Application Number	Expiry Date	Parish	Ward
212720	EXT	Twyford	Twyford

Applicant	Croudace Homes			
Site Address	Land at Bridge Farm, Twyford			
Proposal	Outline application (all matters reserved except access to the site) for the development of up to 200 dwellings, including 40% affordable housing and associated infrastructure, open space, biodiversity enhancements, landscaping and green infrastructure, following demolition of existing agricultural buildings. (Means of access into the site from New Bath Road to be considered.)			
Туре	Hybrid			
Officer	Sophie Morris			
Reason for determination by committee	Major application			

FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Planning Committee on 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2022			
REPORT PREPARED BY	Assistant Director – Place and Growth			
RECOMMENDATION	<ul> <li>That the committee authorise the GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following:</li> <li>A. Completion of a legal agreement relating to the following Heads of Terms (HoTs):</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Affordable Housing Provision – 40% on site provision with a tenure split of 70% social rent, 25% First Homes and 5% shared ownership; The remaining 60% of Dwellings to be provided as open market dwellings;</li> <li>Open Space delivery, transfer to WBC and maintenance thereafter;</li> <li>Open Space maintenance sum;</li> <li>Biodiversity Net Gain off-site provision (if Biodiversity Net Gain not secured in kind Biodiversity Net Gain Contribution to be paid in lieu)</li> </ul>			
	<ul><li>Public Transport Subsidy contribution;</li><li>My Journey Travel Plan contribution;</li></ul>			
	Off-site allotments contribution;			
	<ul> <li>Off-site sports facilities contribution;</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Costs of the Traffic Regulation Order along the A4;</li> <li>Costs of ashael aread reduction signs at the</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Costs of school speed reduction signs at the Piggott School;</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Delivery of Toucan crossing on A4 subject to completion of a Section 278 agreement or minor works agreement pursuant to the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) as appropriate;</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Employment Skills Contribution;</li> </ul>			
I				

	Contribution to WBC's Air Quality improvement initiatives; Prior to commencement of development to either complete an agreement pursuant to sections 38 and/or 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) to dedicate the estate roads or parts thereof on the application site for adoption by the Council (subject to the plans and specifications for the roads being to the Council's adoptable standards) failing which or at the election of the developer/owner to enter a further supplementary deed under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and other enabling powers prior to the approval of reserved matters application to secure, amongst other things, arrangements for the satisfactory construction and through a management company for the maintenance in perpetuity of the estate roads or parts thereof as private streets. S106 Monitoring Contribution;
E	5. Conditions and informatives as set out in Appendix 1 (subject to any additions and updates agreed with the Assistant Director – Place and Growth between the date of the resolution and the issue of the decision):
C	2. Alternative recommendation: That the Planning Committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event of a S106 legal agreement not being completed within six months of the date of the committee resolution (unless a longer period is agreed by the chairman of the Planning Committee and confirmed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) for the following reasons:
1	) In the absence of a planning obligation to secure suitable contributions / on site and off works for the following:
•	Affordable Housing Provision – 40% on site provision with a tenure split of 70% social rent, 25% First Homes and 5% shared ownership; Open Space delivery, transfer to WBC and maintenance thereafter; Open Space maintenance sum; Biodiversity Net Gain off-site provision (if Biodiversity Net Gain not secured in kind

<ul> <li>Biodiversity Net Gain Contribution to be paid in lieu)</li> <li>Public Transport Subsidy contribution;</li> <li>My Journey Travel Plan contribution;</li> <li>Off-site allotments contribution;</li> <li>Off-site sports facilities contribution;</li> <li>Costs of the Traffic Regulation Order along the A4;</li> <li>Costs of school speed reduction signs at the Piggott School;</li> <li>Delivery of Toucan crossing on A4;</li> <li>Employment Skills contribution;</li> <li>Prior to commencement of development to either complete an agreement pursuant to sections 38 and/or 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) to dedicate the estate roads or parts thereof on the application site for adoption by the Council (subject to the plans and specifications for the roads being to the Council's adoptable standards) failing which or at the election of the developer/owner to enter a further supplementary deed under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and other enabling powers prior to the approval of reserved matters application to secure, amongst other things, arrangements for the satisfactory construction and through a management company for the maintenance in perpetuity of the estate roads or parts thereof as private streets.</li> <li>S106 Monitoring Contribution;</li> </ul>
The Local Planning Authority is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal includes adequate mitigation measures to prevent the proposed development from having an adverse effect on infrastructure, services and would fail to provide affordable housing. This is contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and would compromise the delivery of the necessary infrastructure. This is contrary to policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP5, CP6, CP7, CP8, CP10, CP18 and Appendix 7 of the Core Strategy, policies CC01, CC08, TB08, TB12 of the Managing Development Delivery Development Plan Document.

## SUMMARY

The proposal is a hybrid planning application, in that it seeks outline planning permission for up to 200 dwellings on the site, with full planning permission sought for access, which is being considered in full at this stage. All matters are reserved except for access, and whilst an illustrative masterplan accompanies the application, only the principle of development is being considered at this stage therefore detailed layout and design will be considered under subsequent reserved matters applications.

The application site comprises a greenfield site of approximately 12.2 hectares located between the Henley branch train line to the east and River Loddon to the west. To the north lies the A4 and to the south a children's nursery. Residential development lies beyond the railway line to the east, and the development limits of the major development location of Twyford terminate at the western edge of that residential development. The site is therefore located close to, but outside of the current development limits of Twyford. The site is therefore located in the countryside.

As such, given the site is situated within the countryside, and not within the development limits as identified within the adopted Core Strategy, the proposals would not accord with the current adopted settlement boundary and countryside policies which seek to restrict development in such areas other than in a limited number of instances. However, as outlined in the report, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, and as such, and in accordance with the NPPF, policies which are considered most important to the determination of planning applications should be considered out of date for decision making and the NPPF tilted balance in the presumption of sustainable development is engaged unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

It is noted that the reason for the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply is a result of past over delivery rather than under delivery, and therefore the tilted planning balance should be tempered. However, given the location of the site, directly adjacent to Twyford and comprising a direct link to Twyford from the south, the proposals are not considered to result in any significant adverse impacts that would undermine the objectives of development plan policy, or would lead to suggest that the application should be refused.

In this case, the location of the development is considered to be sustainable and would allow easy and safe access to facilities within walking distances to local services and facilities within Twyford. The proposals are therefore considered to be well aligned with the underlying objectives of the policies concerning proposals outside development limits and in the countryside. It should also be noted that the NPPF does not dismiss development which is located outside of defined development limits provided it is located in a sustainable location. Moreover, it is noted that the A4 to the north and River Loddon to the west form natural breaks to development around Twyford.

As advised, it is considered that the proximity of the site to the centre of Twyford would provide occupants ease of access to a range of retail and other local services by foot or cycle, including Twyford train station which is considered a significant benefit. Given the sustainable location of the site and the scale of the proposals, the application proposals would not result in significant adverse impacts upon the surrounding highway network. The proposed access to the site is considered to be acceptable in principle. It should also be noted that the access has been designed to serve this development only and not any other speculative applications to the north. Whilst the design and layout of the site are reserved matters, the FRA has applied the sequential approach to establish an outline parameter plan which would ensure that all built development would be situated outside of flood zones 2 and 3, including an allowance for climate change as required at this time.

The proposals would bring about public benefits to the area, including the provision of 40% of on-site affordable housing. This is considered to be a benefit of the scheme that should be afforded great weight in the planning balance. The proposals would also contribute towards the Councils 5-year housing land supply, and proposals located where they are

considered sustainable should be afforded more weight in the planning balance than those which are considered less sustainable. Bringing forward proposals located in sustainable locations will also assist the Council in defending less sustainably located and unplanned proposals at appeal.

The proposals are considered to strike an appropriate balance between the provision of a sustainable housing scheme while respecting the surrounding character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would be set within an attractive landscaped setting, which benefits from existing established mature trees both within and around the site. The proposed landscape strategy would provide a landscape buffer between the edge of the built form of the proposals and the setting of the River Loddon, and as such would not result in excessive proliferation of development away from development limits into open countryside and as such would not compromise the separate identity of settlements. The provision of public open space in connection with the proposals would also see parts of the site being brought into public use for recreational enjoyment, and would include a riverside park, an orchard, and a children's play area, which would benefit a wider population than just those residing on the site.

It is noted that the site is proposed for allocation within the Draft Local Plan, and whilst this is still at a fairly early stage and carries limited weight, in accordance with advice contained within the NPPF, refusing the application on grounds of prematurity would not be justified in this instance as the proposed development is not so substantial in itself nor would it contribute to a cumulative effect that would undermine the plan-making process.

The development proposals for this site are therefore considered to be sustainable, provide greater public access to the river, up to 80 new affordable homes in a high value area and the opportunity to deliver high quality development in accordance with the Council's overall spatial strategy. In accordance with the application of the tilted planning balance of NPPF paragraph 11 (d), there are no identified adverse impacts associated with the proposals that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and there are no other material planning considerations of significant weight that would dictate that the application should be refused. As such, in line with the NPPF paragraph 11, Officers are recommending the application for approval, subject to the conditions and informatives listed and an accompanying S106 agreement.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY				
Application Number	Application Number Proposal [			
211853	EIA Screening Opinion for a development of up to 200 dwellings	Not EIA development		
172016	Submission of details to comply with the following conditions of planning consent 162284 (23 November 2016	Approved 2017		
162284	Erection of a detached dwelling	Approved Nov 2016		
160287	Erection of two detached dwellings	Refused May 2016		
RELEVANT APPEAL DECISIONS				
Willow Tree House (Application ref 203560, Appeal ref APP/X0360/W/21/3275086)				
Land at Baird Road (Application ref 202303, Appeal ref APP/X0360/W/21/3276169)				

DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION	
Proposed units	Up to 200
Proposed density - dwellings/hectare	35 DPH (approx) to be determined at RM stage
Number of affordable units proposed	Up to 80 (40%) all on site
Previous land use	Agricultural (cattle grazing in connection with dairy farm)
Existing parking spaces	0
Proposed parking spaces	To be determined at the reserved matters stage in line with WBC parking standards
Proposed public open space	Approximately 6ha
PLANNING STATUS	Countryside
	Flood Zones 1, 2 & 3
	Sand and gravel extraction
	BMV Agricultural Land
	Groundwater consultation zone
	Landfill consultation zone
	Minerals consultation zone
	Potentially Contaminated land consultation zone
	Landscape Character Assessment Area B1
	'Loddon River Valley with Open Water'

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust	No comments received
Crime Prevention Design Officer	No comments received
Environment Agency	No objections subject to conditions
ESP Utilities Group	Standing advice on gas and electric assets in vicinity of the site
Fulcrum pipelines	Standing advice on gas pipelines in vicinity of the site
Gigaclear	Standing advice regarding listed assets within vicinity of the site
GTT	Standing advice regarding listed assets within vicinity of the site
National Grid	No comments received
Natural England	No objection
National Planning Casework	No comments received
Network Rail	No objections – informatives 10 & 11
Buckingham, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (ICT)	No objection
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue	No objection
Southern Gas Networks	No comments received
SEE Power Distribution	No comments received
Thames Water	No objection subject to conditions and informatives
	376

WBC Biodiversity WBC Growth and Delivery (Planning Policy)	No objection subject to conditions and S106 No objection subject to conditions
WBC Economic Prosperity and Place	No objection subject to S106 affordable
(Community Infrastructure)	housing obligations
WBC Drainage	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Education (School Place Planning)	No objection
WBC Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Green Infrastructure	No objection subject to conditions and S106
WBC Highways	No objection subject to conditions and S106
WBC Sports Development (Places and	No comments received
Neighbourhoods)	
WBC Tree & Landscape	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Cleaner & Greener (Waste	No comments received
Services)	
WBC Public Rights of Way	No comments received

# REPRESENTATIONS

## Town/Parish Council:

# Twyford Parish Council: Objects to the proposals

Summary of objections:--

- The application is premature and if approved would deny residents of Twyford their democratic right to participate fully in the development of the next Wokingham Local Plan by presupposing its outcome. Officer comment: It is noted that the site is proposed for allocation within the Draft Local Plan and in accordance with advice contained within the NPPF, refusing the application on grounds of prematurity would not be justified in this instance given the Council's 5 year housing land supply position.
- The arguments to establish a principle of development presuppose the shape and form of the emerging draft local plan. It presupposes that the 5year supply of land situation will change and that the village developed envelope will have to change to afford sustainable development. In neither case has evidence been submitted to show that this is the case or that development needs to take place in contravention of the existing local plan. Officer comment: Refer to above comment, and as referenced in the report (paras 18-21), the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the restrictive locational policies contained in the current Local Plan are considered to be out of date, and therefore the tilted balance required by the NPPF is engaged and the presumption in favour of sustainable development must be applied.
- Impact of any extension of the village envelope on local services and infrastructure not taken into account. Officer comment: As set out in the report, it is considered that the scale of proposals could be acceptably accommodated with no adverse harmful impacts upon the surrounding area or upon the highway network. The development will be subject to CIL payments regarding other community infrastructure demands which help support the development.

• Access: impact on both traffic on the A4 and through the centre of Twyford have not been fully considered and should be assessed properly through the emerging local plan process. Again, this robs residents of Twyford the right to participate fully in the local plan development process and strips us of the protection of the existing local plan. Officer comment: The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment which has been reviewed by WBC Highways who consider that the traffic impacts of the proposals can be accommodated without adverse impacts upon the surrounding highway network. As mentioned, refusing the proposals on the grounds of prematurity would not be justified in this case.

# Charvil Parish Council: Objects to the proposals

Summary of objections:--

- Currently outside of the development area for Twyford. While we acknowledge that • this site was included in the first draft of the Local Plan update, it is only when this has been adopted that the area changes to being within the development area. To allow this development at this stage would set a dangerous precedent for all other sites included in the first draft and would not allow for the holistic approach that the Local Plan is designed to bring, including infrastructure considerations clearly of major concern to many residents in both Charvil and Twyford. It would also challenge the legitimacy of the process, with no option for the independent inspector to have the final say. Officer comment: Each application must be assessed on its own merits. In this instance, although the application site is located outside the existing settlement boundary, as mentioned, due to the Council's 5 year housing land supply position, relevant locational restrictive policies are considered out of date, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development must be applied. Furthermore, the proposals are not considered to result in significant harmful impacts which would warrant the refusal of planning permission in advance of the Local Plan adoption.
- Charvil is a low-lying parish, with large areas flooding on increasingly frequent • occasions. Fortunately, so far, the water meadows have largely managed to prevent homes being flooded (with a few unfortunate exceptions). While the site in question is not in the flood plain, it does serve to reduce the risks of flooding in both the lowest lying parts of Twyford, and in Charvil. This development may well be the tipping point, despite the flood mitigation measures suggested, and this risk is too great for Charvil householders. Even the developers own flooding assessment admits that flooding on the site itself could happen if the culvert where the River Loddon runs under the A4 becomes blocked, and that it should be checked weekly for such blockages. The chances of weekly checks being made, each week, every week, in perpetuity, is vanishingly small, and hence a flood at some point would be almost inevitable. Moreover, this is the conclusion for a development of 150 homes; the effects of an extra 50 are not discussed. Officer Comment: See 'Flood Risk and Drainage' section of the report (paras 94-108). The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which has been updated since the initial submission. The error referring to 150 units has been rectified, and the FRA is based on the proposed development of up to 200 dwellings. The FRA has modelled the future flood zones on the site, including an allowance for climate change. All built development on the site would be situated within Flood Zone 1. No levels will be raised in the areas that flood and further planting could assist with flooding. The flood risk assessment advises that the culvert under the A4 should be checked at regular intervals particularly after heavy rainfall. not weekly. However, maintenance of the River falls under the EA's remit. WBC's

Structures team would also notify the EA if any obstruction was observed on a visit to inspect the culvert structure itself. However it should be noted this is not relevant to this planning application. The surface water drainage scheme for the site proposes to use Sustainable Urban Drainage System, the details for which will need to demonstrate that surface water run off from the site will be managed sustainably, and at the same rate as (or better than) the existing greenfield run off rates. The Environment Agency raise no objection to the proposals on the basis of the flood risk assessment and mitigation measures proposed, subject to a number of conditions which have been included within the recommendation.

• Traffic concerns: The A4 is already extremely slow moving on a school day morning and afternoon; frequent accidents bring the whole area, including the centres of Twyford and Charvil, to a standstill. A further major junction so close to the existing Wargrave Road roundabout will increase the likelihood of accidents and delays on a road already close to capacity at peak times. The developer tacitly admits this is likely to be a problem as they are offering extensive funds to try to make their plans acceptable. Officer comment: The proposed access points have been the subject of a Stage one Road Safety Audit (RSA). A full RSA will be undertaken at the detailed design stage. The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment which has been reviewed by WBC Highways who consider that the traffic flow impacts of the proposals can be accommodated without significant adverse effects upon the surrounding highway network.

# Charvil PC second response:

- Charvil Parish Council would like to add the following comments in relation to the additional evidence provided recently. The Council's original comments are still valid despite the extra information on travel - we still believe that this development will adversely affect the local road network by the addition of a very complex series of road changes on the A4, although the reduction in the speed limit between Charvil and Twyford is broadly welcomed. That said, this should be done as a matter of course, not just because of development.
- The flood risks to the South and West of the site are also not adequately addressed to ease the fears of Charvil residents.

# Wargrave Parish Council: Objects to the proposals

• Wargrave Parish Council objects to this application. This Council considers that the second junction (the T junction on the plans) with the A4 would be detrimental to highway safety and liable to cause considerable problems with traffic flow on this main arterial road. Furthermore, the proposed roundabout will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on the busy A4 as a result of the number of vehicle movements to and from the proposed development. It is noted that this stretch already becomes gridlocked at peak times due to the proximity of The Piggott School. The Parish Council is also concerned at the impact the development would have on local facilities including schools and healthcare facilities. *Officer comment: The proposed access points have been the subject of a Stage one Road Safety Audit (RSA). A full RSA will be undertaken at the detailed design stage. As mentioned the application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment which has been reviewed by WBC Highways who consider that the traffic flow impacts of the proposals can be accommodated without significant adverse effects upon the surrounding highway* 

network. See paras 137-141 of report in relation to infrastructure and existing services and school places. There is currently capacity in local primary school provision and this year, and the Piggott Secondary School were able to offer a place to all children in catchment whose parents had applied for the school as their first preference, along with some outside of catchment. Issues around provision of health facilities is managed by the Buckingham, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (ICT) and not a matter for the Local Planning Authority or Council.

# Local Members:

Councillor Lindsay Ferris

- 200 new dwellings on this site would add appreciably to an already congested local road network. I am particularly concerned about how traffic would exit and enter the site onto the A4 via a new roundabout. If someone wishes to get to Twyford Station, then they would need to either travel via Wargrave Road, or via Charvil. In either case they will need to go across Twyford Crossroads. This cross road already has a high level of air pollution and this additional traffic would only make matters worse. There is therefore a potential increase in air pollution leading to an increased health & safety issue and this needs to be recognised within this application. Officer comment: As referred to within the Highway section of the report (paras 79-93), the proposed roundabout and secondary access have been the subject of a Stage One Road Safety Audit, and a full RSA will be submitted at the detailed design stage. However it is considered that a design can be incorporated to accommodate the development. In addition, the proposals would also see a reduction in the speed limit along this section of the A4 from 60mph to 40mph to ensure the safe functioning of the highway proposals. The application proposals are considered to be sustainably located in relation to their proximity to Twyford station, whereby occupants will be encouraged through the WBC 'My Journey' Initiative to walk or cycle. Notwithstanding this, the application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Air Quality Assessment report which conclude that the traffic movements associated with the proposals can be accommodated within the surrounding network, and as referenced later in the report (paras 116-127) the resulting air pollution levels would remain to be below the National Air Quality Objectives (NAQO).
- In addition, access for children to Piggott School could be quite problematic and potentially dangerous. Whilst the school is not far there will still be a number of parents who would drive to the school because of this potential danger. The A4 is already a very busy road. Officer comment: Refer to above comment in relation to proposed reduction in speed. In addition, a footpath along the south side of the A4 is proposed in conjunction with the provision of a signalised pedestrian crossing, which will link the site safely with the ped/cycle route on the north side of the A4 and thus the Piggott School (note Highways section of report).
- The western edge of the site often floods (as it did last winter), so any proposed dwellings would need to avoid this part of the site. With global warming, we will have increased occurrences of flooding as well as increased water levels in general. This would mean that a greater area of the site could become susceptible to flooding in future. Again such a situation needs to be taken account in the application. Officer comment: As mentioned within the report below, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which identifies that all built development associated with the proposals would be located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk of

flooding. This is also taking into account flood modelling zones including an allowance for climate change. The Environment Agency raise no objection to the proposals subject to the development being undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the FRA. It should be noted that the LPA cannot make an assessment based potential future climate change outside the current modelling guidance set by the Environment Agency (note FRA section in report and condition 25 refers).

I do not believe that these issues have been taken into account sufficiently. *Officer comment: See responses above.* 

# Neighbours:

Representations have been received from 245 surrounding residents. Of these, 238 object, 5 support, and 2 are general comments. A summary of the concerns raised are summarised below:

Highways Impact of additional roundabout and traffic along Bath Road/safety concerns Traffic surveys not undertaken at a time which was an accurate representation of typical volumes Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based</i>	
Impact of additional roundabout and traffic along Bath Road/safety concerns Traffic surveys not undertaken at a time which was an accurate representation of typical volumes Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals</i> <i>have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the</i> <i>initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts</i> <i>undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	Summary of objections
Traffic surveys not undertaken at a time which was an accurate representation of typical volumes Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	Highways
typical volumes Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals</i> have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	•
from home or were furloughed and when schools were not fully open. It was also not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	typical volumes
not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	Traffic surveys were carried out during a covid lockdown when many people worked
school run. No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
No integrated traffic assessments at morning peak with pedestrian crossing impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	not carried out during the peak rush hours in the morning or evening nor the peak
impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	school run.
Errors in TA RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
RSA carried out during the roadmap out of lockdown Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	impacts on both new and A321 roundabouts
Increase in traffic at Twyford traffic lights are already overburdened - no north/south bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
bypass around Twyford North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
North Wokingham Development has already put pressure on Twyford crossroads Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Traffic along A4 at peak times is already an issue Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Parking near the train station and in the village is a long-standing issue Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Commuters and visitors to the village park in Brook Street and prevent residents from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning <i>Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on</i>	
from being able to park near their home. Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Parking/Infrastructure in Twyford can't cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Accessing the Wargrave roundabout from Wargrave Road is already difficult, often queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
queueing down Wargrave Road, additional entrance and roundabout will make it more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
more difficult and lead to increased congestion down Wargrave Road Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Pre-covid A4 between Charvil and Twyford roundabouts at a standstill in the morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
morning and evening. New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
New access to the A4 will be a disaster. The work done to study traffic impacts does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
does not seem to reflect the pre covid reality of congestion and saturation of existing capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
capacity at peak times. Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Adding another roundabout would cause further chaos and back up to A4 in Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Sonning Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
Officer comment: Refer to Highways section of report (paras 79-93), the proposals have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
have been assessed against the submitted TA which has been amended since the initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
initial submission in response to comments from WBC Highways. The traffic counts undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
undertaken to support the application were growthed up to 2022 levels based on	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
331	
	331

the national TEMPro database (Trip End Model Presentation Program which helps provides forecasts of trips) and were therefore considered to be sound. The traffic modelling impacts of the proposals for future years is based on WBC's Strategic Model, the results of which demonstrate that the traffic movements associated with the proposals would not be severe and could be accommodated within the highway network.

Proximity of new roundabout to existing roundabout will cause further congestion and will be dangerous too

The existing ped/cycleway along the A4 is not safe and is a primary pedestrian route for schoolchildren. This needs to be fully segregated from the roadway to be considered safe and healthy. For the proposed road junctions, major investment in the A4 route would be required to provide grade separation to minimise interruption of traffic flows.

The plan shows no pavements proposals on the south side of A4.

A single Toucan crossing has proved insufficient at Charvil probably a central island would be needed in this proposal.

Access on A4 – the plan will have a roundabout, T-junction and a Toucan crossing all close to each other and to the existing Wargrave roundabout.

The Charvil and Wargrave roundabouts and Dobbies garden centre junction are already accident prone

No mention how many houses secondary access would serve

How could access to the estate be safely positioned and if it were to go ahead what is the plan for children to cross the road to Piggott school

Parents living at the development will want to drop their children at the roundabout so they can walk to Piggott school – children would need to cross A4

There has already been an accident this year (2021) along this stretch of the A4 where a vehicle hit a child walking home from school.

Officer comment: See Highways section of report (paras 79-93). The proposed access points including the new roundabout and Toucan crossing have been the subject of a Stage one Road Safety Audit (RSA) and have taken on board comments from the Road Safety Auditor. A full RSA will be undertaken at the detailed design stage. A 3m pedestrian/cycle footpath is proposed along a section of the south side of the A4 to connect the development with the ped/cycle path on the north side of the A4. The proposals also include a speed limit reduction from 60mph to 40mph along this section of the A4 from Charvil to the Wargrave roundabout which would provide for a safer highway environment for children travelling to school.

Traffic coming from the estate past the nursery will impact pedestrians walking up and down Wargrave Road, including school children.

Access track to nursery gets congested at drop off/pick up times – how would residents / cyclists pass queueing cars

Any vehicular access to the site beyond the nursery would be dangerous/create more pollution/noise

Officer comment: Access to the development from the southern end of the site would be for pedestrians/cyclists and emergency vehicle access only. As the proposals are outline in nature at this stage, condition 31 requires details of a walking and cycling strategy which will include details of proposed enhancements to link the site safely with Twyford which could include signage and some physical measures to help with safety. No impact assessment of disruption timescales to A4 modifications which will gridlock Wargrave Rd roundabout

Any road works must be completed out of major commuting times and completed prior to any work on development

Concerns around heavy plant traffic during construction will put users of the A4 at risk (including school children who travel independently of parents)

Officer comment: Should the application be approved, the applicant will be required to submit a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to the Council for approval. Some disruption is inevitable during construction, however this would not warrant a reason for refusal. Any works to the highway as part of the proposals would be co-ordinated with WBC's Streetworks Team to ensure that any disruption to the surrounding highway is minimised as best as possible.

Flood Risk

Houses backing on to site often have free standing water during heavy rainfall when fields between them and Loddon are unable to cope with floodwater

Area already prone to flooding e.g. Charvil meadows and fields behind Park View Drive North

Concern over flood mitigation and consequences for the wider area

Proposal will increase risk of flooding to Charvil

Part of the site is flood plain which will increase with the runoff from the site.

Building on flood plain will increase flood risk elsewhere

Building on slopes that lead to a flood plain will increase the speed of the water flow and increased flooding of the river Loddon

Agricultural land absorbs massive amounts of floodwater. The overall surface water absorption capacity will be reduced – where will the water go?

Cedar Park nursery car park is sometimes flooded in the winter

EA issued flood warning for SE area of the site in Feb 2020

Who will own and maintain remaining flood plain on completion?

Knock on effect of building here will increase flooding elsewhere

Other examples across the country where developers have claimed proposals will not impact upon flooding, and hydrological experts have proven this to be wrong. The scheme should be examined thoroughly by qualified hydrologists and not trust the drainage strategy proposed by the developer

FRA mentions 150 not 200 dwellings

New Gingell's Farm Road development has had to have houses pumped out due to flooding, this is 500 yards from the proposal. Site proposal is in flood zone 3, no development should be allowed on this basis alone

EA report in 2003 showed flood plain previously covered the whole area to be built on

The underlying chalk structure should be investigated further before any decision making.

The exceedance of soakaways so close to the River Loddon should be a warning to potential flood risk, especially when fields are covered in hard materials, that have less drainage capacity.

Reference in the FRA to flooding on the if the culvert where the River Loddon runs under the A4 becomes blocked, and that it should be checked weekly for such blockages. The chances of weekly checks being made weekly, in perpetuity, is small and hence a flood at some point would be almost inevitable.

Officer comment: See 'Flood Risk and Drainage' section of the report (paras 94-108). The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which has been updated since the initial submission. The error referring to 150 units has been rectified, and the FRA is based on the proposed development of up to 200 dwellings. The scheme has been reviewed by both the Environment Agency and WBC as Lead Local Flood Authority both of whom raise no objection to the proposals subject to a number of conditions which will include full details of the proposed drainage system and results of intrusive ground investigations. The resulting open space within the flood plain will be transferred to the Council for its ongoing management and maintenance.

The below report acknowledges that areas of the site is prone to flooding at times however this is within those areas falling within the Environment Agency's designated flood zones 2 and 3. All built development associated with the proposals will be situated outside of these zones, and located within zone 1 which has the lowest risk of flooding. This includes incorporating an allowance for climate change. With regards to surface water drainage, this is proposed to be managed through using a Sustainable urban Drainage system (SuDs), which will feed into an attenuation pond before being released at green field run off rates. As this is an outline application, full details of the proposed system, along with detailed drainage calculations will be submitted alongside the reserved matters application however officers are content this can be accommodated within the site. The flood risk assessment advises that the culvert under the A4 should be checked at regular intervals particularly after heavy rainfall, not weekly. However, maintenance of the River falls under the EA's remit. WBC's Structures team would also notify the EA if any obstruction was observed on a visit to inspect the culvert structure itself. However it should be noted this is not relevant to this planning application.

# Infrastructure

Twyford already overcrowded and will not cope with increase in numbers proposed Proposal would result in approximately 10% increase in population of Twyford Is a village but with more houses will turn into a town

Lack of infrastructure including doctors surgery, schools, parking, pavement width in Twyford to support this many people

Twyford already oversized in relation to its amenities, services and schools Impacts on residents of Charvil

Waiting time of 3 weeks at doctor surgery, no NHS dentist spaces

How can we be sure that all of the income received goes directly to Twyford to improve these points

Twyford and Charvil are already being overdeveloped without necessary infrastructure and resources

All schools in Twyford are considerably oversubscribed, how would spaces be provided at schools for 200 extra families. Residents on the south side of the railway must be able to continue to send their children to Piggott school (not at the expense of new homes).

Piggott school oversubscribed and development will enable new residents to take places away from other residents who are already living in the area

This year (2021) schools in the area were not able to provide places for children from 50 or so families in the catchment area

Only one nursery

Proposals will have a negative impact on existing residents

Without significant investment, the development will negatively impact the local community in many ways with no benefit

Inadequate water supply

Officer comment: See paras 137-141 of report in relation to infrastructure and existing services and school places. There is currently capacity in local primary school provision and this year, and the Piggott Secondary School were able to offer a place to all children in catchment whose parents had applied for the school as their first preference, along with some outside of catchment. Issues around provision of health facilities is managed by the Buckingham, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (ICT) and not a matter for the Local Planning Authority or Council. Thames Water raise no objection to the proposals subject to conditions 45 to 49.

Environmental

More traffic will add to the high volumes of traffic already causing congestion, pollution, noise and high levels of speeding cars

Potential 800 more people will add to noise pollution

Air pollution is already a problem at Twyford Crossroads

No pollution assessment of Twyford crossroads

Anti-idling posters – very people do switch off engines

Proposals should not just meet energy use and insulation standards but exceed them; properties should be sold with option of solar panels, air or soil heat pumps Solar panels should be mandatory

Public transport is infrequent, expensive and unreliable in Twyford and Charvil and most people have 2 cars. Allowing 200 more dwellings will mean at least 400 more vehicles causing air pollution and traffic. There are already problems with air quality in Twyford and Charvil. Planting more trees will not solve the problem

Threat to existing sustainable means of travel due to increase in traffic and pollution.

Officer comment: The application has been assessed with regards to traffic impacts (paras 79-93), and air pollution (paras 116-127) and are not considered to result in significant adverse impacts in these regards. A proposed residential use is not considered to be a land use which would be considered demonstrably harmful to surrounding residential amenities with regards to resulting noise impacts. Also the separation distances indicated are within policy standards. Due to the location of the site and its proximity to Twyford, it is considered that occupants would also be encouraged to travel by sustainable means in the locality including walking and cycling.

Housing

Twyford is an expensive area to live, any housing built are unlikely to be affordable by those who wish to remain local

40% affordable housing is not enough, should be 80% does not meet local housing need

There should be better smaller housing ratio i.e. one beds, suitable for one or two adults

The plans show too high density

Unhealthy obsession with building in the SE. Other parts of the country need to take their fair share. Wokingham has been destroyed by over development in the last 5/10 years

Officer comment: the proposals would provide the policy requirement of 40% affordable housing on site reflecting a mix of social rent, shared ownership, and first homes (a form of discount market sale) to contribute towards meeting the affordable housing needs of the borough. The dwelling size mix of the affordable housing would be secured through the S106 and reflects the mix requested by WBC

Housing to ensure the provision meets identified local need. The proposed market housing mix will be determined at the reserved matters stage and will need to have regard to the latest local housing need survey data at the time of consideration. The resulting density would be determined through the reserved matters proposals and would need to ensure compliance with all WBC space standards to ensure an appropriate density for the site. WBC has a statutory duty with regards to housing delivery in the borough.

Ecology/Wildlife

Loss of green space; the land currently supports wildlife and biodiversity which will be destroyed; such areas should be protected and enhanced

What will happen to incoming house martins when their habitat is destroyed (agricultural buildings)

Impact on Flora and Fauna

Loss of nature and wildlife along the river Loddon

Where will wildlife go – taking more of their habitat will result in more vermin in private gardens

Bridge Farm is the last rural area close to the centre of Twyford. Should be protected as an amenity for the local community. It should be used for farming, or as a nature reserve. Much of the local wildlife originate here

Impact of proposals on nature conservation and wildlife - where will the wild animals currently living on this site go?

Why are findings redacted in the ecological assessment

Concerned about impact upon bat population

Land is greenbelt agricultural land

Loss of views

Loss of agricultural land that acts as separation to Charvil

Biodiversity should be a consideration

An increase in urban developments are a threat to bees

Officer comment: The site is not designated Green Belt land. Impact upon ecology has been assessed (paras 72-78 of report refer) and conditions around mitigation measures are proposed. The proposals will be required to demonstrate a 10% uplift in biodiversity on the site. WBC Ecologist considers details provided at this stage have indicated that this can be achieved, but will need to be demonstrated further through the landscaping proposals that come forwards as part of reserved matters. Parts of the Ecological Appraisal are redacted in relation to information around some protected species which are vulnerable to criminal activity, however WBC Ecologist has reviewed unredacted version of the document. The proposals would retain a buffer between the western edge of the site and the River Loddon. Loss of view is not a material planning consideration.

General

Such a large development not in keeping with the local area, will be isolated Detrimental to the character of Twyford

Application conflicts with its own policies CP1, CP2, CP4, CP9, CP10

Proposed development sits outside of the existing settlement where presumption is against such development under CP11

Premature to consider it ahead of the new Local Plan

Setting precedent elsewhere in the borough

Allowing this development will give the green light for more

The Council should look to use existing spaces that are already built and consider change of use or rebuild where opportunity arises

Wokingham's brownfield register shows there is other land available – should not be allowing greenfield development when there is brownfield available

Officer comment: The site is not considered to be isolated due to it's proximity and location to the centre of Twyford. Refer to Paras 6 to 24 regarding principle of development.

With regards to comments around setting a precedent, WBC must consider applications which are put before them and be assessed on their individual merits. The proposal has extended the area 5TW005 originally identified in the Draft Local Plan and this should be subject to further community consultation

Submitted plan is based on an out of date OS map, and a number of newer dwellings located at the rear of Wargrave Road are not indicated.

Officer comment: The site area is reflective of that which was indicated in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and the Draft Local Plan. The detailed reserved matters application will need to ensure the base map is corrected to demonstrate WBC separation standards are met. This is not material to the current outline application which (with the exception of access) seeks to establish the principle of development only. Unfortunately the Council's current housing land supply position means that the development needs to be considered in advance of the Local Plan.

No idea of what archaeology is there.

No accessible public documents on natural environment or archaeology Effect on listed building and conservation area

Officer comment: The application proposals included a suite of required accompanying documents including an Historic and Desk Based Assessment, and an Ecological Appraisal, both of which are available to view online. The site does not contain nor is located near to any listed buildings and is not located within a conservation area. Berkshire Archaeology were consulted on the application and have responded recommending a condition which requires a further archaeological report (condition 50)

Summary of support

Glad to see a new development proposal, we need more housing

Construction access should only be from A4, not through the village

May be prudent to consider a space for a corner coffee shop; this would be useful for the residents of the development and for the village

It would be a good idea to have an area of play for children, ideally placed centrally, overlooked by some of the houses

If housing needs to be built this is a reasonable area with a reasonable number proposed

Ideal chance to build a cycle path in Twyford and could link through the Bridge Park development and the high street

Broadly supportive provided no vehicle except emergency services has access to the site via Bridge Farm Road and appropriate provision of amenities in the local area

Schools are over the influx, more available spaces now than children to fill them Good for local businesses with people spending on the High Street

A lot of people will be working from home

Do not object in principle provided suitable mitigation is in place for impact on existing community and local environment

General comments

Gives an opportunity to create a public footpath along the banks of the Loddon joining with the existing footpath along Old Bath Road – would enhance the village for residents

Good to see appropriate measures being taken to manage flood risk Good to see mention of solar panels, electric heat pumps and electric vehicle charging

All land to the west of the bisecting road track should be left for nature to recolonise

Other representations

Turley Associates on behalf of David Wilson Homes (Southern):

David Wilson Homes is promoting land for residential development north of the A4 at Twyford (Riverways Farm), immediately north of the Croudace scheme; Twyford is a highly sustainable location; Land West of Twyford provides opportunities to accommodate growth in an unconstrained, highly sustainable location;

Urge the LPA to ensure that the proposed development at Bridge Farm would not prejudice future growth elsewhere before granting a planning consent.

Officer comment: The proposed new roundabout junction is designed only to accommodate the development proposed as part of this application, and not development to the north of the A4. The application proposals are assessed on the basis of the application before them and not in relation to other potential development proposals. Any other proposal would need to undertake their own assessment and design.

Other non-material planning issues were raised

# PLANNING POLICY

#### National Planning Policy Framework National Design Guide National Planning Practice Guidance

# Core Strategy (CS)

- CP1 Sustainable Development
- CP2 Inclusive Communities
- CP3 General Principles for Development
- CP4 Infrastructure Requirements
- CP5 Housing Mix, Density and Affordability
- CP6 Managing Travel Demand
- CP7 Biodiversity
- CP9 Scale and Location of Development Proposals
- CP10 Improvements to the Strategic Transport Network.
- CP11 Proposals Outside Development Limits (Inc Countryside)
- CP17 Housing Delivery

# **MDD Local Plan (MDD**

CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CC02 - Development Limits

- CC03 Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping
- CC04 Sustainable Design and Construction
- CC05 Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks
- CC06 Noise
- CC07 Parking
- CC08 Safeguarding alignments of the Strategic Transport Network & Road Infrastructure
- CC09 Development and Flood Risk
- CC10 Sustainable Drainage
- TB05 Housing Mix
- TB07 Internal Space Standards
- TB08 Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Standards
- TB12 Employment Skills Plan
- TB21 Landscape Character
- TB23 Biodiversity and Development
- TB24 Designated Heritage Assets
- TB25 Archaeology

## Other

Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

CIL Guidance

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan

# PLANNING ISSUES

#### Application Site and Surroundings

- 1. The application site known as Bridge Farm is located approximately 0.5km to the northwest of the centre of Twyford. The site extends to approximately 12.2 hectares and comprises agricultural land, previously used for the grazing of cattle, and includes associated agricultural buildings and an agricultural track running through the site from north to south, known as Muddlers Lane. There is an existing dwelling located in the centre of the site known as 'Orchard House' however this is excluded from the application red line boundary. Adjoining the site to the north-west is a single dwelling, 'Loddon Acres' and to the south lies a pair of semi-detached dwellings ('Wythe Cottages') and beyond these is the Cedar Park children's day nursery. Again, these properties are all excluded from the application site boundary.
- 2. The east boundary of the site borders the Henley Branch railway line and its associated cutting and beyond this lies the edge of the built-up area which defines the current boundary of the Major Development Location of Twyford. The site is therefore located close to but sits outside of the current development limits of Twyford. The site is therefore located in the countryside. The site is not, however located within designated Green Belt or within a Conservation Area.
- 3. The north of the site borders the New Bath Road (A4) and the River Loddon to the west, beyond which are further fields and the Old River. Vehicular access into the site is currently via Muddlers Lane access track off the A4 to the north and Bridge Farm Road which is accessed off the Wargrave Road to the south. Open views into the site are limited from the south and east due to the existing extent of the Twyford settlement boundary, and therefore the main views into the site are from the A4 New

Bath Road. The site contains a number of established mature trees, both along Muddlers Lane within the site, as well as along its boundaries and along the edge of the River Loddon.

#### **Development Proposals**

- 4. The application proposals are for the development of the site to provide up to 200 (80 affordable) dwellings and associated open space. The proposal also includes the provision of an on-site NEAP children's play area (Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play). The application is a hybrid proposal in that outline permission is sought for the residential element, with full planning permission being sought for access into the site which would be taken from the A4 New Bath Road. Access from the south of the site from Wargrave Road would be for pedestrian and cycle access only into the development.
- 5. Whilst this is an outline application, and therefore matters relating to the detailed design, appearance, layout and landscaping would be reserved for future consideration under a reserved matters application, an illustrative masterplan has nonetheless been submitted with the application. This indicates that the proposed dwellings forming the development would be located on the east and north sides of the site, leaving the west side of the site adjacent to the River Loddon to be provided as an area of public open space. This is discussed in more detail later in the report.

#### Principle of development

6. In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The current Development Plan for Wokingham comprises the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy (CS) (2010) and the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) (2014).

# National Policy Context

7. The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the council's Development Plan. The NPPF is clear that where a development does not result in significant harm and is sustainable, it should be supported. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in limited circumstances, where both:

(a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and

(b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

8. In this case, the proposals are not considered to be so substantial in themselves, nor cumulatively contribute to undermine the plan-making process. Therefore, in this context, refusing the application on grounds of prematurity would not be justified in this instance.

## Emerging development plan

- 9. The Council is currently preparing a Local Plan Update (LPU) and the application site was put forward in the 'call for sites' within the early stages of the LPU process. A consultation on a Draft Plan took place between 3 February and 3 April 2020, alongside which WBC published its assessment of all the promoted sites in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). This included the application site as being potentially suitable for development and as such Policy H2 of the Draft Plan proposed to allocate the application site for around 150 dwellings.
- 10. Since the Draft Plan was published for consultation in 2020, there have been a number of changes in circumstances. In particular, the originally proposed Grazeley Garden Town is no longer a deliverable option as a result of the extension of the emergency planning zone around AWE in Burghfield. As such, a subsequent 'Revised Growth Strategy' consultation took place between November 2021 and January 2022. The application site remains to be proposed for allocation within the revised strategy, with an update to the potential number of dwellings increasing from around 150 to around 180. However, the supporting text to draft policy H2 advises that "The stated capacities are approximate since there will be a need to take into account further detailed evidence on constraints, design considerations and the need to ensure the most efficient use of land, at the planning application stage. It is likely that a number of the proposed allocations are capable of delivering a larger number of dwellings than shown, depending on the design and layout of development and detailed consideration of impacts."
- 11. The timing of the application submission was originally intended to run alongside the LPU process, to help demonstrate to the Planning Inspector examining the Local Plan that the site was capable of being delivered. However, due to the delays in the original timescale for preparing the Local Plan, it is still at a fairly early stage of preparation and at the time of writing remains to have limited weight in the decision-making process and as such, the planning status of the site at present remains unallocated.
- 12. A Neighbourhood Plan for Twyford is currently in the process of being prepared, and the draft Twyford Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to the council, and a public consultation ended in November 2022. An independent examiner has therefore been appointed to examine the Neighbourhood Plan. As the examination of the plan is still ongoing, it has limited weight in the decision-making process.

#### Local Policy Context

13. Given the current status of the emerging LPU, the proposals are to be considered against relevant policies within the current Local Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) Policy CC01 – *Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development* states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It continues by stating that where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the

time of making the decision, then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- a) Any adverse impacts of planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Framework (NPPF) taken as a whole; or
- b) Specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework indicate that development should be restricted.
- 14. Relevant policies concerning the principle of development include MDD Policy CC02 -Development Limits, which sets out the development limits for each settlement as defined on the policies map. Core Strategy Policy CP9 – Scale and Location of development proposals sets out that development proposals located within development limits will be acceptable in principle, having regard to the service provisions associated with the major, modest and limited categories.
- 15. The application site is located outside of the Core Strategy defined settlement boundaries and therefore, in policy terms, it is located within the countryside. Policies CP9, CP11 of the Core Strategy and Policy CC02 of the MDD are therefore relevant and seek to restrict development outside development limits other than in a few limited circumstances, however the scheme would not meet any of the cited exceptions criteria.
- 16. Core Strategy Policy CP9 Scale and location of development proposals directs development to within settlement limits and states that "The scale of development proposals in Wokingham borough must reflect the existing or proposed levels of facilities and services at or in the location, together with their accessibility". Supporting paragraph 4.52 of the CS states that Major Development Locations "are those with the greatest range of facilities and services which also allow residents the greatest choice in modes to access them. It is within the development limits of these settlements where major development (including urban extensions within these limits) would be acceptable". While the site is located adjacent to the major settlement of Twyford, the site is not located within the current defined development limits.
- 17. As such, development proposals beyond development limits, in the countryside, should be assessed against Core Strategy Policy CP11 *Proposals outside Development Limits*. Policy CP11 establishes that development proposals will not normally be permitted except where one or more of the specified exceptions apply, however the proposals would not meet any of these specified exceptions and the proposals would therefore represent a conflict with these locational restrictive policies.
- 18. Notwithstanding the above, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply in respect of its housing targets as required by the NPPF. This situation is one which Inspectors have also found to be the case in recent appeal decisions (referenced in the planning history). It should be noted however, that the reason for the identified shortfall is due to the significant over delivery of housing in recent years rather than under delivery, the effect being that this has reduced the bank of planning permissions that remain and therefore the short-term deliverable housing land supply.
- 19. In terms of how this affects the consideration of the application proposals, paragraph 11 of the NPPF advises that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in

favour of sustainable development, and continues by explaining that for *decision-taking* this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

*d)* where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- *i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- *ii)* any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
- 20. Therefore, in respect of Local Plan policies which are relevant to establishing the acceptability of the principle of development on the application site, Core Strategy policies CP9, CP11 and MDD Policy CC02 are considered to be the most important. However, given that WBC does not currently have a five-year housing land supply, these policies are considered to be out of date in the context of the NPPF and the tilted balance of paragraph 11 (d) referenced above is therefore engaged.
- 21. Further considerations around whether any adverse impacts associated with the proposals would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits are considered within the remainder of the report below.
- 22. The application site is considered to be sustainably located, the benefits of which are that future occupants would have good access to local day to day facilities, particularly the shops and associated facilities located in Twyford centre which is located less than 1km from the site. As referenced later in the report, many of the local facilities, such as the train station, shops and schools etc are located within walking distance from the site and therefore the site would bring forward housing where there would be less day to day reliance on car travel. Therefore, enabling further housing on suitable, sustainable sites are likely to further strengthen WBC's case for the rejection of unsatisfactory, less sustainable sites elsewhere in the borough.
- 23. Notwithstanding that the above referenced locational policies are considered out of date, the physical location of the site in relation to its proximity with the Major development location of Twyford, is such that in this instance, permitting development on a site beyond the existing settlement boundary is not considered to undermine the Council's strategic objectives in relation to planned population growth in the area.
- 24. A range of economic benefits would also derive from the development such as the creation of a range of construction jobs and opportunities; increases in resident expenditure in the locality providing a boost to the local economy; and the creation of "spin-off" jobs in services and other firms resultant from wage spending and supplier sourcing from the occupiers of the new development. These economic effects align well with a wide range of national, regional, and local policy objectives, in particular, increasing the supply of high quality, sustainable housing to meet projected increases

in population and enhancing economic prosperity through creating employment opportunities for local people. The site will also deliver the provision of 40% on-site affordable housing provision, which would be equivalent to 80 dwellings. This is considered to be a benefit which should be attributed great weight in the planning balance. The development will provide CIL payment in order to help mitigate its impact which could also be of benefit to the wider community.

## Outline Layout and Design

- 25. Core Strategy Policies CP1- *Sustainable Development* and CP3 *General Principles for Development* set out the requirement for the development to achieve high quality of design that respects its context and maintains or enhances the quality of the environment. This includes the way development integrates with its surroundings and the use of appropriate landscaping.
- 26. This requirement is amplified by MDD Policies CC03 *Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping* and TB21 *Landscape Character*, which require proposals to demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment and respond positively to the local landscape context, retaining or enhancing features that contribute to the landscape including topography, natural features hedgerows, trees, watercourses etc. heritage assets, settlement patterns and the network of routes. The Government's National Design Guide: *Planning practice guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places* released in 2019 is also relevant.
- 27. Whilst the proposals are outline in nature (with the exception of access), an illustrative masterplan has been submitted to accompany the application. This proposes the main vehicular access into the site being via a new roundabout located on the A4 (slightly further along to the west from the existing A4 access) together with a secondary access further along the A4 to the east. The existing vehicular access point at the southern end of the site off the Wargrave Road would remain accessible by vehicle to occupiers of the existing dwellings and nursery located off Bridge Farm Road, but it would only provide pedestrian and cycle access into the application site as part of the proposals. The northern end of the existing access off the A4 would be provided as a pedestrian only access to/from the site to the north.
- 28. Within the site, the illustrative layout indicates a number of perimeter blocks of housing which would predominantly be positioned on the east and north sides of the site, with a smaller block positioned where existing agricultural buildings currently exist which are proposed for removal as part of the scheme.
- 29. The blocks would emanate from a central north / south route through the centre of the site, the alignment of which would generally follow the alignment of the existing agricultural track although there would not be vehicular access out of the site at the southern end as currently possible, and as mentioned, this would be limited to providing pedestrian and cycle access only from/to the site to/from the Wargrave Road. As discussed later in the report, parts of the western/southern side of the site are situated within flood zones 2 & 3 and as such, this has influenced the illustrative location of the dwellings, all of which would be located within flood zones 2 & 3 would form parts of the proposed public open space adjacent to the River Loddon. This area is proposed to be designed to be a riverside park, with wetland features and planting

appropriate to its riverside setting, which will also serve to enhance biodiversity. This would not only serve the residents of the development but the wider public also. Adjacent to the riverside park would be a children's NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play) which is located outside of the areas that flood and would be a benefit both to new residents but also the wider community.

- 30. Dwellings forming the perimeter blocks are generally shown to be oriented so that they would address and provide frontages to the streets, and would face out towards the boundaries of the site, which is considered appropriate as it offers protection from encroachment into existing hedgerow/tree buffers. Providing a suitable buffer between the built form and the boundaries allows space for the provision of an attractive soft edge to the development which is considered appropriate in this location. The exception to this would be on the eastern side of the site, where the dwellings would be oriented away from the railway line with back gardens facing towards the railway line. Consideration regarding the relationship between the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings and the trees which line the railway route will need to be given at the reserved matters stage, to ensure the root protection areas (RPAs) of these would be protected. Condition 20 would also require details of tree protection measures throughout the construction process.
- 31. Whilst a response has not been received on this application from the Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) they are generally supportive of dwelling arrangements which incorporate a block structure with back-to-back gardens, and a building orientation that supports natural surveillance over the public realm. Whilst this is an outline application, careful consideration at the reserved matters stage would need to be given to corner plots and all corner plot dwellings should be shown to benefit from a dual aspect or two active frontages. The CPDA would be consulted again as part of any subsequent reserved matters proposals, and the detailed layout proposed at that stage would need to demonstrate how the design of the development has taken into account principles of Secured by Design (condition 51).

# <u>Scale</u>

- 32. The application is accompanied by an illustrative Storey Heights Plan which originally indicated that the site would predominantly provide 2 storey dwellings, with some 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  and 3 storey buildings in a few locations on the site, such as on the main north/south street through the site, along with 3 storey apartment buildings shown being located at the entrance to the site off the A4. However, given the location of the site outside of the settlement boundary and in the countryside, it is considered that will come forward on the site, particularly where these would be highly visible from views along the A4. Due regard will need to be paid to the prevailing urban form and character of the wider area. As such, the illustrative storey heights plan has been amended and now indicates that the majority of the dwellings across the site would be up to 2 storeys in height, with some locations providing up to 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  storeys.
- 33. It is, however, noted that this would not necessarily preclude some 3 storey elements on the site being proposed as part of the reserved matters application, as it is acknowledged that the wider area is not wholly devoid of three storey development. However, any potential locations within the site where three storey elements might be proposed would need further scrutiny at the reserved matters stage once the detailed design for the dwellings and the site as a whole has been worked up in further

detail to ensure that the overall development would not appear out of scale or character with the wider area.

#### Appearance

- 34. Whilst the detailed design of the proposed dwellings would form part of the subsequent reserved matters application, reference to the character of the local area is made within the submitted Design and Access statement, which in turn references the Council's Design guide which includes reference to some of the prevailing architectural style and characteristics of the built form within Twyford. The Design and Access statement also makes reference to the provision of different character areas within the site, and in order to ensure that this is worked up into detail and carried through to the design brought forward at the reserved matters stage, condition 10 requires the submission of a Design Code to be submitted to the Council for approval prior to the submission of the principles for development in each of the character areas and street typologies demonstrating a comprehensive approach that will deliver a cohesive and high-quality development with distinct character areas within it.
- 35. The subsequent reserved matters submission would therefore need to demonstrate how the design principles within the approved design code have been carried through to the proposed design and appearance of the dwellings, and how the development would be compatible with and complimentary to the character of the local area. In order to ensure the materials proposed to be used are acceptable, further details and samples would be required to be submitted to the Council for approval (condition 11).

#### Affordable Housing, Dwelling Mix and Standard of Accommodation

- 36. MDD policy TB05 (Housing Mix) requires that residential development should provide an appropriate density and mix of accommodation reflecting the character of the area. assessed on a site-by-site basis and reflecting the Council's Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD. The MDD LP and Affordable Housing SPD suggest a guide mix, to be considered in conjunction with the latest information from the Housing Register. Core Strategy Policy CP5 requires that development outside the SDLs should secure 40% affordable housing. In this instance, the 40% affordable housing policy requirement would be wholly met on-site. This is considered to be a significant benefit of the proposals that should be afforded great weight in the planning balance.
- 37. A written Ministerial Statement published on 24 May 2021 introduced 'First Homes', which is a form of discounted market sale housing, and is considered to meet the definition of 'affordable housing' for planning purposes. These 'First Homes' are the government's preferred discounted market tenure and should account for at least 25% of all affordable housing units. As such, and in line with advice provided from WBC Housing officers, the proposed tenure mix for the affordable dwellings on the site would therefore be as follows:

	Social Rent	First Homes	Shared Ownership	Total
Mix (quantum)	56	20	4	80
Mix (%)	70%	25%	5%	100%

In consultation with WBC Housing officers, the requested affordable housing dwelling type split would be as follows:

- $\circ$  20% one bedroom flats 16 units.
- $\circ$  15% two bedroom maisonettes or houses 12 units.
- $\circ$  30% two bedroom houses 24 units.
- 20% three bedroom houses 16 units.
- 15% four bedroom houses 12 units.
- 38. The WBC Housing team requested that no two-bedroom flats are provided on this site as the Registered Providers (RPs) are reporting issues with low demand for two-bedroom flats in the borough, particularly with people seeking more space (inside and outside) as a result of the pandemic. As such, two-bedroom maisonettes or houses are considered acceptable instead.
- 39. The above mix/split of affordable housing has been agreed in consultation with WBC's housing team to ensure the proposals will ensure the delivery of mixed and balanced communities in accordance with policy CP5. The provision and delivery of the affordable housing element of the scheme would be secured through the accompanying S106 agreement. The locations of the affordable dwellings across the site would be determined at the reserved matters stage.

#### Market Dwelling mix

40. The Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) (2020), which formed part of Council's evidence base for the emerging Local Plan Update, provides the most up-to-date information/guidance on market housing mix. Figure 42 below provides a guide to the potential size and tenure mix of dwellings based upon past trends of the sizes of dwellings occupied by different household types across the borough:

	Affordable Housing	Market Housing	All Dwellings
1 bedroom	20-25%	5-10%	10%
2 bedrooms	45-50%	5-10%	10%
3 bedrooms	20-25%	40-50%	45%
4+ bedrooms	5-10%	35-40%	35%

Figure 42: Potential Size and Tenure Mix (Source: ORS Housing Model. Note: Figures may not sum due to rounding)

41. Whilst this is an outline application, the market housing mix would be considered and approved as part of the subsequent reserved matters proposals. Notwithstanding this, the accompanying planning statement advises that the intention is to broadly follow the suggested market housing split as cited within the above referenced LHNA 2020. The exact mix would therefore be determined at the reserved matters stage paying due regard to relevant policies concerning housing mix and need. All of the dwellings will be required to meet or exceed the minimum size standards set out in the National Space Standards. However, as the housing element of the proposal is outline in nature, this will need to be demonstrated at the detailed reserved matters stage. The Borough Design Guide separation distances and minimum garden depth of 11m will also need to be demonstrated through the detailed plans submitted for reserved matters approval.

42. Conditions 5 & 6 are recommended which remove permitted development rights of the properties. This is to ensure that any future proposals to extend or alter the properties, including into the garden spaces, can be assessed through the submission of a planning application. This will help to restrict unacceptable encroachment into these important garden spaces which might otherwise benefit from permitted development rights. The reserved matters proposals will therefore need to demonstrate a good mix, balance and quality of dwelling types and sizes so that a range of housing needs can be met. This will ensure that the development is sustainable in meeting the housing needs of the community.

## Neighbouring Residential Amenity

- 43. Core Strategy policy CP3 requires that new development should be of a high quality of design that does not cause detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users. Separation standards for new residential development are set out in section 4.7 of the Borough Design Guide.
- 44. The illustrative masterplan submitted with the application demonstrates that all dwellings on the site are capable of meeting all separation distances of the standards set by WBC's Borough Design Guide, however, this will need to be detailed and assessed in full at the reserved matters stage, including addressing the discrepancy noted in respect of properties located off Wargrave that are not indicated on the base OS plan.

## Trees, Landscaping and Open Space

- 45. Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3 require a high quality design that respects its context. This requirement is amplified by MDDLP Policies CC03 and TB21 which require development proposals to protect and enhance the Borough's Green Infrastructure, retaining existing trees, hedges and other landscape features wherever possible and incorporating high quality ideally native planting as an integral part of any scheme, within the context of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment. Policy CC02 states that planning permission for proposals at the edge of settlements will only be granted where they can demonstrate that the development, including boundary treatments respects the transition between the built-up area and the open countryside by taking account of the character of the adjacent countryside and landscape.
- 46. The site represents a landscape gap between the settlement areas of Twyford and Charvil, located within the influence of the 'Old River' floodplain. The Landscape Character Assessment should be used to determine the sensitivity of the landscape context of this site. The site is located in Landscape Character Area B1 'Loddon River Valley with Open Water', the landscape strategy of which is to '*Protect the individual identity of settlements by conserving the rural character of the landscape between adjacent towns and village centres and avoiding amalgamation of these settlements'*
- 47. Core Strategy policy CP11 criteria 2 states that proposals should not lead to 'excessive encroachment' within the countryside and policy TB21 of the MDD requires that proposals shall retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape. Notwithstanding that Policy CP11 is considered out of date, its overall aim is to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain

the quality of the environment. In this regard, the site is well contained by the River Loddon to the west and the A4 to the north, with the development limits lying to the south and east. It is therefore considered that the proposals in this instance would not compromise the separate identity of settlements.

- 48. However, it is inevitable that development proposals in a currently undeveloped site will result in some harm to the existing landscape. A report on Landscape and Visual Matters accompanies the application and has assessed the visual impact of the development from key visual receptors and from a variety of different representative viewpoints. The impact is also assessed in terms of the initial construction and once the development is complete and operational. The report provides a description of the baseline landscape condition and a visual appraisal of the site and surrounding landscape. WBC Trees and Landscaping officer considers the report provides a clear and fair assessment of the development proposals and its possible effects on landscape character and features and the identified viewpoints, and overall, agrees with the findings of the report. A summary of the findings is that the proposed development will have a moderate to slight effect on the landscape elements and character reducing to slight adverse after 15 years post completion. Consideration has been given to the site's close proximity to the Loddon Valley and its special landscape qualities and WBC Trees and Landscaping officer considers this has been addressed through the site layout which proposes to retain an area of undeveloped land adjacent to the River Loddon to provide a landscape buffer.
- 49. With regards to views, the main effects from the development will be in views from the A4 Bath Road north of the site, where the proposed changes which include a new access into the site via a new roundabout, will be the most significant. The new development including access arrangements and the associated vegetation clearance will have some significant adverse effects during the initial construction period. However, such effects would be reduced post completion for all users through the implementation of the landscaping mitigation proposals. Other views to the site from the south, east and west are considered relatively well contained by existing vegetation and/or the existing development on the edges of Twyford.
- 50. As part of the scheme development, a landscape strategy has been incorporated which will help mitigate the impacts and effects of the proposed development within the wider landscape and the aims of the landscape design proposals are given in the Landscape Report and illustrated on the Landscape Strategy Plan. In summary these consist of the following measures:
- Retaining and enhancing the existing trees and hedgerows adjoining the site and adjacent to Muddlers Lane.
- Providing a new landscape buffer on the northern boundary adjacent to the A4 Bath Road.
- Introduction of more informal squares and greens though the development following the alignment of the proposed central main street which will include SuDS elements and new tree planting.
- Provision of a large open and landscaped area within the western and southern part of the site adjacent to the River Loddon.
- Provision of an open space in the south-eastern corner of the site as a continuation of the western space.
- Landscape provision to front gardens and adjoining access roads.

- 51. Further details on the landscape provision would need to be provided as part of any reserved matters application, and WBC Trees and Landscaping officer provides a number of comments relating to the illustrative masterplan that will be expected to be addressed in detail at the reserved matters stage. In summary, these relate to the following:
- Street tree planting will need to be an integral part of the scheme;
- Visitor parking spaces should be loacted within the development itself rather than on the edges of the site;
- Dwellings backing onto the eastern boundary of the site will need to allow sufficient space within the rear garden for the retention of the existing trees and tree groups shown to be retained;
- Space will need to be made to allow for appropriate strategic new planting between the access road and new dwellings on the eastern side of the road to provide appropriate defensible private space to the fronts of the dwelling and street tree planting as discussed as part of point 1 above;
- The landscape scheme will need to include planting on the new roundabout;
- The RM submission will need to demonstrate how the SuDs features will be incorporated into the surface water sewer;
- The scheme will also need to consider whether it is possible to provide direct pedestrian links and connections to the Country Parks to the west and south -west of the site, rather than having to walk along the A4 join the public right of way.

#### Arboricultural Report

- 52. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) accompanies the application. As previously mentioned the majority of trees within the site are mainly found on the site boundaries and therefore can be retained as part of the development proposals as the substantial area of proposed development would be located within the two existing open fields. There are a number of Category A trees identified, the majority of which are growing on the western boundary adjacent to the River Loddon. The most significant Category A tree T38, is a veteran hybrid Black Poplar growing on the southern boundary of the site and this would be retained as part of the proposed open space. Condition 21 would require the submission of an Aged and Veteran Tree strategy to ensure its continued protection.
- 53. The development proposals would result in some tree removals along the northern boundary adjacent to the A4 Bath Road in order to accommodate the main access into the site and a smaller secondary access. These would include a mix of two Category B and two Category C trees and one tree group and a partial tree group (Category C). However, notwithstanding this, a submitted 'Tree Retention and Removal Plan' identifies that the existing trees, (with the exception of those identified above), can be retained in principle as part of the proposed illustrative site layout. In addition to this, a significant number of new trees (circa. 350) would be planted to provide an attractive landscape setting for the development. As mentioned earlier, such tree planting would include street trees, along with planting within areas of open space, including an orchard in the southeastern corner of the site.
- 54. Therefore, whilst WBC Trees and Landscaping officer identified a few areas to address in relation to the proposed layout of the development as well as possible conflicts with the drainage strategy, subject to these matters being resolved in

conjunction with the future reserved matters for the site (which may require a reduction in the number of dwellings proposed), the proposals are not considered to give rise to any significant adverse impacts in relation to trees and landscaping which would dictate that the application should be refused.

#### Loss of Agricultural Land

- 55. Policy CP1 states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that, amongst other issues, "7) Avoid areas of best and most versatile agricultural *land*". Further, the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should recognise the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land. The site contains best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land which is defined as Grade 1 to Grade 3a. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) identifies the site as containing Grade 1 and Grade 4 agricultural land, based on national mapping. An 'Agricultural Land Classification, Soil Resources and Farming Circumstances' report has been submitted with the application which includes a more detailed, localised survey of the agricultural land quality. This shows that the proposed developable area would comprise Grade 2 (very good quality) and Grade 3a (good quality) as well as 3b.
- 56. Supporting documents put forward the argument that the current agricultural landholding is unviable due to various constraints and its size and therefore the loss of a quantum of BMV agricultural land would not result in unacceptable impacts, particularly when weighed against the perceived benefits. Officers agree with the assessment that the land is less viable for farming practices. Whilst the loss of BMV land that would result from the scheme, would therefore represent a conflict with policy CP1, this therefore needs to be weighed into the overall tilted planning balance. Although limited weight can be attributed to the emerging LP, the fact that the site includes BMV land has not restricted its proposed inclusion for housing allocation within the LPU. It is also noted that Natural England have raised no objection to the proposal on this basis.

#### <u>Minerals</u>

- 57. The application site falls within an area identified as a Mineral Safeguarding Area, due to the presence of mineral resources, notably sand and gravel deposits. Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states that: "It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation." Paragraph 212 clarifies this further by stating: "Local planning authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in Mineral Safeguarding Areas if it might constrain potential future use for mineral working."
- 58. Relevant policies relating to this are set out in the emerging Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (Joint Plan). The independent examination of the Joint Plan has now been completed and the Inspector's report has been received which states that, subject to the main modifications set out in the appendix of the report, the Joint Plan is sound, and it is proposed to be formally adopted by the council in January 2023. The Joint Plan is therefore capable of carrying weight in the decision-making process in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48.

59. Joint Plan Policy M2 – *Safeguarding sand and gravel resources* advises that nonminerals development in the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Area may be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the option of prior extraction has been fully considered as part of an application, and:

a. Prior extraction, where practical and environmentally feasible, is maximised, taking into account site constraints and phasing of development; or

b. It can be demonstrated that the mineral resources will not be permanently sterilised; or

c. It would be inappropriate to extract mineral resources in that location, with regard to other policies in the wider Local Plans.

- 60. The Joint Plan acknowledges that despite new site allocations, there is likely to be a shortfall in mineral supply during the plan period, as the aggregate industry has not identified sufficient sites to fill the shortfall. Wider sources of aggregate will therefore form an important component of supply over the plan period.
- 61. Whilst the application site is not included within the list of Joint Plan site allocations, the policy response to address the shortfall is the identification of an 'Area of Search' to demonstrate the potential for, in effect, windfall provision within the plan area. The application site lies within the Area of Search and accordingly Policy M4(3) provides qualified support for extraction of sand and gravel.
- 62. With regards to the consideration of prior extraction as referenced within Policy M2 above, the applicant submitted a Preliminary Minerals Resource Assessment which concluded that the site would be unlikely to provide a viable extraction site. The applicant was subsequently requested to provide further evidence to this effect to support their position, including details of contact made with local industry operators to understand what commercial interest the site may have for extraction. In undertaking this exercise, the applicant's consultant contacted 4 commercial operators who are active in the local area and sought a view as to whether the site would be of interest to them as an extraction site. Responses from two industry operators (CEMEX and Summerleaze Ltd) were received and expressed that there would be qualified interest in taking any extracted mineral from the site to their processing sites elsewhere. However, the response from Summerleaze expanded further on this and advised that....

"The site looks to be too small to be of interest to a mineral operator, the volume of possible mineral against the volume of overburden is not in its favour and the costs of infrastructure would be very high....If it were to be made available with the infrastructure in, planning approved and a settled way to reinstate the land by way of EA permit then we would be interested in taking the aggregate to our Bray site for processing."

63. The above responses received would lead to suggest that whilst there could be interest in taking any raised aggregate from the site, this would be on the basis of the infrastructure already being in place on site to enable this. This would be the subject of an entirely separate planning process, one which could take up to 10 years from the application submission to site restoration following the extraction of the minerals. This would, in turn affect the deliverability of the site and its contribution to the housing land supply. The fact that the council is currently unable to demonstrate a deliverable housing land supply in excess of 5 years, as required by national policy, is considered

to be an important material consideration to be weighed in the planning balance around pursuing extraction.

- 64. Notwithstanding the above, there are other factors relating to this issue with this application site which also need to be weighed in the planning balance. A further factor is the potential impact extraction and processing of minerals could have upon surrounding neighbouring amenities.
- 65. In this respect, Policy DM9 of the Joint Plan is relevant and relates to the protection of health, safety and amenity. In the supporting text to the policy, it acknowledges that "the screening of sites and delivery of mitigation measures are often required to ensure the potential impact of minerals and waste developments on the habitats, landscape, townscape and local communities is kept to acceptable levels. It is recommended practice for operational mineral extraction and inert waste recycling sites to have a minimum buffer zone of 100 metres, where appropriate, from the nearest sensitive human receptors, such as homes and schools, though this distance will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis".
- 66. The applicant has provided a buffer zone plan which plots the extent of a 100m buffer zone from the nearest sensitive receptors, these being existing dwellings located adjacent to the site. This plan demonstrates that with the provision of a 100m buffer this would significantly reduce the "winnable area" of land for mineral extraction, and should the possibility of mineral extraction on this site be pursued, the extent of land available once a 100m buffer zone from the nearest sensitive receptors is taken into account, this would result in only 3 small areas on the site which would not fall within the buffer zones totalling an approximate area of 1.08ha. The "winnable area" would fall below the minimum plot size of 3ha identified in the emerging Joint Plan where prior extraction is considered to be economical.
- 67. Taking into account buffer zones, the remaining area where prior extraction could occur can reasonably be concluded to be unviable. This issue on its own merits is therefore considered sufficient to conclude that the site does not provide realistic prospects for the prior extraction of minerals on site due to the overriding need to protect surrounding existing residential amenities. There are other environmental sensitivities including the presence of the River Loddon which would require obtaining appropriate permits from the Environment Agency as well as the proximity of the adjacent railway line, whereby measures would need ensure that any extraction process on site would not impact upon the railway embankment. Moreover extraction would impact the local area in terms of noise, air quality and traffic generation from HGV's for a sustained period. As such, this form development would not be considered appropriate in terms of its impacts on the local area.
- 68. Notwithstanding the above, the supporting text to Policy M2 states that it is expected that, as a minimum requirement, incidental recovery of sand and gravel as part of a non-mineral development will take place. Incidental extraction is the most straightforward way to ensure any mineral recovered as part of the normal construction/excavation is put to good use. It can be factored into the overall site design layout (which is reserved until a future time), through drainage or landscaping strategies. As such, should planning permission be forthcoming for the development proposed, clauses are recommended within the proposed construction management plan condition in relation to i) a method for ensuring that minerals that can be viably recovered during the development operations are recovered and put to beneficial

use; and ii) a method to record the quantity of recovered mineral (re-use on-site or off-site) and to report this data to the LPA upon completion of the development (condition 7 refers).

69. Taking the above considerations into account, pursuing the possibility of prior extraction on the application site is not considered to be warranted or the best use of the site in this instance. The requirement for incidental extraction to occur as part of the construction process is considered a reasonable measure to ensure that the site is not unnecessarily wholly sterilised, should the non-mineral development proposals be granted permission.

#### Open Space and Green Infrastructure

- 70. Policy TB08 of the MDD DPD lays out the required standards for development in terms of Public Open Space (POS) provision. Whilst outline in nature, an open space plan accompanies the application which illustrates how the proposals would provide for the on-site provision of the typologies of open space required by Policy TB08. This would comprise a variety of open spaces amounting to approximately 6ha of open space within the site including a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) children's play area. These areas would be further detailed at the reserved matters stage and will be transferred to the Council for their ongoing maintenance once completed. As such, the provision, delivery and maintenance cost requirements of the on-site open space will be secured through the S106.
- 71. Contributions in lieu of on-site allotment and sports facilities will be secured through the S106 and are reflected in the Heads of Terms. The cost of provision of these will be secured via CIL.

#### Ecology and Biodiversity

- 72. Core Strategy Policy CP7, carried forward by MDD LP Policy TB23, requires appropriate protection of species and habitats of conservation value. Design Principle 1b (i-ii) is concerned with protection of ecological habitat and biodiversity features, together with mitigation of any impacts that do arise. An ecological appraisal accompanies the application and has been updated since the application was submitted in order to address initial comments made by WBC ecologist. The application site does not include any statutory or non-statutory ecological designations but does, however, have ecological sensitivities including the presence of the River Loddon on the western boundary and a number of trees/hedges which are of ecological importance. Land to the west of the site boundary falls within a Habitat Priority Area, and is also within the Loddon Valley Gravel Pits Berkshire Biodiversity Opportunity Area. The Loddon Nature Reserve (Local Wildlife Site) is located approximately 300m to the south of the site, accessed from the A3032. The ecological baseline status of the site and wider area was established through desk and field survey.
- 73. The habitats within the site support, or have potential to support, several protected species, including species protected under the provisions of the relevant legislation. Accordingly, a number of recommendations and measures are set out in regard to these species, with suitable mitigation strategies and compensatory measures identified, which would minimise the risk of harm to protected species, whilst enabling the conservation status of local populations to be maintained (and enhanced) as a

result of the proposals. As such, conditions 23 and 24 relating to ecological permeability, species specific enhancements including a minimum of 100 bat and bird boxes are recommended by WBC ecologist to ensure that mitigation measures as proposed within the submitted Ecological Appraisal are implemented.

74. Condition 7 relating to the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan includes a requirement in relation to ecological protection matters during the construction phase.

## Net gain for biodiversity

- 75. The NPPF para 170 (d) requires development to minimise impacts upon and provide net gains for biodiversity and para 180 advises that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided or mitigated, then planning permission should be refused. A Technical Briefing Note: Biodiversity Net Gain and a full Defra metric 3.0 spreadsheet has been submitted in order to consider the habitat changes proposed on site and whether these will lead to a biodiversity net gain.
- 76. This has been reviewed by WBC Ecologist who advises that the local planning authority can be confident that the proposed development will result in a greater than 10% uplift in biodiversity net gain, provided the detailed landscaping to match the proposals and the mechanism by which ongoing management to retain the proposed habitat changes are secured. The Environment Agency's response also comments on matters around biodiversity and considers that the proposals have an opportunity to incorporate the River Loddon into the development in a more beneficial way than originally indicated. They note that the river is recognised as an important local feature through its local wildlife site designation and opening up this previously unused section of river to the public will likely bring some adverse impacts through additional noise, disturbance, dogs and litter. Therefore, to ensure this section of the river is protected and enhanced for the benefit of local wildlife, the river element should be included within the net gain metric calculations and the detailed landscape proposals should ensure a balance between the wellbeing benefits of public access to nature, with ecological protection and enhancement. It is noted that an updated net gain metric calculation was subsequently submitted, however as the landscaping details are in outline at this stage, this will need to be re-calculated in any event in conjunction with the detailed landscape proposals that come forward.
- 77. In this regard, condition 16 includes securing a reassessment of biodiversity net gain alongside the detailed landscaping, and an off-site provision would be secured through S106 agreement as a contingency in the event of a shortfall. The S106 open space maintenance sums will also include provision for the ongoing management of these habitats.
- 78. Enhancements such as creation of a backwater for juvenile fish and introducing gravel and large woody debris is something the EA advised they would support. Condition 17 is also recommended to secure the submission and agreement of a Landscape Environmental Management Plan for all areas of public open space.

# Transport, Highways and Parking

79. The NPPF seeks to encourage sustainable means of transport and a move away from the reliance of the private motor car. Core Strategy policies CP1, CP4, CP6 and

CP10 broadly echo these principles and indicate that new residential development should mitigate any adverse effects on the existing highway network.

- 80. The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been amended within the application process to respond to comments from WBC Highways. This concludes that the impact of the development would not be severe and would not result in adverse impacts on the operation and safety of the local highway network. Many of the consultation responses have raised concerns in relation to the traffic impacts upon the free flow of traffic along the A4, as well as in Charvil and the centre of Twyford. However, the assessment within the submitted TA has been undertaken using the approved WBC traffic modelling WSTM4 trip rates, which has been reviewed by WBC Highways who are satisfied that the traffic generation associated with the proposals would not result in significant adverse impacts upon the surrounding highway network. Other comments refer to the time at which the road traffic surveys were undertaken and that these were not representative of the usual traffic flows. In this regard, WBC Highways advise that the traffic flow data was growthed to 2022 based on the national TEMPro database (Trip End Model Presentation Program which helps provides forecasts of trips) and was therefore considered to be a sound assessment.
- 81. As part of the modelling undertaken in conjunction with the TA, the following junctions were assessed:
  - Proposed Site access roundabout;
  - Proposed secondary site access;
  - Wargrave Road Roundabout;
  - London Road/Shepherds Hill Junction Westbound;
  - A4 Westbound approach to Charvil A4 / A3032 roundabout;
  - A4 / Sonning Lane;
  - A4 / Pound Lane Roundabout; and
  - Wargrave Road / London Road / Church St / High Street signal junction.
- 82. WBC highways have reviewed all of the above junction modelling details and are satisfied that no mitigation in the form of upgrades to existing junctions would be required as a result of the traffic generated by the development.
- 83. In conjunction with the proposal to provide a new roundabout at the main access into the site, the speed limit along the A4 New Bath Road from a point on the east edge of Charvil to the Wargrave roundabout would be reduced from 60 to 40mph. As such, a contribution for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be secured through the accompanying S106 and this is therefore reflected in the S106 Heads of Terms. The proposals also initially sought to include a reduction in the speed limit along the A321 Wargrave Road in front of the Piggott secondary school. However, due to speed data collected in relation to this, it was considered unlikely that such an application to reduce the speed limit in this location would be successful. As such, it is agreed that the developer will fund the provision of speed reduction signs in the vicinity of the school. This would be secured through the accompanying s106 and is also reflected in the s106 Heads of terms. It should be noted that the new roundabout junction is designed only to accommodate this development and not development to the north of the A4. Any proposal would need to undertake their own assessment and design.

Public Transport & Travel Planning

- 84. In order to encourage use of non-car travel modes, a contribution is being sought towards local bus service improvements. Whilst the nearest bus stop to the site is located on the north side of the A4, close to the proposed secondary access and is served by an eastbound service, this only runs once daily. The nearest westbound services travel towards Reading along Old Bath Road. There are however a number of frequent bus services which run from Twyford train station which is within walking distance of the site. The proposed site access design also includes an area safeguarded for a potential future bus stop on the westbound carriageway.
- 85. A contribution would also be secured through the associated S106 agreement for the Council's 'My Journey' initiative. Such contributions are necessary to help encourage the use of alternative modes of transport other than by private car. As referred to later in the report, the 'My Journey' initiative also plays an important role in respect of seeking to reduce air pollution in the borough by promoting and encouraging alternative means of travel, other than by private car.
- 86. Table 3.1 below is included within the applicant's TA and Travel Plan and sets out both the walking and cycling times from the site to a number of the surrounding local facilities and services in the area. These are all considered to be located within broadly acceptable walking distances and indicates the range of facilities that the site would have access to.

Facility	Distance (meters)	Walking Time (minutes)	Cycle Time (minutes)	
Cedar Park Day Nursery & Pre School	170	02:00	00:30	
King George V Rec. Ground	650	07:45	02:00	
Newdays Pharmacy	750	09:00	02:20	
M&S Simply Food	750	09:00	02:20	
Twyford Library	800	09:30	02:30	
Loddon Hall	800	09:30	02:30	
Tesco Express	850	10:05	02:40	
Waitrose Twyford	900	10:40	02:50	
Polehampton Infant School	1,000	12:00	03:05	
Piggot C of E School	1,000	12:00	03:05	
Twyford Surgery	1,100	13:05	03:20	
Twyford Train Station	1,100	13:05	03:20	
Fields Pharmacy	1,200	14:20	03:45	
Polehampton C of E Junior School	1,200	14:20	03:45	
Charvil Stores & Post Office	1,500	17:50	04:30	
Walk speed 1.4m/s (Guidelines for Journeys on Foot The Institute of Highways & Transportation				
Cycle speed 5.5m/s Cycle Infrastructure Design LTN 1/20				

#### Table 3.1 Local Facilities

87. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location whereby occupants would have ease of access to the local services and facilities within the centre of Twyford, all of which would be accessible safely by foot. The proximity of Twyford train station to the site is considered to be a significant benefit of the proposals, particularly given the number of train services which operate from the station, including frequent services into London and Reading. Some of the consultation objections commented that there is insufficient parking available at the station. However, as the site is considered to be within acceptable walking distance from the station, bringing sites forward such as the application site are preferred over those which may be more remote, and would therefore place more reliance on private car travel.

# Illustrative Layout

- 88. As already mentioned, the main vehicular access into the development would be from a new roundabout junction located on the A4 New Bath Road at the north western side of the site, with a secondary access located further along the A4 to the east. These have been the subject of a Stage one safety audit, and details for these have also been reviewed as part of the application and considered acceptable. However full highways details of the accesses including further Road Safety Audits would be provided through conditions submissions (condition 14). There is not currently a pavement on the southern side of the A4, and as such, a 3m wide ped/cycle path is proposed to link the site with the location of the signalised 'Toucan' pedestrian crossing, in order to safely connect the site for pedestrians and cyclists with the ped/cycle path on the north side of the A4 which would also be the walking/cycling route from the site to the Piggott School.
- 89. The proposed illustrative layout is considered acceptable in highways terms, both for vehicles, but also for pedestrians and cyclists alike. It is proposed that the site will be designed to Manual for Streets (MfS) guidance, which is welcomed, however the design will also have to meet with the Borough's Highway Design Guidance. It is currently proposed that the main highway routes through the site would be put up for adoption by the Council. This will be secured through the S106 agreement.
- 90. The development will provide good permeability within and from/to the site by walking and cycling. However, a condition is recommended which would provide details of all walking/cycling routes connecting the site with the wider area. As mentioned whilst these have been indicated at the application submission stage in respect of connecting the development with the A4 ped/cycle path to the north of the site, further analysis of any potential improvements from the southern access of the site to the local facilities i.e. such as the infant and junior schools, bus stops and health and other local facilities. As such, condition 31 requires the submission of a walking and cycling strategy to be submitted which will need to demonstrate how the development would provide for safe connections to the wider locality.
- 91. Further detailed highways matters will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage and through conditions submissions recommended. This will include car & cycle parking, highway widths and alignments, tracking for refuse and emergency vehicles, service margins and other related highways layout details.

# Parking and Cycle Parking

92. In line with Core Strategy Policy CP6 and MDD Policy CC07, and the Council's standards, as currently set out in MDDLP Appendix 2, the reserved matters will need to demonstrate that the development will incorporate parking and cycle parking in line with the Council's standards. Notwithstanding that this is an application for outline planning permission, details have been submitted which indicate that the illustrative

layout could accommodate the parking requirements of the illustrative housing mix in line with policy. This will need to be further demonstrated and detailed further at the reserved matters stage to reflect the final proposed mix, and addressing comments made by WBC Trees and Landscaping officer with regards to the location of some of the visitor parking bays on the site.

# Electric Vehicle Charging

93. It is proposed that the level of EVC charging points will be in alignment with the standards for 2026 as a minimum which is welcomed. This would be at a rate of 20% active and 50% passive (on plot parking) and 10% active and 40% passive (off plot) across the site which is over and above our current guidelines. This will be reviewed and amended to be in alignment with the local and national standards that are in operation at the time of the reserved matters application is submitted. Such provision would be secured by Condition 35.

# Flooding and Drainage

- 94. The NPPF and its supporting Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on '*Flood Risk and Coastal Change*' provide guidance on how flood risk should be considered within the planning application process and encourages the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). The NPPF also requires applications to be subject to a Sequential Test, to guide development to areas at the lowest risk of flooding.
- 95. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CP1 'Sustainable development' and MDDLP Policies CC09 'Development and flood risk' and CC10 'Sustainable drainage' are relevant and establish that new development should avoid increasing and where possible reduce flood risk (from all\_sources) by first developing in areas with lowest flood risk, carrying out a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) where required, and managing surface water in a sustainable manner. Applications are also required to demonstrate how they have used the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to determine the suitability of the proposal.
- 96. In accordance with the above policies, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which references WBC's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) which was published in 2020. The site has been assessed as part of the Sequential Test undertaken as part of the SFRA.
- 97. As mentioned, River Loddon bounds the western boundary of the site and is classified as 'Main River' managed by the Environment Agency. The river flows northwards and its confluence with River Thames is approximately 1.9km north of the site. River Loddon merges with Twyford Brook approximately 400m south of the Site.
- 98. The accompanying FRA identifies that at present the majority of surface water on the site either drains via natural infiltration into the ground or south-westwards following natural topography eventually discharging to the River Loddon which bounds the western boundary. The northeast part of the site is flat or drains towards the eastern boundary.
- 99. Most of the application site falls within Flood Zone 1 where the risk of flooding is low. However, parts of the site are located within flood zones 2 & 3, these areas being located in proximity to the route of the River Loddon located on the west side of the

site and a further area at the southern end of the site. Areas adjacent to the river have been subject to flooding in the past, and concerns relating to this have been raised within a significant number of the consultation responses on the application, both in terms of the application site itself, but also with regards to impacts of the proposed development upon flooding elsewhere in the locality.

- 100. The River Loddon has historically been subjected to numerous flood events. Since the autumn of 2000, the SFRA records 7no major flood events for the River Loddon including the winter floods of 2013/2014 which recorded the highest water level on record, whilst the Environment Agency's historic flood map records the greatest recorded flood extent in 2002.
- 101. The Environment Agency maintains monitoring stations along the River Loddon to record and monitor water levels used to inform the UK Governments Flood Information and Warning Service. The nearest monitoring station to the site is the Twyford Monitoring Station located approximately 500m downstream. Key information relating to the gauging station is contained within the UK River Levels database which identifies that the usual range of the River Loddon at Twyford is between 0.50m and 2.26m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
- 102. The highest level ever recorded at the River Loddon at Twyford is 3.43m, AOD which was reached on 9th February 2014. The rainfall during winter 2019/2020 also caused severe flooding across the country, and a peak water level of 3.10m above gauge datum was recorded at the Twyford Monitoring Station during this time. Consultants undertaking the flood risk assessment for the application were on site during this time and photographs showing the extent of flooding on the site have been included within the FRA.
- 103. However, highest recorded flood events are lower than the modelled 1 in 1000year flood extent which has been used to determine the developable area of the site. The FRA confirms that all properties within the site will be located outside of the 1 in 1000-year plus climate change flood extent which is as shown on the submitted illustrative masterplan and illustrative land use plan, and all finished floor levels will be set 300mm above the maximum modelled flood level of 35.53m AOD.
- 104. The Environment Agency's response on the application notes that the application has applied the sequential approach to development with the indicative layout confirming that all proposed development can be delivered within Flood Zone 1. They therefore raise no objection to the proposals as they consider that the application does not present an increase in the risk of flooding on site or in the surrounding area. They note, however, that the land shown to be a risk of flooding should be safeguarded and no built development or ground level raising should take place in the designated areas. They therefore request condition 25 to be included which requires the development to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted FRA; for all finished floor levels to be set no lower than 35.83 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and for no development or ground level raising to take place within the 1% annual probability flood extent with a 35% allowance for climate change as shown in Appendix J of the FRA.
- 105. It is noted that since the submission of the application, the PPG note on flood risk sets out an updated methodology for modelling the extent of flood zones including an allowance for climate change. The applicant has submitted a technical note which

concludes that when applying the updated PPG note method for flood modelling, the site flood zone boundaries would be slightly reduced as a result. This document was sent to the Environment Agency for information. They responded to advise that if the applicant wished to amend their proposal on this basis then this would need to be formally assessed. However, the applicant has not proposed to amend their proposals on this basis, and the originally modelled flood zone extents, including allowing for climate change will remain as originally indicated which is welcomed. As such despite concerns being raised relating to on and off site flooding from the development, the development is considered to meet the current standards.

### Surface Water Drainage Strategy

106. In terms of the proposed surface water drainage strategy for the site, Policy CC10 - '*Sustainable drainage*' is relevant, stating:

All development proposals must ensure surface water arising from the proposed development, including considering climate change, is managed in a sustainable manner. This must be demonstrated through:

- a) A Flood Risk Assessment, or
- b) Through a Surface Water Drainage Strategy.
- All development proposals must

a) Reproduce greenfield runoff characteristics and return run-off rates and volumes back to the original greenfield levels, for greenfield sites and for brownfield sites both run-off rates and volumes be reduced to as near greenfield as practicably possible.

*b)* Incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), where practicable, which must be of an appropriate design to meet the long term needs of the development and which achieve wider social and environmental benefits

c) Provide clear details of proposed SuDS including the adoption arrangements and how they will be maintained to the satisfaction of the Council [as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)] d) Not cause adverse impacts to the public sewerage network serving the development where discharging surface water to a public sewer.

- 107. It is proposed that surface water run-off will be managed using a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) in line with the CIRIA SuDS manual and would comprise porous paving areas, soakaways, bioretention areas and swales, as well as attenuation in pipelines which would feed into an attenuation basin located on the west side of the site, before being discharged at the greenfield run-off rate. This outline strategy is welcomed and a "SuDS Management Train" process will be implemented to ensure that the proposed drainage strategy mimics the natural catchment of the site as closely as possible. However, further details will be required at the reserved matters stage to clearly demonstrate how these SuDS features will link with the surface water sewer. Such details would be required to be provided under the requirements of condition 26.
- 108. WBCs Flood Risk and Drainage Advisor has reviewed the submitted FRA and drainage strategy details submitted in support of this application for the site and notes the potential risk of groundwater flooding based on infiltration testing results. The FRA advises that appropriate waterproofing will be required to be included in the substructure design and any service trench installations to prevent the ingress of ground water into the pipes through leaking joints. Subject to mitigation measures,

no objection is raised to the application and conditions relating to further detailed surface water drainage information in conjunction with the subsequent reserved matters application will be required and formally agreed under conditions 26, 28 and 29.

#### Environmental Health

109. Core Strategy Policy CP3 – *General Principles for Development* requires that new development should be of a high quality of design that does not cause significant detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users and their quality of life. Various reports have been submitted with the application relating to Environmental Health considerations around noise, contamination and air quality.

#### Noise and Construction

- 110. Core Strategy Policy CP1 *Sustainable Development* seeks to avoid development in areas where noise may impact on the amenity of future occupants and MDD LP Policy CC06 *Noise* reinforces this, requiring proposals to demonstrate how noise impacts on sensitive receptors (both existing and proposed) have been addressed.
- 111. A noise assessment report has been submitted with the application and identifies that the dominant noise source affecting the site is associated with vehicular traffic travelling along the A4 to the north, along with intermittent noise associated with the Henley Branch railway line located to the east of the site.
- 112. The noise assessment modelling is based upon the illustrative layout and identifies those areas of the site where mitigation in the form of higher specification glazing and alternative ventilation would be needed in to achieve required internal ambient noise levels within the site, notably properties closest to the A4 and the railway line. It is noted that noise levels associated with traffic along the A4 is likely to reduce as a result of the proposed reduced speed limit along the site boundary with the A4. Notwithstanding this, as this is an outline application condition 40 is proposed to ensure that the housing layout within the subsequent reserved matters is designed and/or insulated so as to provide attenuation against externally generated noise.
- 113. Noise, disturbance and inconvenience during the construction period will be managed and minimised as far as is reasonable through good practice and through the requirement for the submission (for the Council's approval) of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (cond 7) and through the restriction of the permitted hours of construction activity (cond 9).

#### **Contamination**

- 114. Core Strategy policy CP1 *Sustainable Development* requires development (amongst other factors) to minimise the emission of pollutants, limit any adverse effects on water quality (including ground water) and avoid areas where pollution (including noise) may impact upon the amenity of future residents.
- 115. A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment has been submitted alongside the application and concludes that whilst the soils across the majority of the site are not

expected to be affected by contamination, it does identify some potential sources of contamination (i.e. fuels, metals, pesticides and herbicides, ground gas) and potentially asbestos used in farm barns/sheds building fabrics. As such, detailed Phase 2 intrusive ground investigations are recommended across the site to confirm the presence or absence of these and to identify what remediation may be required. As such, condition 38 is recommended which requires the submission of a detailed investigation and risk assessment to ensure that any potential contamination is identified and remediated in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing by the Council.

# <u>Air Quality</u>

- 116. Core Strategy Policy CP1 *Sustainable Development* establishes that development should minimise the emission of pollutants into the wider environment. A detailed Air Quality assessment has been provided with the application. The assessment considers the potential impact of traffic associated with the proposed development along with the temporary impacts of construction activity. The report concludes that the impact on local air quality will be low and will be well below the Air Quality objectives for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>. The report has been reviewed by WBC Environmental Health Officers who accepts the conclusions, these being that the proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts upon surrounding air quality.
- 117. Local authorities are required to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas, and to determine whether or not, the air quality objectives are likely to be achieved. Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) are declared when there is an exceedance or likely exceedance of an air quality objective. The major source of air quality pollutants in Wokingham Borough is road transport, and the main pollutant of concern is nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). Three Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been declared for exceedances of the Annual Mean NO<sub>2</sub> Objective. These are located in Wokingham Town Centre (declared in 2015), Twyford Village Centre Crossroads (2015) and along, and 60m either side of, the M4 throughout the whole of the borough (declared in 2001, amended in 2004). After declaration, the authority should prepare an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) within 12 months setting out measures it intends to put in place in pursuit of compliance with the objectives. Air Quality Action Plans (AQAP) for Twyford and Wokingham were subsequently published in 2018 and are currently in the implementation stage.
- 118. Whilst the application site itself is not located within the Twyford crossroads AQMA, the southern end of the site is located approximately 0.5km to the northwest of it, and it is acknowledged that traffic from this site will travel through Twyford crossroads. The air quality report therefore includes an air quality dispersion modelling assessment of the potential impact upon air quality in the area, including within the Twyford AQMA.
- 119. The methodology for this modelling exercise is accepted by WBC EHO, the outcomes of which predict that NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations within the Twyford Crossroads AQMA resulting from additional traffic associated with the development would be well below the National Air Quality Objectives (NAQO) levels.
- 120. As already mentioned, local authorities are required to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas and to this end, WBC produces 'Local Air Quality Management Annual Status Reports' (ASR), the most recent of which was published

in June 2022. These report the results of the monitoring of NO<sub>2</sub> levels within the borough to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The 2022 Annual Status Report advises that the monitoring of NO<sub>2</sub> levels in Wokingham have shown a decreasing trend since 2017 and that no diffusion tube sites exceeded the Annual Mean Objective levels. Within the Twyford AQMA specifically, the continuous monitoring recorded an Annual Mean NO<sub>2</sub> level of  $26.0 \mu g/m3$ , which also met the objective. Across the borough as a whole, no diffusion tube results were recorded above  $60 \mu g/m3$  which indicated no exceedances of the 1 hour objective. As such, the ASR advises that no extensions or amendments to the AQMAs are required nor are any new AQMAs needing to be declared.

- 121. The ASR report acknowledges that the past two years have been the only time in the history of air quality monitoring when there has been very limited vehicles in some months on the road network in the Wokingham borough, due to the pandemic. Comparisons of NO<sub>2</sub> pre and post covid has been undertaken which shows that the Twyford Crossroads saw a reduction of NO<sub>2</sub> between 27% and 45% in 2020 compared to 2019. This equated to a 27.96% reduction in NO<sub>2</sub> annual mean concentration relative to 2019 in Twyford. However, when comparing 2021 to 2019 there is still an average reduction of 14.9% in Twyford. However, the AQMA designation cannot be revoked until there has been 3 continuous post covid years of meeting the air quality objectives.
- 122. The report acknowledges that whilst air quality has improved significantly in recent decades and will continue to improve due to national policy decisions (electric vehicles, cleaner engines etc), there are some areas where local action is needed to improve air quality further. Some of the local actions undertaken have included a successful joint application with Bracknell Forest and West Berkshire Councils to the Air Quality Grant Scheme 2020 in securing grant funding of £259,000 for the project of creating an anti-idling campaign, measuring PM2.5 at the schools located near/within the AQMA's and looking at behaviour change of residents. In 2021 an Air Quality Officer was appointed. Some examples of the methods used to help improve air quality were a "Bumper Stickers Competition", where children were asked to create a sticker to put in the rear of a car to remind the people behind to switch off their engines. The Public Protection Partnership (PPP) also started the procurement process for the PM2.5 School monitoring and Behaviour Change Specialists, who were appointed in early 2022.
- 123. During Clean Air Day in 2019, Wokingham Borough erected highway banners in both Wokingham and Twyford to ask drivers to cut their engines and stop idling. These Banners were to be revamped using the DEFRA Grant and the Behaviours Change specialists. There are also several Green Lamp Posts in Twyford, and it is anticipated that the impact will be evaluated in the 2023 ASR.
- 124. An anti-idling competition was also run by MyJourney, along with PPP in 2020 to help children become aware of idling and how it can cause pollution. As the banners were so popular with Schools and the Local Parishes these were continued to be displayed during 2021 outside schools and areas where traffic idling occurs such as the Twyford Railway station. These banners continue to be displayed at the winning schools or outside areas where there is idling.
- 125. Whilst the modelling assessment of the proposals do not indicate that traffic generation associated with the proposed development would result in harmful

impacts upon surrounding air quality, there are other local initiatives being undertaken which will further raise awareness for new residents. In this regard and whilst air quality mitigation measures are not required in this case to mitigate the air quality impacts of the proposals, the applicant has offered a contribution towards local air quality improvement initiatives. This is welcomed and would be secured within the S106. As mentioned within the Highways section of the report, the site is considered to be sustainably located, with good access on foot to local services. As already mentioned, the S106 will also secure a contribution towards the 'My Journey' initiative, to encourage alternative and sustainable travel patterns to and from the site. The provision of Electric Vehicle Charging (EVC) points on the site will also support the rising ownership of electric vehicles, which also assists in the reduction of vehicle related air pollution. The national trend and that of national legislation, is that EV use will increase over the next decade which will improve air quality further.

- 126. With regards to potential impacts upon local air quality during the construction phase, condition 7 requires the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which will contain methodologies and procedures to minimise dust.
- 127. Therefore given that the assessment of the proposals in respect of air quality impacts shows that NO<sub>2</sub> levels, (including within the Twyford Crossroads AQMA) resulting from additional traffic associated with the development would be below the National Air Quality Objectives (NAQO) levels, the proposals in this respect would not give rise to adverse impacts upon surrounding air quality.

# Sustainable Design and Construction

- 128. Core Strategy Policy CP1 requires development to contribute towards the goal of achieving zero carbon development by including on-site renewable energy features and minimising energy and water consumption. This is amplified by MDDLP policies CC04: Sustainable design and construction and CC05: Renewable energy and decentralised energy networks and the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (May 2010). As the proposal is for residential of over 1000sqm, Policy CC05 also advises that planning permission will only be granted for such proposals that deliver a minimum 10% reduction in carbon emissions through renewable energy or low carbon technology.
- 129. An Energy Statement has been submitted in support of the application, which sets out the various renewable and low energy technology measures which could be used in the design of the development in order to reduce energy demand on site, and as such, reduce  $CO_2$  emissions. As the application is outline in nature, details provided within the energy statement are based on calculations using a sample of dwelling types as the final layout/dwelling types would not be agreed until the reserved matters stage. Notwithstanding this, the predicted calculations identified that by adopting a fabric first approach combined with the use of renewable technologies in the form of (PV) solar panels, a 26.1% reduction in  $CO_2$  emissions could be achieved.
- 130. However, whilst the submitted sustainability report sets out various potential measures which could be used to achieve in excess of the policy requirement of a 10% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, it is noted that Building Regulations have been updated since the application was submitted, and the final layout and dwelling

number and designs will not be finalised until the reserved matters stage. As such, condition 41 requires the reserved matters submission to be accompanied by a detailed sustainability and energy efficiency report which will need to factor in the updated Building Regulation requirements to demonstrate compliance with Policy CC05.

131. As referenced earlier in the report, in conjunction with the proposals, a significant number of new trees would also be planted across the site (circa.350), which would also help reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and further contribute towards the Council's Climate emergency commitment response to working towards achieving zero carbon developments.

#### Archaeology and Heritage

- 132. MDD Policy TB25 states that in areas of high archaeological potential, applicants will be required to provide a detailed assessment of the impact on archaeological remains. If development is likely to affect an area of high archaeological potential or an area which is likely to contain archaeological remains, the presumption is that appropriate measures shall be taken to protect remains by preservation in situ. Where this is not practical, applicants shall provide for excavation, recording and archiving of the remains.
- 133. Berkshire Archaeology (BA) were consulted on the application and their response refers to the application documentation submitted in support of the application which includes the results of a pre application archaeological investigation (involving a geophysical survey, evaluation trenching), and a *Desk-Based Assessment* (DBA). Their response advises as follows:-

"The evaluation trenching has demonstrated the existence of both early Neolithic activity and Late Iron Age activity within the red line boundary of the site, in the northwest and southwest parts respectively.

Early Neolithic and Late Iron Age remains have been discovered at the site. Early Neolithic cut features are not common in this region: no other Neolithic features are recorded within a 1 km radius of the site in the Berkshire Archaeology Historic Environment Record. Neolithic evidence in this area is confined to the findspots of three flint axes and a flint scatter. This site is likely to be of regional significance. Similarly, the Late Iron Age features, depending on their full extent and nature, are also likely to be of at least local, and possibly regional significance.

Evaluation trenching has confirmed that much of the site has not previously been built upon. The groundworks required to facilitate the proposed development have the potential to negatively impact previously undisturbed archaeological deposits.

We would therefore recommend that a further scheme of archaeological works is secured by an appropriately worded condition should permission be granted for this development. This is in accordance with Paragraph 205 of the NPPF which states that "*Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.*"

134. As such, and in accordance with the request from Berkshire Archaeology, condition 50 is proposed, requiring a further scheme of archaeological works to be submitted and approved in consultation with BA.

# <u>Heritage</u>

135. Policy TB24 of the MDD sets out that the Borough Council will conserve and seek the enhancement of designated heritage assets in the Borough and their settings. There are no designated or undesignated heritage assets within the site and none are located within such a distance from the site that their setting would be affected by the proposals. The proposals would therefore not have a detrimental impact upon the special interest or setting of any nearby Listed Buildings or designated Heritage Assets.

# Employment Skills Plan

136. Policy TB12 of the Wokingham Borough Council MDD, requires planning applications for all major development (both commercial and residential) in Wokingham Borough to submit an employment skills plan (ESP) with a supporting method statement. However, in this instance, the applicant has elected to pay a contribution in lieu of the provision of an Employment Skills Plan and as such, this would be secured within the S106 agreement and is reflected in the S106 Heads of Terms.

# Community Infrastructure Levy and associated supporting infrastructure

- Concerns have been raised within a significant number of consultation 137. responses around the impact of the proposals upon existing infrastructure and services in the locality such as roads, schools and doctors/dentist surgeries etc. In this regard, the development will be subject to Community Infrastructure Levy payments, which are used to support infrastructure requirements of new developments, the rate for which is currently £365sqm (rising to £500.29 in Jan 2023). The total amount payable would be calculated in full based on the rate applicable following the approval of reserved matters. In relation to the concerns around the existing capacity on the doctor and dentist surgeries, this sits outside the Council's control and remit, and the Buckingham, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (ICT) were consulted on the application. Their response advised that they had noted the potential population numbers for planning purposes and had informed the surgeries closest to the proposed development. They also stated that they continue to liaise with WBC to help meet the increased demand associated with the aggregate impact of housing developments in the Borough. The Integrated Care Board are the responsible body in respect of NHS health facilities in the area, and as such, whilst WBC collect the CIL contributions, the ICT liaise with the Council accordingly in respect of requesting CIL monies towards any identified required improvements.
- 138. As referred to in the Highways section of the report, the assessment of the application proposals with regards to the existing surrounding road infrastructure has concluded that there is capacity to accommodate the travel demands associated with the development without significant adverse impacts or the need for upgrades to any existing junctions in the local area. The location of the site within Twyford is considered to be such that occupants living within the development will be able to

access a range of day-to-day services and facilities within the village centre, without the need to travel by car.

- 139. The applicant will also pay a contribution towards the Council's 'My Journey' initiative which will provide further information to new residents around travel planning and encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. The proximity of the site with Twyford train station is considered a significant benefit in respect of encouraging the use of alternative transport modes.
- 140. With regards to the concerns raised around school places, WBC Education service raises no objection in relation to the proposals and advises that as things currently stand, WBC has local primary schools that can't use all their capacity and therefore the most likely short / medium term impact will be to help fill existing schools.
- 141. It is acknowledged that there has recently been an increase in demand for secondary school place capacity, and WBC is working to create additional secondary school capacity to serve the borough. However, as WBC Education advises, the existing 'bulge' will be in schools by the time homes appear on the site as WBC will have made the provision needed, and because the bulge will pass through, demand will subsequently drop. Of relevance to this application, the Piggott Secondary School was granted planning permission earlier this year for a temporary classroom provision to facilitate an increase in pupil intake whilst longer term proposals are prepared. It is noted that for the most recent September 2022 intake, all children in catchment whose parents had applied for the school as their first preference got a place (unless their parents subsequently opted to make other arrangements), along with some outside of catchment. It is therefore considered that the proposals would be able to acceptably accommodate the educational needs of the development without compromising those of existing residents.

# **Conclusion**

- 142. For the reasons outlined in the above report, the site is considered to be a sustainable and suitable development site that would offer public benefit to help meet the needs of the community. The application will deliver high quality development in accordance with the Council's overall spatial strategy and although it is situated beyond the existing settlement boundary within the countryside, the site is located adjacent to a major development location and the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh limited conflict with the underlying aims and objectives of the development plan.
- 143. However, and as outlined above, as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the most important policies for determining the application are considered out of date and the NPPF tilted balance in the presumption of sustainable development is engaged. Furthermore, the proposals are not considered to result in any significant adverse impacts that would lead to suggest that the application should be refused and it is considered that an appeal Inspector would likely reach the same conclusion in this regard. Officers therefore recommend the application for approval, subject to the conditions listed and an accompanying S106 agreement.

# The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010)

In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts upon protected groups as a result of the development.

# **APPENDIX 1 - Conditions / Informatives**

1. <u>Approved Details</u>

This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings outlined below. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

5563.003G Proposed Access Arrangements

PRB-TWY-013D Illustrative Land Use Plan

PRB-TWY-012D Illustrative Storey Heights Plan

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.

2. Dwellings Limit

The number of dwellings constructed on the application site pursuant to the planning permission hereby approved shall not exceed 200 dwellings.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Phasing

Prior to the commencement of development, a strategy for the sub-phasing of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Strategy will define:

- i. the development to be delivered within each sub-phase of the development;
- ii. timescales;
- iii. details of the coordination of housing and infrastructure delivery including triggers for delivery of infrastructure and the arrangements to prevent interruption of delivery across sub-phase and phase boundaries;

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Phasing Strategy.

Reason: to ensure comprehensive planning of the site, to ensure the timely delivery of facilities and services and to protect the amenity of the area in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP5, CP6, CP17.

4. <u>Reserved Matters</u>

a) Approval of the details of the layout, scale, design and external appearance of the buildings and the landscaping treatment of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

b) Application for approval of the reserved matters referred to in a) above shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before expiration of 18 months from the date of this permission.

c) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of S91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1991 (as amendment by s51 of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004).

# 5. <u>Permitted Development</u>

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no buildings, extensions or alterations permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 of the Second Schedule of the 2015 Order (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) shall be carried out.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the area and residential amenity of neighbouring properties and the character and appearance of the landscape. Relevant Policies: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and reenacting that Order with or without modification), no external lighting shall be installed on the site or affixed to any buildings on the site except within rear gardens and front door lamps or in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard amenity and highway safety. Relevant Policies: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 and CP6.

# 7. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

Prior to commencement of development hereby permitted, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in respect of that phase shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved CEMP. The CEMP shall include the following matters:

i) a construction travel protocol or Green Travel Plan for the construction phase including details of parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;

ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;

iii) storage of plant and materials;

iv) programme of works, including measures for traffic management and operating hours;

v) piling techniques;

- vi) provision of boundary hoarding;
- vii) details of a site security strategy;
- viii) protection of the aquatic environment in terms of water quantity and quality;

ix) details of proposed means of dust suppression and noise mitigation;

x) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction;

xi) details of any site construction office, compound and ancillary facility buildings. These facilities shall be sited away from woodland areas;

xii) lighting on site during construction;

xiii) measures to ensure no on-site fires during construction;

xiv) monitoring and review mechanisms;

xv) implementation of the CEMP through an environmental management system; xvi) details of the haul routes to be used to access the development;

xvii) details of temporary surface water management measures to be provided during the construction phase;

xviii) details of the excavation of materials and the sub-surface construction methodology;

xix) a method for ensuring that minerals that can be viably recovered during the development operations are recovered and put to beneficial use; and,

xx) a method to record the quantity of recovered mineral (re-use on-site or offsite) and to report this data to the LPA upon completion of the development.

xxi) Relevant ecological mitigation measures for protected mammal species in particular in relation to mammals, birds, and reptiles, based on up-to-date surveys;

- xxi) Details of how the 10m ecological buffer zone to the River Loddon will be protected during development.
- xxii) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
- xxiii) Responsible persons and lines of communication.

xxiv) Appointment of a Construction Liaison Officer.

Reason: To protect occupants of nearby dwellings from noise and disturbance during the construction period, in the interest of highway safety and convenience; to minimise the environmental impact of the construction phase and to ensure that construction activities adequately mitigate the risk to protected species (capturing recommended mitigation measures MM3, MM4, MM7, MM8, MM9, MM10, and MM11) in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3, CP6 and CP7 and TB23 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy, and ODPM circular 2006/05.

8. <u>Construction Vehicles</u>

No development shall commence until provision has been made to accommodate all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site during the construction period, in accordance with details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The provision shall be maintained as so-approved and used for no other purposes until completion of the development or otherwise as provided for in the approved details

Reason: To prevent queuing and parking off site, in the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP6.

9. Hours of operation

No work relating to the development hereby permitted, including works of ground clearance or preparation prior to commencement of construction operations shall take place other than:

- i) between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday; and
- ii) 08:00-13:00 on Saturday; and
- iii) at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays except for
- iv) individual operations which cannot reasonably be undertaken within the construction working hours defined above and have been notified to the Local Planning Authority (including details of the nature extent and timetable for the works) at least two weeks in advance and agreed in writing (by exchange of letter).

Where works are agreed by the LPA under iv) above, key stakeholders including residential properties within an identified zone that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, ward members and town/parish councils shall be given written notice at least one week in advance of the works taking place. The notification shall include details of the nature, extent and timetable for the works and telephone number that the party responsible the works can be contacted on for the duration of the works.

Reason: To protect the occupiers of neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period, in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3, and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC06, whilst providing flexibility where works outside the usual hours are unavoidable or would not result in unacceptable disruption in the surrounding area.

# 10. Design Code

Prior to the submission of Reserved Matters pursuant to condition 4, a Design Code for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The details shall include:

- amplification of the principles for development in each of the character areas and street typologies demonstrating a comprehensive approach that will deliver a cohesive and high-quality development with distinct character areas within it;
- an interconnected movement network delivering a hierarchy of streets and paths to prioritise movement by pedestrians and cyclists including connectivity to Twyford town centre and Charvil Meadows and Charvil Country Park;
- iii) principles for how parking to the council's standards will be delivered within each character area including integration of unallocated parking in the public realm;
- iv) measures to ensure that the proposals provides a sufficient buffer to the sensitive open countryside to the west and south of the site and accommodate the necessary mitigation planting as required by the Landscape Report.

The subsequent submitted Reserved Matters shall demonstrate how the proposals accord with the principles established within the approved Design Code

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory form of development relative to surrounding buildings and landscape. Relevant policy: NPPF and Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 and Managing Development Deliver Local Plan Policy TB21.

# 11. <u>Samples of Materials</u>

Prior to commencement of development above finished floor level, samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building/s shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the so-approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3

### 12. Levels

No development shall take place until a measured survey of the site and a plan prepared to scale of not less than 1:500 showing details of existing and proposed finished ground levels (in relation to a fixed datum point) and finished floor levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the approved scheme shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the building(s).

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory form of development relative to surrounding buildings and landscape. Relevant policy: NPPF and Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 and Managing Development Deliver Local Plan Policy TB21.

#### 13. Lighting for Light Sensitive Species

Prior to commencement of development, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:

a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for protected mammal species and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and

b) include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination for all external lighting strategies including details of lighting for all highways, cycleways, footpaths, public areas and any non-residential buildings.

c) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications)so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications

and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent an adverse impact upon wildlife and safeguard amenity and highway safety in accordance with NPPF and Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policy CP1, CP3, CP6 and CP7 and TB23.

### 14. Highway Construction details

Prior to the commencement of development, full details of the construction of roads, cycleways and footways, including levels, widths, construction materials, depths of construction, surface water drainage and lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Each dwelling shall not be occupied until the vehicle access to serve that dwelling has been constructed in accordance with the approved details to road base level and the final wearing course will be provided within 3 months of first occupation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that roads and footpaths are constructed to a standard that would be suitable for adoption as publicly maintainable highway, in the interests of providing a functional, accessible and safe development. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

### 15. Landscape Design Statement

The reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a Landscape Design Statement and plan to give details of the landscape proposals and structural planting including street tree planting in accordance with the landscape measures detailed in the submitted Landscape Report, in advance of the landscape details required to be provided to comply with the detailed landscape condition 16.

Reason: In order to ensure that provision is made to allow satisfactory maintenance of the landscaping hereby approved. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21.

### 16. Detailed Landscaping

No development shall take place in any phase of the development until full details of both hard and soft landscape works for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The details shall include, as appropriate:

- a) scheme drawings;
- b) proposed levels and contours;
- c) detailed design of SuDS features in accordance with the SuDS Strategy, demonstrating how they will be integrated into the wider landscape, with attenuation basins having a natural shape and shallow profile (not requiring lifesaving equipment and fence barriers), allowing them to fulfil amenity, ecological and drainage functions;

- d) soft landscaping details including planting plans, schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
- e) a Landscape Specification document covering soft landscaping (including site preparation, cultivation, plant handling and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment) and hard landscaping including all construction works such as paths, bridges and retaining walls;
- f) details of the street tree planting pits in combination with the roadside swales/raingardens demonstrating that the trees have sufficient rooting volume to enable their successful retention long term health;
- g) hard landscaping materials including samples;
- h) minor artefacts and structures (e.g., street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, external services) including specifications for the product and its installation;
- i) specification for tree rooting systems and use of structural soils under paving or where rooting volumes are limited;
- all boundary treatments, and other means of enclosure or controlling access such as gates, bollards and vehicle restraint systems, which shall include consideration of ecological permeability;
- k) car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- measures required for ecological mitigation and biodiversity net gain to include an updated assessment using the Defra metric to achieve a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain;
- m) how the river channel morphology and bankside habitat will be enhanced to contribute to biodiversity net gain.
- ii) Details of quality control measures, including supervision of landscape contract(s) by a suitably qualified landscape specialist and annual landscape audits for the five-year period from completion of the landscaping for the Landscape Phase or until adoption (whichever is longer). The annual Landscape Audit shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for information prior to the next planting season and replacement planting undertaken in accordance with the landscape audit and iii) below.
- iii) Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and permanently retained.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to maintain favourable conservation status of the site for protected species and species of principal importance. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3, CP7 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03, TB21 & TB23

17. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)

The reserved matters application shall include a detailed landscape and ecological management plan, including long-term design objectives, management

responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens). The plan shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority and carried out as approved. Approved mitigation shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently retained thereafter\_throughout the lifetime of the development. Any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the following elements:

- 1. Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- 2. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management to include an ecological buffer zone of no less than 10 metres adjacent to the River Loddon. This zone shall be free of all built development including lighting, footpaths and formal landscaping. A detailed planting scheme for this zone shall be submitted which includes native species of local provenance which enhance the value of the watercourse.
- 3. Aims and objectives of management
- 4. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives
- 5. Details of all new habitat created on site, including enhancements to the River Loddon and its riparian corridor.
- 6. Details of maintenance regimes and a long-term management plan for the site.
- 7. Delivery and maintenance of the biodiversity net gain measures outlined in the submitted Technical Briefing Note: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Aspect Ecology, ref: 1005672, March 2022)
- 8. Prescriptions for management actions.
- 9. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
- 10. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. This approach is supported by paragraphs 174 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which recognise that the planning system should conserve and enhance the environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

This condition is also supported by legislation set out in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and Article 10 of the Habitats Directive which stresses the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity.

To secure appropriate wildlife mitigation, compensation and enhancements within the course of the development, as appropriate under the NPPF and in accordance with Local Plan policies CP7, CC03 and MDD Policy TB23.

### 18. <u>Arboricultural Impact Assessment</u>

The reserved matters application shall be accompanied by an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to ensure development proposals including SuDS requirements have been fully considered in relation to the tree constraints.

Reason: To secure the protection throughout the time that development is being carried out, of trees, shrubs and hedges growing within the site which are of amenity value to the area. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21

### 19. <u>Retention of trees and shrubs</u>

No trees, shrubs or hedges within the site which are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without previous written consent of the local planning authority; any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of similar size and species unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To secure the protection throughout the time that development is being carried out, of trees, shrubs and hedges growing within the site which are of amenity value to the area. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21

### 20. <u>Protection of trees</u>

a) No development or other operation shall commence on site until a scheme which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent the site in accordance with BS5837: 2012 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (the Approved Scheme); the tree protection measures approved shall be implemented in complete accordance with the Approved Scheme for the duration of the development (including, unless otherwise provided by the Approved Scheme) demolition, all site preparation work, tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery.

b) No development (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence until the local planning authority has been provided (by way of a written notice) with a period of no less than 7 working days to inspect the implementation of the measures identified in the Approved Scheme on-site.

c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the Approved Scheme.

d) The fencing or other works which are part of the Approved Scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site, unless the prior approval of the local planning authority has first been sought and obtained.

Reason: To secure the protection throughout the time that the development is being carried out of trees shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area, and to allow for verification by the local planning authority that the necessary measures are in place before development and other works commence Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21

### 21. Aged and Veteran Tree Strategy

Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed veteran and aged tree mitigation strategy for the veteran tree within the site shall be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. The strategy shall include a tree management plan for the tree works that are required to maintain the tree's ecological value as well as providing mitigation proposals to compensate for encroachment of development within the RPA. The management plan should cover a period of 10 years from the commencement of development. The mitigation strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To secure the continued appropriate management and maintenance of the tree, in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP3, CP7 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21.

# 22. Details of boundary walls and fences

Prior to commencement of development above finished floor level, details of all boundary treatment(s) shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development or phased as agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be maintained in the approved form for so long as the development remains on the site.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 and CP6

# 23. Ecological Permeability

The reserved matters for the development shall include a detailed scheme to maintain or enhance the ecological permeability of the site (especially with regard to mammals). The mitigation and contingency measures contained within the plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate mitigation of the impact upon protected species during construction and in the long term, in accordance with NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CP7 and MDD Policy TB23.

#### 24. <u>Species Specific Enhancements</u>

Prior to commencement, a detailed strategy for species specific enhancements in line with measures EE5, EE6, and EE7 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal report (Aspect Ecology, ref: 5672 EcoAp vf4 /SK/HK/MRD, March 2022) and to provide a minimum of 100 bat and bird boxes across the site shall be provided to the local authority for its approval. Once approved the strategy shall be implemented in full unless otherwise agreed by the local authority in writing.

Reason: To secure biodiversity net gain in the design as per NPPF paragraph 174 and MDD Local Plan policy TB23.

#### 25. Flood Risk and Drainage

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref 5563.FRA Issue 04 Dated 24.03.2022, produced by Stuart Michael Associates Limited) and the following mitigation measures it details:

1. Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 35.83 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD)

2. No development or ground level raising shall take place within the 1% annual probability flood extent with a 35% allowance for climate change as shown in Appendix J of the FRA

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to prevent flooding elsewhere by ensuring flood water storage is retained in accordance with paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policy CP1 and CC09.

26. <u>Surface Water Drainage Strategy</u>

No development shall take place until full details of the drainage system for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The details shall include:

- Results of intrusive ground investigation demonstrating seasonal high groundwater levels for the site and infiltration rates in accordance with BRE365.
- Demonstration that the base of SuDS features are at least 1m above seasonal groundwater level.
- Full calculations demonstrating the performance of soakaways or capacity of attenuation features to cater for 1 in 100 year flood event with a 40% allowance for climate change and runoff controlled at Greenfield rates, or preferably better.
- Calculations demonstrating that there will be no flooding of pipes for events up to and including the 1 in 100 year flood event with a 40% allowance for climate change.

- A drainage strategy plan for the proposed development, including pipe details with invert levels.
- A maintenance arrangement for the SuDS features throughout the lifetime of the development, indicating who will be responsible for the maintenance.

Reason: To prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC09 and CC10

27. No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution caused by mobilised contaminants. This is in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policy CP1.

#### 28. Exceedance Flow Route

Development shall not take place until an exceedance flow routing plan for flows above the 1 in 100+40% climate change event has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed scheme shall identify exceedance flow routes through the development based on proposed topography with flows being directed to highways and areas of public open space. Flow routes through gardens and other areas in private ownership will not be permitted. The scheme shall subsequently be completed in accordance with the approved details before first occupation of the site.

Reason: To prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC09 and CC10.

#### 29. Overland flow

The layout of the development site and the drainage system should be designed so that natural low lying areas and overland conveyance pathways are used to manage surface runoff, where appropriate, where they do not pose an unacceptable risk to the new developments or downstream areas/ elsewhere. Where run-off from off-site sources is drained together with the site run-off, the contributing catchment should be modelled as part of the drainage system to take full account of additional flows.

Reason: To ensure the continued operation and maintenance of drainage features serving the site and to prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC09 and CC10.

#### Access and movement

# 30. <u>Access</u>

Prior to commencement of the development, details of the proposed vehicular accesses on to New Bath Road to include visibility splays of 2.4m by 43m shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The accesses shall be formed as so-approved and the visibility splays shall be cleared of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height prior to the occupation of the development. The accesses shall be retained in accordance with the approved details and used for no other purpose and the land within the visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any visual obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

### 31. Walking and Cycling Strategy

The reserved matters for the development shall include details of internal pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and connections from the development to improve footway and cycleway routes that connect the development with local services and Twyford centre shall be submitted for approval by the local planning authority. The measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the first dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable travel, convenience and highway safety in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP6.

Parking

# 32. <u>Garages and car ports to be retained as such</u>

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the garage and car port accommodation on the site identified on the approved plans shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles ancillary to the residential use of the site at all times. It shall not be used for any business nor as habitable space.

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking space is available on the site, so as to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking, in the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

# 33. Details of car and motorcycle parking

The reserved matters application for the development shall include details of car and motorcycle parking in accordance with the Council's policies and which are to be approved in writing by the Council. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular accesses, driveways, parking and turning areas to serve it including any unallocated space have been provided in accordance with the approved details and the provision shall be retained thereafter. The vehicle parking shall not be used for any other purposes other than parking and the turning spaces shall not be used for any other purposes than turning.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP6, CC07 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (Feb 2014), the Parking Standards Study within the Borough Design Guide 2010.

# 34. Cycle parking

The reserved matters application for the development shall include details of secure and covered bicycle storage/parking facilities serving that dwelling for the occupants of, and visitors to the development. The cycle storage/parking shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be permanently retained in the approved form for the parking of bicycles and used for no other purpose.

Reason: In order to ensure the development contributes towards achieving a sustainable transport system and to provide parking for cycles in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP6, the Parking Standards Study within the Borough Design Guide 2010 and CC07 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan.

### 35. <u>Electric Vehicle Charging</u>

Prior to commencement of development above finished floor level, an Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy shall include details relating to on-site electric vehicle charging infrastructure, in accordance with Building Regulations Approved Document S and details of installation charging points and future proofing of the site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed strategy thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure that secure electric vehicle charging facilities are provided so as to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

#### 36. Parking Management Strategy

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Parking Management Strategy for the management of the on-site parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The management of the parking within the site shall be in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: to ensure satisfactory development in the interests of amenity and highway safety in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP6 and CP21.

# 37. <u>Speed Limit Reduction Measures</u>

Prior to commencement of the development, details of speed limit and speed reduction measures along New Bath Road (between the access to Newland Farm and access to the site) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be implemented prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

### Environmental Health

38. Land Contamination

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of contamination remediation must not commence until conditions A - D (below) have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has commenced, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, to the extent specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority, until there is compliance with condition D (below)

### A Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment shall be completed in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority to assess the nature and extent of contamination on the site, whether or not it originates at the site. (This is in addition to any assessment that may have been provided with the planning application). The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The report of the findings must include:

- (i) all previous uses
- (ii) potential contaminants associated with those uses
- (iii) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of the contamination;
- (iv) a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors;
- (v) potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site to:
- a) human health;
- b) property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and services and pipework;
- c) adjoining land;
- d) groundwater and surface waters;
- e) ecological systems;
- f) archaeological sites and ancient monuments
- (vi) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option

(N.B. The assessment must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11.)

#### **B** Submission of a remediation scheme

A detailed remediation scheme that describes how the site will be made suitable for the intended use must be submitted to the local planning authority for written approval. The remediation scheme shall include, the proposed remediation

objectives and remediation criteria, details of all works to be undertaken, the timetable of works and site management procedures. The remediation scheme shall ensure that the site cannot be declared as being contaminated under part 2Aof the Environmental Protection Act 1990, in relation to the intended use, after remediation works are completed.

### C Submission of a Verification Plan

A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (B) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

#### D Implementation of the approved remediation scheme

The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented before other groundworks or construction works commence unless a phased approach has been agreed as part of the approved remediation scheme or unless written approval is given by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant or contractor must give at least two weeks written notice before remediation works commence. Following completion of remediation works at the site, or upon completion of each phase a verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

### E Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

If unexpected contamination is found at any time during development this shall be reported in writing as soon as possible to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of condition A (above), and where remediation work is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared and submitted for written approval to the local planning authority, in accordance with condition B (above). Following the completion of measures set out in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to the local planning authority in accordance with condition Scheme a verification report shall be submitted to the local planning authority in accordance with condition C.

#### F Long term monitoring and maintenance

A scheme setting out the future monitoring and maintenance that will take place at the site shall be submitted for written approval to the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the timescales over which monitoring and maintenance will take place and how frequently reports will be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. All monitoring and maintenance work will be carried out in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified at the outset to allow remediation to protect existing/proposed occupants of property on the site and/or adjacent land. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) and Core Strategy policies CP1 & CP3.

39. Foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources including quality in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policy CP1.

40. The reserved matters submitted pursuant to condition 4 shall be accompanied by a noise assessment report which demonstrates that the housing layout has been designed and/or insulated so as to provide attenuation against externally generated noise. The noise assessment shall demonstrate that all noise implications are mitigated so that internal ambient noise levels for dwellings shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq (16 hour) 07:00-23:00 during the daytime and 30 dB LAeq (8 hour) 23:00-07:00 during the night. The design and/or insulation measures identified in the scheme shall ensure that ambient internal noise levels for the dwellings meet the BS8233/2014 Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings – Code of Practice. For gardens, the steady noise level should not exceed 50dB LAeq,T. The approved mitigation measures to serve each dwelling shall be implemented prior to occupation and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect future residents from the harmful effects of high noise levels, in accordance with the NPPF and Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Policy CC06.

41. Sustainability and energy efficiency

The reserved matters application for the development shall include an updated energy statement to include:-

i) a strategy detailing how the development will secure a 10% reduction in carbon emissions above the minimum requirements of Part L: Building Regulations; or

ii) an alternative strategy which can demonstrate a greater carbon saving than would be achieved by i) above

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable forms of developments and to meet the terms of the application. Relevant Policies: Core Strategy policies CP1, and CC04 and CC05 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (Feb 2014), the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

42. All new dwellings shall be provided with the appropriate connections for broadband or similar technologies, or ducting that shall enable the connection of broadband or similar technologies.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate level of infrastructure is provided in accordance with Wokingham Core Strategy Policy CP1 and CC04 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (Feb 2014).

43. The development shall include provision for all dwellings with a garden with:

a. A water butt of an appropriate size installed to maximise rainwater collection; and

# b. Space for composting

Reason: To reduce, reuse, and enable the efficient use of water and organic household waste in accordance with NPPF, Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policy CP1, the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC04, the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

### 44. <u>Emergency water supplies</u>

Development shall not commence until details for the provision of a water supply including fire hydrants to meet firefighting needs throughout the development (including the installation arrangements and the timing of such an installation) have been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that adequate measures for firefighting can be incorporated into the development, including the construction phase in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policy CP4.

### 45. <u>Water supply infrastructure</u>

No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason: The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

46. No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground strategic water main, utility infrastructure. The works has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

47. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation

with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

48. Development here by approved shall not commence until a 'Phase II' contaminated land risk assessment has been submitted to and approved by,the local planning authority in consultation with the water undertaker. The risk assessment shall document the nutrient impact to ground water abstraction as a result of the development and propose mitigation and monitoring to ensure that at least 'nutrient neutrality' is achieved. The development shall be constructed in line with the recommendations of the Risk Assessment.

Reason: To ensure that the water resource is not detrimentally affected by the development.

49. Development here by approved shall not commence until a Source Protection Strategy, detailing how the developer intends to ensure the water abstraction source is not detrimentally affected by the proposed development both during and after its construction, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in consultation with the water undertaker. The development shall be constructed in line with the recommendations of the strategy.

Reason:To ensure that the water resource is not detrimentally affected by the development

50. Archaeological investigation

Development shall not commence until a programme of archaeological work (which may comprise more than one phase of work) has been implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: The site is identified as being of archaeological potential. Investigation is required to allow preservation and recording of any archaeological features or artefacts before disturbance by the development. Relevant policy: National Planning Policy Framework Section 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB25

#### 51. <u>Secured by Design</u>

The reserved matters application for the development shall include details of how the development has taken into account principles of Secured by Design. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, & CP3.

52. <u>Communications Plan</u>

Development shall not commence until a Communications Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall specify methods for communicating with local residents, including the creation of a liaison group to meet in accordance with an agreed schedule. The Plan shall be carried out as approved until the final completion of the development.

*Reason: In order to minimise disturbance to neighbours during construction works.* 

# Informatives

- 1. This permission should be read in conjunction with the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (yet to be finalised) the contents of which relate to this development.
  - 2 You are advised, in compliance with The Town and Country Planning [Development Management Procedure] [England] Order 2010 that the following policies and/or proposals in the development plan are relevant to this decision:
    - National Planning Policy Framework
    - Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010)
      - CP1 Sustainable Development
      - CP2 Inclusive Communities
      - o CP3 General Principles for Development
      - o CP4 Infrastructure Requirements
      - CP5 Housing mix, density and affordability
      - CP6 Managing Travel Demand
      - CP7 Biodiversity
      - CP9 Scale and Location of Development Proposals
      - CP10 Improvements to the Strategic Transport Network
      - CP11 Proposals outside development limits (including countryside)
      - CP17 Housing delivery
    - Adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (2014)
      - CC01 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
      - o CC02 Development Limits
      - o CC03 Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping
      - CC04 Sustainable Design and Construction
      - CC05 Renewable energy and decentralised energy networks
      - o CC06 Noise
      - o CC07 Parking
      - CC09 Development and Flood Risk (from all sources)
      - CC10 Sustainable Drainage
      - $\circ$  TB05 Housing Mix
      - TB07 Internal Space standards
      - TB12 Employment Skills Plan
      - TB21 Landscape Character
      - TB23 Biodiversity and Development
      - TB24 Designated Heritage Assets
      - TB25 Archaeology
    - Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012)
    - Infrastructure Delivery and Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
    - Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2011)

- Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (2010)
- DCLG Nationally Described Space Standards
- Living Streets: a Highways Guide for Developers in Wokingham (2019)
- Wokingham SuDS Strategy (January 2017)
- 3 The Corporate Head of Environment at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham should be contacted for the approval of the access construction details before any work is carried out within the highway. This planning permission does NOT authorise the construction of such an access
- 4 If it is the developer's intention to request the Council, as Local Highway Authority, to adopt the proposed access roads etc. as highway maintainable at public expense, then full engineering details must be agreed with the Corporate Head of Environment at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham. The developer is strongly advised not to commence development until such details have been approved in writing and a legal agreement is made with the Council under S38 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 5 Any works/events carried out either by, or at the behest of, the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be coordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in Wokingham.
- 6 Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site, shall be co–ordinated by them in liaison with Wokingham Borough Council's Street Works Team, (telephone 01189 746302). This must take place at least three months in advance of the works and particularly to ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are coordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time.
- 7 Adequate precautions shall be taken during the construction period to prevent the deposit of mud and similar debris on adjacent highways. For further information contact the Local Highway Authority on tel: 0118 9746000.
- 8 The attention of the applicant is drawn to the requirements of Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 in respect of the minimisation of noise on construction and demolition sites. Application, under Section 61 of the Act, for prior consent to the works, can be made to the Environmental Health and Licensing Manager.
- 9 The council advises that the developer produces a strategy to install superfast broadband infrastructure for future occupants of the site. The strategy should ensure that upon occupation of a dwelling the new home owner has access to a superfast broadband service through a site-wide network. It is also advised that the developer keeps occupants fully informed of any delays to superfast broadband connection in before they purchase/occupy their new homes.

- 10 Due to the close proximity of the proposed works to Network Rail's land and the operational railway, Network Rail requests the applicant / developer engages Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team via AssetProtectionWessex@networkrail.co.uk prior to works commencing. This will allow our ASPRO team to review the details of the proposal to ensure that the works can be completed without any risk to the operational railway.
- 11 The applicant / developer may be required to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement to get the required resource and expertise on-board to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/assetprotection-and-optimisation/

#### **APPENDIX 2 - Twyford Parish Council Comments**

PLANNING REF	:	212720
PROPERTY ADDRESS	:	PO Box 8250
	:	Reading
	:	RG6 9SZ
SUBMITTED BY	:	Twyford Parish Council
DATE SUBMITTED	:	16/09/2021

COMMENTS:

Twyford Parish Council would like to object to this outline planning application. The application is premature and if approved would deny residents of Twyford their democratic right to participate fully in the development of the next Wokingham Local Plan by presupposing its outcome.

The arguments to establish a principle of development presuppose the shape and form of the emerging draft local plan. It presupposes that the 5year supply of land situation will change and that the village developed envelop e will have to change to afford sustainable development. In neither case has evidence been submitted to show that this is the case or that development needs to take place in contravention of the existing local plan. As such it takes no account of the im pact of any extension of the village envelope on local services and infrastructure in the wider sense.

In terms of access, which is not a reserved matter, we object to this application as the impact on both traffic on the A4 and through the centre of Twy ford have not been fully considered and should be assessed properly through the emerging local plan process. Again, this robs residents of Twyford the right to participate fully in the local plan development process and strips us of the protection of the existing local plan.

We do not wish to comment on reserved matters at this time as they do not provide any material evidence for determining this application and could change at any time if an approval was given.