

4.4.92 The Borough is also home to a number of clubs providing training to national and international standards. Reading Football Club’s training ground and associated facilities are also within the borough.

**Issue 42: Tourism – Suggested Option**

Our approach is:
To include a policy on:
- Visitor management including visitor travel demand and other environmental pressures
- Tourist accommodation
- Protecting existing significant sporting facilities for national or international events

We consider that this can be achieved by:
- Identifying areas that would benefit from the development and implementation of visitor management. This could vary from the management of visitor travel demand to Visitor Information Points.
- Ensuring the diversity of the tourism accommodation and protecting good quality accommodation in rural areas where there is evidence of market demand.
- Co-ordinating with adjoining local planning authorities.
- Ensuring the protection of the Borough’s character (including landscape), historic environment and heritage.

**Issue 42: Tourism – Alternative Option**

To not include a policy on visitor management, tourist accommodation and significant sporting events. Rely on other local policy, in particular the LTP3.

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development); CP9 (Scale and Location of Development); CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside) |
Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies
N/A

National Policy Linkage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS4</th>
<th>Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 CHARACTER AND HERITAGE ASSETS

4.5.1 This section considers how the Council seeks to address the impact of development on the character of an area and the importance of maintaining and enhancing the Borough’s valued historical assets and areas, heritage assets, including potential archaeological sites, and minimising impacts of development on the character of an area.

Issue

4.5.2 All development can impact on the overall character of the area. Each town and village, together with the areas between them has their own unique character. Consequently, it is vital that the Council minimises any adverse impacts (Core Strategy paragraph 4.19).

4.5.3 The character of different areas of the Borough is greatly valued by the Borough’s residents in helping to shape the local identity of an area, character and sense of place. This includes the historic environment, assets of local significance and amenity green space, both public and private.

Context

4.5.4 PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) at paragraph 13 iv requires proposals for development to acknowledge the unique character of areas to ensure that the distinctiveness of different parts of the Borough is maintained.

4.5.5 PPS5 (Planning for the Historic Environment) along with the guidance produced by English Heritage gives significant protection and guidance on any proposal that may involve a ‘heritage asset’. Nationally designated heritage assets such as Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and conservation areas are covered by legislation in the form of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeology Areas Act 1979.

4.5.6 However the Council consider that there may be the need to have policies on protecting and enhancing locally designated assets and areas of local significance.

4.5.7 PPG17 (Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) indicates the broad range of open spaces that may be of public value. Criteria v) includes amenity green space (most commonly, but not exclusively in housing areas) – including informal recreation spaces, green spaces in and around housing, domestic gardens and village greens.

4.5.8 Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy recognise the importance of local character and Policy CP3 c) of the Core Strategy requires proposals to have no detrimental impact upon important heritage. Policy CP3 j) of the Core Strategy states that development proposals must not lead to a loss of community or recreational facilities including land.
4.5.9 The Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD seeks to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that can integrate with the character of the area. The Design Guide which is currently being updated will include further guidance on character as well as public realm and shop front issues, including traditional shop fronts in Conservation Areas.

Issue 43: Heritage Assets

4.5.10 Wokingham Borough contains a number of Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens (Statutory List and Local List) and Scheduled Monuments. The MDD DPD could include policy on locally designated heritage assets (such as locally designated Historic Parks and Gardens, Buildings of Traditional Local Character and Areas of Special Character). This could include guidance on the re-use of historic assets and the historic environment and climate change.

4.5.11 Historic parks and gardens form a valuable part of the Borough’s heritage. Those on the English Heritage Register (nationally designated) are:

- Bearwood College
- Farley Hall
- Park Place and Temple Coombe
- Swallowfield Park
- The Deanery, Sonning
- Temple Island (part of Fawley Court historic parkland)

4.5.12 The locally designated Historic Parks and Gardens are:

- Barkham Manor, Barkham
- Bill Hill Park, Hurst
- Billingbear, Hurst
- Haines Hill, Hurst
- Hurst Lodge, Hurst
- Ravenswood, Wokingham Without
- Whiteknights Park, Earley

Areas of Special Character

4.5.13 There are some areas or groups of buildings of a consistent period or character which reflects the area’s past, but where a conservation area designation may not be justified. It is desirable to protect these areas from development or change that may harm the particular character of that area. These are known as Areas of Special Character and can provide a link to the past and a sense of place, which can be diminished through unsympathetic new development.

4.5.14 Saved WDLP Policy WHE3 provides guidance on Areas of Special Character.

Buildings of Traditional Local Character

4.5.15 There are buildings in the Borough that fall outside of national standards for statutory listing (Listed Buildings) but are nonetheless of considerable importance to the Borough’s historic environment and local character. These are known as ‘Buildings of Traditional Local Character’. The Borough Council
will review the possibility of more pro-active identification or protection in collaboration with Town and Parish councils and other appropriate organisations.

4.5.16 Saved WDLP Policy WHE9 provides guidance on buildings of Traditional Local Character.

### Issue 43: Heritage Assets – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

To have policy which sets the principles for protecting and enhancing local heritage assets.

The boundaries of Areas of Special Character, as set by the WDLP, will be set in the MDD DPD.

To include the boundaries for the locally designated Historic Parks and Gardens in the Borough in the MDD DPD. These can be viewed in maps 7.1-7.3.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Ensuring that development proposals do not adversely affect the character and features, or the historical context, or the setting of locally designated assets.
- Reflecting Saved WDLP Policies WHE3, WHE4, WHE9, Undesignated heritage assets will be assessed through the process of determining planning applications.
- Ensuring any development of or within the public realm, particularly in a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Character, should be of a sensitive design that enhances, reinforces and develops its distinctive character.
- Including policy guidance on the re-use of historic assets and the historic environment and climate change.
- Using criteria for identifying assets of local significance broadly based on that used by English Heritage for statutory listing.

### Issue 43: Heritage Assets – Alternative Option 1

2. Not include policy guidance on heritage assets.

The Council will need to rely on Core Strategy Policy CP3 c) and national planning policy. *This may not provide the right level of detail to protect and enhance these assets.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>CP3 c) General Principles for Development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WHE4</th>
<th>Historic Parks and Gardens: Conservation, Restoration, and New Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### National Policy Linkage

| PPS5 | Planning for the Historic Environment. |
Q. Are there any other areas the Council should include in its policy guidance for Heritage Assets?

Issue 42: Archaeology

4.5.17 The Borough contains a number of archaeological remains, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs). There are also sites of archaeological potential, which do not have statutory protection but may nonetheless be of great importance. These sites form a fragile and finite resource and it is considered that the MDD DPD could include a policy to protect sites of archaeological potential including the requirement to ascertain the likely impact of development on these remains.

4.5.18 The WDLP Proposals Map provided a guide in indicating those areas with high archaeological potential. As the amount of information available about sites varies and new remains may be discovered at any time. Berkshire Archaeology should be consulted to obtain the latest information regarding the nature and extent of remains.

Issue 44: Archaeology – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WHE12 ‘Development Affecting Sites of Archaeological Potential’.

The boundaries for archaeological potential sites in the Borough as shown on the WDLP Proposals Map will be carried forward into the MDD DPD. See maps 7.1-7.3.

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Where remains exist of either national or local importance, preservation in situ is the preferred means of protection. Where not appropriate, provision must be made for the remains to be excavated and recorded prior to development.
- Consulting Berkshire Archaeology on relevant planning applications.

Issue 44: Archaeology – Alternative Option

Do not carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WHE12.

The Council considers this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP3 c) General Principles for Development. |

Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

| Policy WHE12 | Development Affecting Sites of Archaeological Potential |
National Policy Linkage

| PPS5          | Planning for the Historic Environment |

Issue 45: Assets of Local Significance- Amenity Green Space

Amenity Green Space in built-up areas

4.5.19 Amenity green space can contribute towards quality and character of the Borough’s built-up areas and can also promote health and wellbeing, be a community resource and have a visual amenity function. It does not necessarily have to be publicly accessible and can include back-gardens and other urban greenfield sites. Amenity green space can also include allotments. The issue of amenity green space is separate from the open space requirements for developments (Policy CP3 (g) and Appendix 4 of the Core Strategy). The Council’s open space standards will continue to apply.

4.5.20 There is no current policy on amenity green space.

4.5.21 The Council considers that the MDD DPD could include a policy to ensure that amenity green spaces are not detrimentally impacted by development. This would amplify policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy. This would also apply to sites allocated through the Development Plan (Core Strategy and MDD DPD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 45: Assets of Local Significance – Amenity Green Space Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our approach is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a policy to minimise any adverse impacts on the character of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towns and villages and the areas between them, to protect assets of local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance and to address the loss of amenity green space (which can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include allotments).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| We consider that this can be achieved by:                                 |
| • Reflecting Saved WDLP Policy WR7.                                       |
| • Ensuring development is of a high standard of design that can integrate |
|   with the character of the area and accessible to all (including older   |
|   people and people with special needs)                                   |
| • Evidence included in the emerging Open Space and Sports Assessment      |
|   Report.                                                                 |
| • Securing appropriate and sensitive design of and within the public     |
|   realm:                                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 45: Assets of Local Significance – Amenity Green Space Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not include a policy on locally significant amenity green space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council considers this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development); CP3 (General Principles for Development) |
Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WR7</td>
<td>Provision of public open space in new residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1</td>
<td>Delivering Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17</td>
<td>Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Do you think the MDD DPD should include policy on Areas of Local Significance - including the loss of amenity green space?

Issue 46: Public Art, Shopfront Design and Traditional Shopfronts

4.5.22 The Core Strategy (Appendix 1) indicated that saved WDLP policies WBE2 (Public Art), WBE7 (Shop Front Design) and WBE9 (Traditional Shop Fronts in Conservation Areas) would be replaced through the MDD DPD. The Council now considers that these matters will be covered by the approach of the MDD DPD (in amplifying the Core Strategy) together with an updated Borough Design Guide SPD.

Issue 46: Public Art, Shopfront Design and Traditional Shopfronts - suggested Option

Our approach is:

To not carry forward Saved WDLP Policies WBE2, WBE7 and WBE9 in the MDD DPD

We consider that this can be achieved by:

- The approach of the MDD DPD in amplifying the Core Strategy.
- Policies CP1, CP3 a) and f) of the Core Strategy and an update to Borough Design Guide SPD.
- Encouraging public art where appropriate.

Issue 46: Public Art, Shopfront Design and Traditional Shopfronts – Alternative Option

To carry forward saved policies WBE2, WBE7 and WBE9 of the WDLP.

*The Council now considers that these matters will be covered by the approach of the MDD DPD (in amplifying the Core Strategy) together with an updated Borough Design Guide SPD.*

Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Borough Core Strategy (2010) | CP1 (Sustainable Development); CP3 a) and f) (General Principles for |
Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WBE2</th>
<th>Public Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WBE7</td>
<td>Shopfront Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WBE9</td>
<td>Traditional Shopfronts in Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Policy Linkage

| PPS5          | Planning for the Historic Environment |
4.6 GREEN BELT

4.6.1 This section considers the Council’s suggested approach to development within or adjoining the Green Belt in the Borough. The Green Belt comprises the land north and east of Twyford but excluding Wargrave. It also includes the land in the parish of St. Nicholas Hurst east of the ‘The Straight Mile’ and north of Carter’s Hill.

Issue 47: Green Belt boundary, Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Development Adjoining the Green Belt

4.6.2 The Borough’s residents and the Council attach great importance to Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness.

4.6.3 There is currently one major developed site within the Green Belt at the Star Brick & Tile Works, Knowl Hill. The Managing Development Delivery DPD will need to consider whether this or any other major developed site is necessary within the Borough. If so then it will need to include a policy and set a boundary for the major developed site.

4.6.4 Development on the land adjoining Green Belt can also have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and it will be necessary to ensure that any such development is appropriate.

Context

4.6.5 The Government’s policy for the Green Belt is contained within PPG2, which explains the fundamental aims and purposes of including land within the Metropolitan Green Belt. One of the key features of Green Belts is their permanence. Paragraph 3.24 of PPG2 deals with the issue of new building within the Green Belt and refers to Annex C in respect of major Existing Developed Sites. PPG2 paragraph 3.15 makes clear that the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be harmed by development proposals outside, but conspicuous from it.

4.6.6 As indicated in paragraph 4.59 of the Core Strategy, the Council does not consider that very exceptional circumstances exist to warrant changes to the Green Belt. The Council’s vision and approach to accommodating housing growth shows that it can be met without the need to review the Green Belt within the Borough. The Core Strategy, at paragraph 4.61 requires the precise boundary of the Green Belt to be defined in the MDD DPD. This will reflect that designated by WDLP Policy WGB1. PPG2 (at paragraph 3.15) makes it clear that visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be harmed by development proposals outside, but conspicuous from it. Saved WDLP Policy WGB2 covers the issue of development adjoining he Green Belt.

4.6.7 Saved policy WGB6 of the WDLP identifies one major developed site in the Green Belt within the Borough at the Star Brick and Tile Works at Knowl Hill. It is also an existing waste site. The Council has considered whether it should review the boundary and approach to development within the major developed site designated at the Star Brick and Tile Works. However, as
there have been no changes to Government policy on Green Belt’s since adoption of the WDLP (March 2004), it is not considered that there is any justification for changing the current approach. This site has a defined development envelope, which is show in Map 8.2. Within this envelope the Council will accept the principle of future development, subject to all relevant policies and site specific considerations.

4.6.8 The Council is not aware of any other sites coming forward that would comply with PPG2.

### Issue 47: Green Belt boundary, Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Development Adjoining the Green Belt – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**
To set the boundary of the Green Belt which reflects that shown on the Core Strategy Key Diagram and in line with saved policy WGB1. See map 8.1.

To retain the existing policy approach and site boundary (as per Saved WDLP Policy WGB6) for the Star Brick and Tile Works major developed site in the Green Belt.

The boundary of the Star Brick and Tile works development envelope, as set by the WDLP, will be carried forward into the MDD DPD (map 8.2).

To ensure that development outside the Green Belt, but conspicuous when viewed from it, will not be permitted if it is detrimental to visual amenity of the Green Belt in terms of character, scale, form, setting and materials.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**
- Reflecting Policy WGB1 of the WDLP.
- An approach that carries forward saved WDLP policy WGB2 and WGB6. This policy amplifies Core Strategy Policy CP12.

### Issue 47: Green Belt boundary, Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Development Adjoining the Green Belt – Alternative Option

The Council does not consider there is an alternative.

*At stated in paragraph 4.59 of the Core Strategy, the Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant changes to the Green Belt. There have been no changes in circumstances since the adoption of the Core Strategy.*

*The site specific issues regarding Star Brick and Tile Works at Knowl Hill are not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level. The issue of development adjoining the Green Belt is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP12 (Green Belt) Paragraph 4.59, 4.60, 4.61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WGB2</th>
<th>Development adjoining the Green Belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WGB6</td>
<td>Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Policy Linkage

| PPG2 | Green Belts |
4.7 LANDSCAPE

4.7.1 This section considers the Borough Council’s proposed approach to protecting, maintaining and enhancing the landscape of the Borough.

4.7.2 The landscape section considers the role of the Borough’s Landscape Character Assessment, Special Landscape Areas, River Corridors and Valleys, Sites of Urban Landscape Value and landscaping, ancient hedgerows and trees.

Issue

4.7.3 Wokingham Borough has a varied landscape from river valleys and woodland areas, areas of scenic quality. These areas are important to local character and the amenity of an area.

4.7.4 Development can impact on the overall character of a landscape either by the intrusion of development into that landscape or by the removal of important elements of the landscape.

4.7.5 It is important to ensure that any proposed development both respects and contributes to the enhancement of the character of its immediate landscape.

Context

4.7.6 PPS7 recognises and accepts that there are areas of landscape outside nationally designated areas that are particularly highly valued locally. Whilst the Borough does not contain any nationally designated landscapes (such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), the Landscape Character Assessment highlights the most important parts of the Borough’s landscape and the degree to which it can accommodate development.

4.7.7 PPS1 states that the character of the countryside and urban areas should be conserved and enhanced. The aim of landscape policies are to maintain, conserve or enhance the quality and diversity of the landscape character in each location. Any proposed developments will need to reflect local landscape character. PPS7 encourages the use of criteria-based local policies to protect local landscapes, by utilising tools such as Landscape Character Assessments to identify local distinctiveness.

4.7.8 The Core Strategy emphasises the need to protect the Borough’s landscape. Policy CP3 c) of the Core Strategy requires proposals to have no detrimental impact on landscape.

Landscape Character Assessment

4.7.9 The Borough’s Landscape Character Assessment, adopted in 2004 is a detailed study of the Borough’s landscape. It provides information on the quality, capacity and sensitivity to change. The Landscape Character Assessment is a recognised approach and reflects local and national policy and guidelines.
4.7.10 The assessment takes into account factors that have helped shape a landscape including geology, ecology and use by people. It also outlines how landscapes should be conserved and managed. Development proposals should take account of the results of the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment.

4.7.11 The Landscape Character Assessment identifies the quality, sensitivity and capacity of landscapes along with a landscape strategy for each Landscape Character Area.

4.7.12 The Council considers that a landscape policy based upon approaches laid down in the Borough’s Landscape Character Assessment will better reflect the character of the area and its capacity, if any, for change brought about by development.

**Issue 48: Special Landscape Areas**

4.7.13 The Core Strategy (at paragraph 4.19) requires the MDD DPD to review the ASLI’s and Saved WDLP Policy WLL2. This is to ensure they reflect the Council’s adopted Landscape Character Assessment. ASLI’s will not be carried forward but will be replaced with a Policy which has regard to the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment.

4.7.14 Most parts of the Borough currently covered by Areas of Special landscape Importance will be covered by the proposed Special Landscape Area Policy.

4.7.15 However, there are some areas currently covered by ASLI policy which will not be not covered by the Special Landscape Areas policy. These areas are already covered by other planning designations including countryside, Green Belt and the Thames Valley Area all of which seek to protect areas from inappropriate development.

**Context**

4.7.16 Saved Policy WLL2 of the WDLP relates to areas of Special Landscape Importance (ASLI’s). This policy seeks to:

- protect the ASLI from development that would detract from its rural character and special landscape qualities
- enhance the rural character and landscape qualities by encouraging appropriate management and have regard to the effect that any development on land surrounding an ASLI would have on its character and setting

4.7.17 The WDLP identified 5 Areas of Special Landscape Importance (ASLI’s) in the following areas:

- Swallowfield/ Beech Hill
- Loddon River Valley
- Farley Hill
- Bearwood
- The Blackwater
4.7.18 These Areas of Special Landscape Importance (ASLI’s) were identified prior to the Council undertaking a Landscape Character Assessment for the Borough. The Borough’s Landscape Character Assessment reflects advice laid down in National Policy (PPS7) and is based on robust evidence. The proposed approach is to develop a Special Landscape Areas Policy to reflect the findings of the Landscape Character Assessment.

4.7.19 Maps 9.1-9.3 show the extent of the Borough to which a proposed Special Landscape Areas policy would apply.

**Issue 48: Special Landscape Areas – Suggested Option**

**Our approach is:**
The Council proposes to replace Saved WDLP Policy WLL2 Areas of Special Landscape Importance with a policy on Special Landscape Areas which will be based upon the Landscape Character Assessment. Set boundaries of Special Landscape Areas.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**
- Ensuring Special Landscape Areas are based on the high landscape quality areas identified in the Landscape Character Assessment. These boundaries will replace the ASLI boundaries.
- An approach whereby proposals will not be permitted that have a detrimental impact on the special landscape or which adversely affect both long distance and local views within these Special Landscape Areas.
- An approach that does not allow the loss of important landscape elements/features that contribute to local distinctiveness, the loss of landscape characteristics that add to the perception of an area including tranquillity.

**Issue 48: Special Landscape Areas – Alternative Option**

To carry forward the approach laid down in Policy WLL2 of the WDLP.

*This approach would not reflect the high landscape quality areas identified in the Landscape Character Assessment.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 c) (General Principles for Development).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| Policy WLL2 | Areas of Special Landscape Importance. |

**Other Wokingham Borough Council Guidance**

| Landscape Character Assessment SPG (2004) |

**National Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS7</td>
<td>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 49: Sites of Urban Landscape Value

Issue

4.7.20 There are open areas within settlements important to local character and amenity. These sites are known as Sites of Urban Landscape Value (SULV’s) and are areas important in character and landscape terms and which may also have biodiversity and recreational roles.

4.7.21 The WDLP identified SULV’s in the following areas:
- Bulmershe
- South Lake, Woodley
- Maiden Lake, Earley
- Joel Park, Wokingham

4.7.22 In the case of the SULV in the Bulmershe area the character is greatly enhanced by the presence of a strong tree and shrub screen on the rear boundaries of and within the gardens of properties on the east side of Pitts Lane and Church Road. The inclusion within a SULV does not affect the households statutory permitted development rights and nor does it preclude normal domestic use of garden areas (WDLP paragraph 2.81).

4.7.23 The Core Strategy (at paragraph 4.19) requires the MDD DPD to review the SULV’s and Saved WDLP Policy WLL5.

4.7.24 Maps 9.1-9.3 show the boundaries of the SULV.

### Issue 49: Sites of Urban Landscape Value – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

To carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WLL5. The boundaries of the SULV, as set by the WDLP, will be carried forward into the MDD DPD but with an amendment to the SULV in the Bulmershe Area.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

- Amending the SULV in the Bulmershe Area to reflect the development of the New Addington School (planning application F/2006/8099 approved 8 November 206)) and Goals Soccer Development (planning application F/2006/9350 approved 12 June 2007).
- Restricting inappropriate development that could adversely affect the landscape characteristics (including historic character, townscape or urban form of the area), the visual prominence, recreational or wildlife importance and the individual landscape features (such as ponds, woodland, trees and hedgerows).

### Issue 49: Sites of Urban Landscape Value – Alternative Option

To not carry forward policy and rely on PPS1 and Core Strategy Policy CP3.

*This issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

| Wokingham Borough | Core Strategy | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| Policy WLL5 | Sites of Urban Landscape Value |

**Other Wokingham Borough Council Guidance**

| Landscape Character Assessment SPG (2004) |

**Q: Are you aware of any other amendments required for the boundaries of Special Landscape Areas and Site of Urban Landscape Value?**

**Q: Are you aware of any sites which you feel need to be removed/ designated as Sites of Urban Landscape Value?**

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPS1 | Delivering Sustainable Development |

**Issue 50: River Corridors and Valleys**

**Issue**

4.7.25 Some of the Borough’s best quality landscapes are associated with or based upon river valleys. The valley of the River Thames is identified as an important feature within the Landscape Character Assessment. Other river valleys including the Loddon and Blackwater are also in the highest Landscape Character category (paragraph 4.21 of the Core Strategy).

**The Thames**

**Context**

4.7.26 The South East Plan (Policy C7) highlights the regional significance of the River Thames.

4.7.27 Core Strategy policy CP3 c) requires development proposals to have no detrimental impact on river valleys. Saved WDLP Policy WLL3 (The Thames Valley) and Policy WR19 (Recreational Use of the Thames) are relevant to this issue.

4.7.28 Maps 9.1 and 9.3 show the boundary of the Thames Valley Area.

**Issue 50: The Thames Valley – Suggested Option**

**Our approach is:**

To carry forward Saved WDLP Policy WLL3.

The boundary of the Thames Valley Area, as set by the WDLP, will be carried forward into the MDD DPD.
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Preserving the river environment, landscape and character of the Thames riverside and its surrounding area.
- Where appropriate, ensuring a consistent approach with neighbouring authorities.

**Issue 50: The Thames Valley – Alternative Option**

Do not identify the Thames Valley on the proposals map and have no policy. Rely on Policy CP3 c) of the Core Strategy.

*This issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 c) (General Principles for Development); Policy CP7 (Biodiversity); Policy CP11 (Proposals Outside Development Limits (including Countryside)). |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WLL3</th>
<th>The Thames Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WR19</td>
<td>Recreational Use of the Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WR20</td>
<td>Provision of Transient Mooring Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Wokingham Borough Council Guidance**

| Landscape Character Assessment SPG (2004) |

**National Policy Linkage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS7</td>
<td>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q:** Are you aware of any issues that are not addressed by the policy?

**Issue 51: Loddon and Blackwater Valley Area**

**Issue**

4.7.29 The Loddon and Blackwater Valley Area is a major landscape feature in Wokingham Borough. It is also an important wildlife habitat corridor and a recreational resource for residents of the Borough and visitors.

4.7.30 The Loddon and Blackwater Valley includes the major tributaries such as the Emmbrook, Barkham Brook, the Broadwater and the River Blackwater. These form part of the Valley Areas.

4.7.31 In order to ensure that the valley area is maintained and enhanced the MDD DPD could include policy on Loddon and Blackwater Valley to seek the
management and enhancement of the important wildlife habitat corridor, landscape features and recreational resources.

**Context**

4.7.32 Core Strategy policy CP3 c) requires development proposals to have no detrimental impact on river valleys.

4.7.33 Saved WDLP Policy WR13 (Recreational Use of the Loddon Valley and WR17 (Loddon/ Blackwater Riverside Footpath) are relevant to this issue.

4.7.34 The Loddon and Blackwater Valley Area is considered to be the most important biodiversity habitat complex in Wokingham Borough. There are three Biodiversity Opportunity Areas within the Project area:

2. Loddon Valley South of the M4 between Shinfield and Arborfield
3. Within the Blackwater Valley (saved WDLP Policy WR15) (See Issue 26).

4.7.35 Maps 9.1-9.3 show the potential boundary of the Loddon and Blackwater Valley Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 51: The Loddon and Blackwater Valley – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To include a policy on the Loddon and Blackwater Valley and tributaries to seek the management and enhancement of the important wildlife habitat corridor, landscape features and recreational resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify the Loddon and Blackwater Valley Area on the Proposals map. This will be a new designation. The boundary of the proposed Loddon/ Blackwater Riverside Footpath, as set by the WDLP, will be carried forward into the MDD DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reflecting Saved WDLP Policies WR13 and WR17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeking to complete the establishment of a riverside footpath and bridleway, to accommodate dual use, along the river network in the area for the purposes of informal recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting the development of appropriate recreational opportunities whilst ensuring the level and type of recreational use within project area does not adversely impact the biodiversity and landscape value of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 51: The Loddon and Blackwater Valley – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not identify the Loddon and Blackwater Valley on the proposals map and have no policy. Rely on Policy CP3 c) of the Core Strategy.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 c) (General Principles for Development); Policy CP7 (Biodiversity); |
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Issue 52: Landscaping, trees, hedgerows, woodlands and new development

Issue

4.7.36 The MDD DPD could include policies to seek to ensure that landscaping (including tree planting) and the protection of trees and woodlands are adequately addressed throughout the planning process.

Context

4.7.37 The importance of protecting, conserving and also enhancing biodiversity in the wider environment outside designated sites is a key principle of PPS9. This can include woodland areas which are of nature conservation importance and provide important habitats and wildlife corridors from one habitat to another.

4.7.38 The Core Strategy also includes relevant policy CP1, CP3, CP7 and CP11 to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity.

4.7.39 Saved WDLP Policies WCC3 (The Central Berkshire Forest), WLL4 (Landscape and New Development), WBE4 (Landscape and Planting) and WBE5 (Trees and New Development) are also relevant.

Issue 52: Landscaping, trees, hedgerows, woodlands and new development – Suggested Option

Our approach is:

To have policy on:
- Protection and retention of existing woodland areas, hedges and trees and the promotion of new tree planting;
- Landscape and new development (both within and adjoining the countryside – transition between settlements and countryside);
- Landscape and planting in new development;
- Trees and new development.
We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Reflecting the Landscape Character Assessment and any further landscape capacity work. Reference will be made to the British Standard 5837 (2005) – Trees in relation to construction.
- Ensuring landscape proposals form an integral part of a developments overall layout and design.
- Not allowing the removal of protected trees (TPO’s), unless there are clearly justifiable grounds for removal, and appropriate provision is made for replacement planting.
- Protecting and enhancing other woodland areas which are of nature conservation importance.

### Issue 52: Landscaping, trees, woodlands and new development – Alternative Option

Do not include policy in the MDD DPD on landscaping, trees, hedges, woodlands and new development and rely on other policies in the Development Plan and national policy.

*The Council considers that this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.*

### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development); Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development); Policy CP7 (Biodiversity); Policy CP11 (Proposals Outside Development Limits (including countryside))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WCC3</th>
<th>The Central Berkshire Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy WLL4</td>
<td>Landscape and New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WBE4</td>
<td>Landscape and New Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy WBE5</td>
<td>Trees and New Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Wokingham Borough Council Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Character Assessment SPG (2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPS1</th>
<th>Delivering Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS7</td>
<td>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS9</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Transport and Movement

4.8.1 This section considers the approach to maintaining and enhancing rights of way, footpath and cycle networks. It will also indicate how Council intends to show protected road lines and safeguarded land for other transport schemes (e.g. rail) which are linked to improvements to the Strategic Transport Network, on the MDD DPD Proposals Map. The LTP3 (2011-2026) (adopted March 2011) provides details of how the Council intends to address transport issues including reducing congestion on our roads over the next 15 years.

Issue

4.8.2 Wokingham is an affluent Borough and enjoys strong and prosperous economic growth. One of the major reasons why businesses are attracted to Wokingham Borough is that it is within close proximity of London and has excellent links to Heathrow and the M4.

4.8.3 Transport links have an important role in enabling the Borough to take advantage of its location and in providing access to employment, health, leisure and recreational facilities. It is therefore important that a variety of transport networks including public transport and Rights of Way for cycling and walking are accessible and available.

Issue 53: Strategic Transport Network

Context

4.8.4 National policy for transport is principally set out in PPG13 although there are references in many other documents such as PPS3.

4.8.5 The Core Strategy contains transport policies on Managing Travel Demand (CP6) and on Improvements to the Strategic Transport Network (CP10). Policies CP18-21 (SDL’s) include transport schemes that will be provided in connection with the development.

4.8.6 The Core Strategy, at paragraph 4.55, states that indicated alignments for the improvements to the Strategic Transport Network will be shown in the MDD DPD.

4.8.7 Some of the improvements identified in Policy CP10 have been carried forward from the Local Plan and others form part of the requirements of the SDL’s (Policies CP18-21). Examples of improvements to the Strategic Transport Network listed in Policy CP10 include:

- Measures to improve cross Thames travel which may include a bridge
- Reading Road to Wellington Road Link Road, Wokingham
- Provide a Park & Ride near the Coppid Beech roundabout on the A329, Wokingham
- Cross Rail

4.8.8 The Secretary of State for Transport issued a Safeguarding Direction on 29 April 2009, identifying which land should be safeguarded for a potential extension of the Crossrail scheme from Maidenhead to Reading. This land
will be identified on a Proposals map in the draft Submission document, although there is no need to repeat this safeguarding through policy in this document.

4.8.9 The proposed areas for safeguarding and protected road lines are shown in Map 10.1. Appendix 9 of this document includes Figure 24 of the LTP3 which is a map of the indicative strategic transport projects. This reflects the improvements to the Strategic Transport Network identified in Core Strategy Policy CP10. Paragraph 10.2 of the LTP3 identifies that “the Council will continue to review the need for necessary new strategic transport infrastructure beyond that set out in the Core Strategy.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 53: Strategic Transport Network – Suggested Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our approach is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show road lines to be protected and safeguarded land for other transport schemes (e.g. rail) which are linked to improvements to the Strategic Transport Network, , identified in Policy CP10, CP18-21, Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy and the SDL Masterplan SPD’s, on the MDD DPD Proposals Map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We consider that this can be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Where a scheme identified in policy CP10, CP18-21 and Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy and the SDL Masterplan SPD’s is sufficiently advanced, the road line to be protected will be shown in detail on the Proposals Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflecting the adopted LTP3, including protected road lines and other transport improvements. The alignments included in the LTP3 will be included in the MDD DPD proposals map unless a more advanced alignment has been agreed i.e through planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less developed schemes that need to be protected will be listed in the MDD DPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring the road lines identified are reviewed as proposals are further progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having regard to cross-boundary issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 53: Strategic Transport Network – Alternative Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council do not consider there is an alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local level.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Plan Policy Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP6, Policy CP10 (Improvements to the Strategic Transport Network), Policy CP18-21 (SDL’s). Paragraph 4.55.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Policy Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPG13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 54: Public Transport Provision and Improvement

Context

4.8.10 The Council has a key role in ensuring that all development makes proper provision for access by public transport. This will help achieve policies CP6 (Managing Travel Demand), CP10 (Improvements to the Strategic Transport Network) of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the SDL Masterplan SPD’s and Infrastructure Delivery SPD for the SDLs.

4.8.11 The Government’s Manual for Streets provides guidance for practitioners involved in the planning, design, provision and approval of new residential streets, and modifications to existing ones. It aims to reduce the impact of vehicles on residential streets by asking practitioners to plan street design intelligently and proactively, and gives a high priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport. A Companion Guide (Wider Application of the Principles) to Manual for Streets published in September 2010.

4.8.12 The updated Borough Design Guide SPD will include highways design guidance, including public transport accessibility.

4.8.13 The WDLP includes a saved policy on Public Transport Provision and Improvement (WT10). The Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and Policy CP6 (Managing Travel Demand) of the Core Strategy cover these issues in detail. The LPT3 Goals are:

- Highways Goal: “To have a resilient, safe highway network that balances capacity for all users, enhances the economic prospects of the Borough, and promotes sustainable travel.”

- Active Travel Goal: “To work with partners to promote walking and cycling as a health-enhancing physical activity for all of our residents through providing:
  - Connected, convenient, safe and signed pedestrian networks across the Borough to enhance existing networks;
  - New cycleways integrated with the existing cycle network; and
  - Improved cycle parking at stations, businesses and schools”

- Public Transport Goal: “To promote an integrated and inclusive public transport network that provides a convenient, acceptable, reliable and affordable alternative to car travel. “

- Smarter Choices and Demand Management Goal: “To enable people who live, visit and work in the Borough to make informed, safe and sustainable travel decisions from a range of transport options.”

---

50 Can be viewed at [http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/](http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/)
Strategic Projects Goal: “To manage the demand for travel in order to ensure that people have a high level of access to different destinations, with sufficient choice, whilst minimising the adverse effects of congestion.”

LTP3 (at paragraph 9.4) discussed modal shift and states “Encouraging people to use alternative and more sustainable modes of travel is therefore of the utmost importance if we are to meet the transport challenges facing Wokingham Borough as it is not feasible to deliver enough capacity for unrestrained demand by private car at peak periods.”

4.8.14 The Council needs to consider if the MDD DPD should include a policy on Public Transport Provision and Improvement or whether the Core Strategy and the LTP3 provide suitable guidance.

### Issue 54: Public Transport Provision and Improvement – Suggested Option

**Our approach is:**

Include a specific policy on Public Transport Provision, in particular on smarter choices, demand management and modal shift.

**We consider that this can be achieved by:**

Planning proposals to accord with:

- The LTP3 (and future LTP’s) policies, in particular the Goal of “Smarter Choices and Demand Management” and modal shift.
- Policies CP6 and CP10 of the Core Strategy, SDL Masterplan SPD’s and Infrastructure Delivery SPD for the SDLs, the updated Borough Design Guide SPD and Manual for Streets.
- Use any appropriate census data for evidence on transport/movement patterns.
- Assessing sites submitted to the Council (for consideration in the MDD DPD) on their potential impact on the highway network (transport modelling for schemes over a certain size) – see table 2.53.

### Issue 54: Public Transport Provision and Improvement – Alternative Option

To not include a policy on Public Transport and Provision.

#### Development Plan Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010)</th>
<th>Policy CP6 (Managing Travel Demand)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WT10</th>
<th>Public Transport Provision and Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Other Local Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Transport Plan 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging updated Borough Design Guide SPD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Policy Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPG13</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Issue 55: Rights of Way and Footpath and Cycleway Network**

**Context**

4.8.15 Protection of Rights of Way is covered by legislation (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), but this does not extend to ensuring there is connectivity and permeability to existing Rights of Way from new developments.

4.8.16 National rights of way policy is set out in the Government’s Rights of Way Circular (1/09). The Council as a Highway Authority and Surveying Authority has a duty to manage and maintain the rights of way network. The delivery of new rights of way is set out in the Council’s Rights of Way Improvement Plan\(^{51}\), a statutory document required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000\(^{52}\).

4.8.17 Saved Policy WBE3 of the WDLP requires development proposals to demonstrate good accessibility with easy and safe internal access along a network of interlinked footpaths. The policy also makes clear that the loss of Rights of Way will not be permitted unless appropriate alternative provision can be made.

4.8.18 The Council wants to protect and enhance the existing Rights of Way, footpath and cycleway network and the also improve the connectivity and permeability of new developments to the existing Rights of Way, footpath and cycleway network. Rights of Way could include:

- New public rights of way links from residential areas to transport links such as stations;
- Links to Public Open Space, Country Parks, Local Wildlife Sites and areas of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG);
- Links from new and existing residential areas, links to schools and amenities where appropriate and possibly creating new circular bridleway routes where appropriate.

4.8.19 The MDD DPD could provide policy on this matter and carry forward aspects of saved Policies WBE4 (Accessibility) of the WDLP.

**Issue 55: Public Rights of Way – Suggested Option**

Our approach is:

To develop a policy that reflects saved Policy WBE3 to include improved connectivity and permeability to all Rights of Way (including Bridleways) and footpath and cycleway networks.

---


We consider that this can be achieved by:

- Requiring new development, where appropriate, to improve the Rights of Way, footpath and cycleway network for current and future users with particular regard for those with disabilities.
- Requiring the provision of links to existing network and new links to be convenient to development but set within the landscape.
- Where appropriate, requiring new links to integrate into existing links.
- Ensuring accordance with the Council’s Rights of Way Improvement Plan.
- Mitigating development impact on the Rights of Way and footpath and cycleway network.
- Not permitting the loss of a Rights of Way, footpath and cycleways unless appropriate alternative provision can be made.

**Issue 55: Public Rights of Way – Alternative Option**

To not have specific policy on this matter and rely on Policy CP1 10), CP2, CP3 and CP6 and to include further guidance in the revised Borough Design Guide SPD.

The Council considers that this issue is not adequately dealt with by other policies at a local or national level.

**Development Plan Policy Linkage**

| Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) | Core Strategy Policy CP1 10) (Sustainable Development); CP2 (Inclusive Communities); CP3 (General Principles for Development) and CP6 (Managing Travel Demand). |

**Relevant Wokingham District Local Plan Saved Policies**

| Policy WBE3 | Accessibility |

**Right of Way Improvement Plan (December 2009)**

**National Policy Linkage**

| PPG13 | Transport |
| PPG17 | Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation |