

APPENDIX B: Inspector's Report into the West Berkshire Core Strategy



The Planning
Inspectorate

Report to West Berkshire Council

by Simon Emerson BSC DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date 3 July 2012

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE WEST BERKSHIRE
CORE STRATEGY**

Document submitted for examination on 12 July 2010

Examination hearings held between 2 November 2010 and 22 May 2012

File Ref: PINS/W0340/429/5

Abbreviations Used in this Report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
ADPP	Area Delivery Plan Policies
BHMA	Berkshire Housing Market Assessment
CS	Core Strategy
ELA	Employment Land Assessment
HMA	Housing Market Area
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
MM	Main Modification
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
RS	Regional Strategy
RSC	Rural Service Centre
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEP	South East Plan
SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
SV	Service Village.

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the West Berkshire Core Strategy provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the District, providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan.

The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable them to adopt the Plan. With the exception of the model policy on sustainable development and some of the detailed wording relating to the required review of housing provision, the substance of all the modifications have been agreed or accepted by the Council and are drawn from the various changes published by the Council during the course of the Examination. I have recommended the modifications after full consideration of the representations from other parties on these matters.

The modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Simplification and clarification of the presentation of proposed housing distribution between the settlements and the spatial areas, including the deletion of policy CS2
- Confirming that the 10,500 dwellings proposed in the Plan is not a cap on development; requiring an update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment within 3 years and reviewing planned provision of housing in the light of that update.
- Confirming that development within the strategic allocation at Sandford will be confined to the north and west of the site and other changes to clarify what is proposed and ensure adequate infrastructure and mitigation.
- Replacing the proposed employment policy with a new policy so as to provide greater clarity as to the Council's intentions; to be consistent with national policy for office development; and to provide flexibility to accommodate non B class economic development.
- Introducing a new policy to signal the strong restraint on residential development necessary close to the Atomic Weapons Establishments.
- Introducing a new policy on sustainable development to reflect the overall aim of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Deleting the Rural Exceptions Policy (CS8) as inconsistent with national policy so that the policy approach can be reviewed in a subsequent part of the Local Plan.
- Making a number of other changes to the detailed wording of policies and text to ensure effectiveness and consistency with national policy.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (the Plan) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers whether the Plan is compliant with the legal requirements and whether it is sound. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 182) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared; justified; effective and consistent with national policy. The duty to co-operate in section 33A of the 2004 Act does not apply to this Plan as it was submitted well before 15 November 2011 when that duty came into effect. The duty applies to the preparation of a Local Plan and the legislation does not require it to be applied retrospectively.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The submitted plan is the same as the document published for consultation in February 2010. The basis for my examination is the submitted plan incorporating some minor amendments. The Council's schedule of proposed amendments at submission (CD07/17) included some that were more than minor (as explained in my Preliminary Comments, 22 July 2010). The schedule was subsequently amended in CD07/30. I signalled my intention to accept these appropriate minor amendments in my pre-hearing Briefing Note, 2 September 2010. One of the minor changes was to change the title of Spatial Policies 1-6 to Area Delivery Plan Policies (ADPP) 1-6.
3. My report deals with the main modifications that are needed to make the Plan sound and legally compliant and they are identified in bold in the report (**MM**). In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should make any modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound/not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. These main modifications are set out in the Annex (which includes Appendices).
4. The main modifications are drawn from a series of possible changes that have been the subject of public consultation and, where necessary, Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These were published in February 2011 (Schedules CD07/41 and CD07/42) and in October 2011 (Schedules CD07/74 and CD07/75). I have taken all the consultation responses into account in writing this report. I have also taken into account the responses to the separate consultations undertaken on such matters as the NPPF, the Government's Planning Policy on Traveller Sites and the model policy for sustainable development.
5. The wording of the main modifications in the attached Annex incorporates some minor changes to the text previously published, such as to update references to national guidance following the publication of the NPPF. There are a number of references to national guidance elsewhere in the Plan which should be updated, but where there is no change in the policy approach these changes are minor and are for the Council to consider.
6. To assist parties' understanding of the origin of the main modifications the Annexe provides a reference to the earlier published changes and notes any subsequent amendments. A few of the changes previously published are not included in the main modifications as the relevant policy is sound and

therefore no change is required. I do not refer to any of the schedules of minor modifications that have been published during the Examination. It will be for the Council to decide what additional modifications it wishes to make to the Plan at adoption.

The adequacy of the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Environmental Assessment Report

7. At the end of this report is a summary of my assessment of the Plan's compliance with all legal and regulatory requirements. I conclude there that all the requirements are met. However, consideration of whether the Council has complied with some of the regulatory requirements has been a significant and contentious part of this Examination and I therefore address the most controversial matters here as they form a necessary prerequisite to the consideration of soundness.
8. My note to the Council of 13 July 2011, indicated that in the light of the judgement in *Save Historic Newmarket Ltd & Others v. Forest Heath District Council* [2011] EWHC 606 (CD10/94), the *Sustainability Appraisal and Environmental Assessment Report (SA/SEA)* (CD07/10) published in January 2010 alongside the publication version of the Core Strategy failed materially to meet the requirements of the Regulations. This was because the report contains no explanation of the reasons for the selection of the Sandford strategic site (policy CS4) from the alternative options at Newbury/Thatcham put forward in *Options for the Future* May 2009 (CD07/06), nor for the selection of the broad locational approach in the Eastern Area from the options previously put forward. The selection of a 2nd strategic site at Newbury (in addition to that at Newbury Racecourse which has already received planning permission and where development has commenced) is one of the key decisions made in the Core Strategy.
9. Following consideration at a hearing on 31 August 2011 of the possible ways forward, I suspended the Examination to allow the Council to seek to rectify this Regulatory failure. My note of 7 September 2011 explains the reasons for allowing the Council to proceed in this way. It also outlined the task that the Council was required to undertake, namely an objective re-assessment of the relevant matters in the SA/SEA report so that the report could properly fulfil its purpose in the evolution of the Core Strategy. As explained in that note, I do not see any legal bar to the Council redoing this work during a suspension of the Examination, even though there is no express legislative provision to do so. I do not regard the more recent decision of the European Court in *Inter Environment Wallonie ASBL v Region Wallonne* (Case C-41/11)(CD10/107) nor the Judgement and Order in the domestic case of *Heard v Broadland District Council, South Norfolk District Council and Norwich City Council* (QB CO/3983/2011, February 2012)(CD10/106) as precluding the reworking of the SA/SEA report prior to adoption. Both these cases concerned a challenge to a proposal or plan which had already been adopted.
10. The Council's further work is set out in *SA/SEA Update October 2011* (CD07/72). It is clear from the contents page of the main report that it consists of the main report, 5 Appendices and a series of SA Policy Papers. The various updates made to this material since January 2010 are highlighted by different text and it is clear how it has evolved. The Council has also added

to the document the *Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Phase 1 and Phase 2* reports. These had previously been published separately to the SA/SEA. They are inserted unaltered. There is some inconsistency in the detailed assessment of issues relating to Sandford and North Newbury as addressed in the Phase 1 and 2 reports compared with the rest of the SA/SEA as now updated. For example, not all the potential issues highlighted in Appendix 8 of the Strategic Sites Policy Paper (see paragraph 14 below) are referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoring in Appendix A of the Phase 2 report and some matters are not explained in a similar way, even though it is not apparent that there has been any new evidence to account for these differences. But I do not regard these differences as fundamentally undermining the purpose of the document as a whole. The SA/SEA Update Report is substantial and complex, but all the relevant information is available in its various parts. Although cross-referencing between different parts of the document is necessary, it is now possible to follow the Council's explanation and testing of its policy choices.

11. The revised SA/SEA report does not reassess the long list of 15 possible strategic sites that were scored prior to the publication of *Options for the Future* (CD07/06). I am satisfied that proposal CS9 in *Options for the Future* represented reasonable alternatives for the choice of strategic allocations in the Newbury/Thatcham area and, separately, for the possible alternative approaches to be made in the Eastern Area. The Council's justification for the options put forward in *Options for the Future* and the rejection of other alternatives is adequately explained. Some sites are rejected with brief reasoning, but it is adequate and reasonable in the light of the evidence and circumstances pertaining at the time and now. The selection of strategic sites from an initial long list of alternatives is an iterative process and it is inevitable that each subsequent stage will consider the remaining alternatives more closely than at earlier stages, taking into account potential mitigation. It was reasonable for separate consideration to be given to the appropriate approach to strategic development in each of the 2 spatial areas which contain urban settlements (i.e. Newbury/Thatcham and the Eastern Area). A consequence of this separate approach meant that there was no need to continue to compare a potential strategic site in one spatial area with a potential strategic site in another spatial area.
12. The selection of strategic sites and the approach to major development in the Eastern Area and at Newbury/Thatcham is explained on pages 49-54 of the main SA/SEA report and in more detail in the SA Policy Paper *Strategic Sites*. For the Eastern Area, *Options for the Future* set out 5 options, which included different approaches to development in the area as well as different sites. There is an adequate explanation for the Council's decision not to allocate a single strategic site, but to identify a broad location within which to make future allocations in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. The appropriateness of the decision not to proceed with a strategic allocation at Pincents Hill is confirmed by the Secretary of State's decision in June 2011 to dismiss a planning appeal for development of that site (CD10/101). The Council's approach retains flexibility for future choices in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. On the evidence available, the Council's approach to the Eastern Area is now adequately explained in the SA/SEA report and, in addition, is sound.

13. The alternative strategic sites for the Newbury/Thatcham Area are re-assessed, but with the strategic allocation at Newbury Racecourse now rightly taken as a commitment. From the 3 reserve site options for Newbury/Thatcham in *Options for the Future*, the Council's selection and justification of Sandleford is explained in 2 stages. The first stage was the in principle rejection of Thatcham as a location for a strategic scale of development. This is referred to in Section 18.2 of the Strategic Sites Policy Paper which relies on the earlier justification set out in section 11 (11.1 -11.7) of the Paper. Clear reasons are given. Given this, in principle, rejection of Thatcham, there was no need for the Council to reappraise the site specific merits of Siege Cross. I consider the soundness of the spatial approach to Thatcham under Issue 2 below.
14. There was, finally, a choice to be made between Sandleford and North Newbury. The Council's comparative re-assessment of these 2 sites is in Appendix 8 of the Strategic Sites Policy Paper with a summary of conclusions in the text of the Policy Paper and in the main report. Clear reasons are given in the summary conclusions. Issues of potential concern in relation to North Newbury included the effect on: the strategic road network, Donnington Castle, the site of the 2nd Battle of Newbury and flood risk. Some of these concerns were highlighted by the Council as a result of representations made at the *Options for the Future* stage. But these potential concerns were not the subject of any assessment by the Council to see if there was any real substance to them or whether they could be overcome by mitigation (or if they were assessed such consideration is not explained in Appendix 8). From the Council's response to my note of 1 March 2012 it is clear that strategic highway matters and flood risk are not, in fact, seen by the Council as show-stoppers to strategic development at North Newbury. Accordingly, the presentation of information in Appendix 8 was not as transparent or as comprehensive as it could have been.
15. Having regard to the wide range of matters taken into account in reassessing these 2 strategic alternatives, the weaknesses in the presentation of the Council's comparative assessment are not so great as to undermine the purpose of the SA/SEA in explaining the reasons for the choice made. The assessment involves the exercise of planning judgment about the general locational merits and characteristics of these 2 sites. No one factor appears crucial to the conclusion the Council reached. I consider that the SA/SEA Update Report provides an adequate explanation to meet the requirements of the Regulations. I consider under Issue 3 the soundness of the choice made.
16. The Council's formal consideration of the *SA/SEA Update Report* was at its meeting on 1 November 2011 (CD09/63). (The document refers to the Council meeting on 25 October 2011, but the meeting was postponed to 1 November to give Members more time to digest all the material). The Council endorsed the document for consultation. The Council considered the responses to that consultation at its meeting on 14 February 2012 (CD09/65). These 2 decisions are also the subject of criticism.
17. Minutes of both meetings (CD09/72 and /73 respectively) record much discussion that was unrelated to the particular choices made in the *SA/SEA Update Report*, but that does not mean that the Council ignored the clear recommendations put before it and the substantial material which

accompanied the agenda, including the *SA/SEA Update Report* in its entirety for the meeting in November 2011. At the meeting on 14 February 2012 a motion to amend the motions formally before the Council (which would have had the effect of removing the Sandleford strategic allocation from the Plan) was not allowed to be put forward on procedural grounds. But if the Council did not wish to proceed with a Core Strategy which contained Sandleford, the motion to proceed with the Plan could have been defeated. I do not regard the conduct of the Council meetings as undermining the Council's compliance with the Regulations concerning the SA/SEA.

18. The officer's report to the meeting on 1 November 2011 (CD09/63) clearly sets out a need for the Council to choose a strategic site for the Newbury/Thatcham area. The report to the meeting on 14 February 2012 (CD09/65) does not re-address this main issue, but considers whether the responses to the consultation should lead to any change in the choices that the Council had made at its meeting in November. This was a satisfactory approach to take. The latter report contains an extensive commentary on the responses to the consultation including, at Appendix G, comments on representations made by the promoters of the North Newbury site. It was not essential for these comments to be set out in full or extensively summarised. The summary of the promoters' concerns in Appendix A of the officer's report makes clear that some of the SA/SEA assessment is considered by them to be factually incorrect and unbalanced. This is the most important point that needed to be communicated. The officer's commentary in Appendix G on matters such as flood risk and highways was ambiguous and it would have been preferable if all matters had been dealt with clearly. But in my view this does not make the report and the Council's decision on it fundamentally flawed. There is nothing to suggest that the Council's decision to maintain the choice of Sandleford as the strategic allocation turned on these detailed matters.
19. Consultation on the SA/SEA Update Report along with the Core Strategy provided a fresh opportunity for existing and new parties to make representations on the Plan. Those new parties seeking a change to the Plan in relation to Sandleford were provided with an opportunity to be heard if they wished. This extended process has ensured that a wide range of residents and interest groups have been able to participate in the Examination.
20. Criticisms have been made by members of the public as to the practical difficulty of using the web-based consultation portal for the latest (and earlier) consultations. However, this is a well used system for such consultations and, importantly, the Council also accepted representations made on paper and by email. Any such difficulties do not fundamentally undermine the consultation process. I am satisfied that the regulatory requirements for consultation have been met.
21. Much criticism was also made of the Council's decision-making process between *Options for the Future* and the published Plan in February 2010. There was a lack of transparency and clear reasoning which compounded the failure of the SA/SEA to address the reasons for the Council's choices from the alternatives. However, those shortcomings have been overcome by the further work undertaken by the Council.

22. There is no regulatory requirement for the Council to take into account the representations made when the Core Strategy is published. I have taken these representations into account as part of the Examination. Publication means that the Council consider the document sound. It was therefore reasonable for the Council's officers to meet with the promoter of the Sandleford allocation (eg meeting 30 March 2010; minutes at CD10/56) to discuss advancing the development through master-planning. By that stage the Council had made what it considered to be a sound allocation and it was logical to seek to progress the matter effectively.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

23. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings I have identified 5 main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends.

Issue 1 – Is the overall amount of housing justified?

24. The submitted Core Strategy refers to the delivery of 10,500 homes in West Berkshire between 2006 and 2026. This intention is principally set out in policy CS1, but is also referred to elsewhere in the Plan. This figure is the requirement for the District in the Regional Strategy (RS), the South East Plan (SEP) (CD04/34). The requirement in the SEP remains part of the Council's justification for the soundness of the Plan in relation to overall housing provision.
25. Whilst the SEP remains in place, it is a relevant consideration, not least because of the statutory requirement to ensure that the Core Strategy is in general conformity with it. General conformity does not require precise adherence to the housing figure in the SEP, although there is much more flexibility to provide more housing than less. The SEP was not able to plan for all need and demand and it indicates (7.6-7.7) that local planning authorities can test higher numbers through their development plans. The SEP had a long evolution before its final approval in 2009 and much of the evidence dates from much earlier, eg 2004 household projections. Its assessment of housing needs and demand is not therefore up to date.
26. In my note of 13 July 2011 identifying further matters of unsoundness, I stated that the Council's reliance on the SEP must, at that time, carry substantial weight as the RS had grappled with the conflicting needs and pressures for housing and constraints to its delivery. The RS was intended to reduce uncertainty for Councils in producing lower-order plans. But I also flagged that the considerations relevant at the time I concluded my report might be materially different, as indeed is the case. My note pre-dated publication of the draft NPPF. The Localism Act now gives the Government the authority to revoke the RSs and the final NPPF has been published. I need to assess the soundness of the housing provision in the light of the NPPF's requirements.
27. The *Berkshire Housing Market Assessment* (BHMA) February 2007 (CD09/14 & 15) does not provide a clear understanding of housing needs and demands in the area as required by NPPF paragraph 159. The BHMA states that it has not

sought to assess the overall number of new dwellings required/demand for housing (eg 1.03, Table 10.1, 10.73/10.74). This element of the assessment is drawn from the then emerging SEP. The BHMA does, however, indicate a substantial need for affordable housing (Table 7.37 gives a range of 720-880 annually) which is far greater than the annual average for overall housing provision. The NPPF seeks such needs to be met in full (subject only to the overall balancing of needs against environmental impact set out in paragraph 14). Whilst the Council has sought to maximise the *proportion* of affordable housing to be secured from market developments (see policy CS7 below) the great need for affordable housing does not appear to have weighed materially in assessing the appropriate overall level of housing in the District.

28. The most recent ONS based *household* projections (November 2010, but based on the 2008 population projections) indicate an additional 16,000 households in West Berkshire to 2026. More recent *population* projections indicate a lower rate of increase in the population for the District, but still materially above that projected from the provision of 10,500 dwellings. These projections are based on an extrapolation of the previous 5 years. The 5 year periods leading up to 2008 and 2010 saw considerable changes in relation to the economy and international migration, which may change again over the next 15 years to 2026. There is thus inevitable uncertainty as to the veracity of such projections for planning purposes, but the NPPF clearly expects such projections to form part of an assessment of need and demand.
29. The NPPF requires a cross-border approach to planning and the District must not ignore any unmet housing needs in adjoining areas. The other Councils making up the West Central Berkshire Housing Market Area all have adopted Core Strategies (based on the SEP). None explicitly require any provision in West Berkshire of unmet needs and none of the adjoining Councils made representations to the Examination seeking such explicit provision. However there is evidence that such cross-boundary provision may be required. The report of the Panel (2007) which held the Examination-in-Public of the draft SEP (CD04/35) concluded that housing provision in the Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley was significantly too low (7.79) and had recommended (Recommendation 21.3) an additional 7,500 dwellings on the edge of Reading in West Berkshire to meet the needs of Greater Reading. The Secretary of State did not take up this recommendation because of problems with its deliverability, but she did not take issue with the overall need identified (*Schedule of Changes and Reasoned Justification* CD04/43, Pages 127/128).
30. Given all the above, the Core Strategy's planned provision of 10,500 is not justified by an assessment which meets the requirements of the NPPF. The available evidence indicates that need and demand within the District are materially greater than planned provision and that there may be needs in the wider area that are not being met because the SEP was unable to fully address them. However, in the absence of an up-to-date, comprehensive SHMA based on the Housing Market Area and agreed between the relevant local authorities covering that HMA, there is insufficient evidence to identify what are the objectively assessed needs and demands.
31. The Council emphasised that environmental constraints within the District weigh against making significantly greater provision for housing. But the

evidence does not justify such a firm conclusion. Outside the AONB (see discussion under issue 2), there is the potential to deliver more than the 10,500 proposed in the CS. The SHLAA (CD09/55, Table 4) identifies sites for over 16,000 additional dwellings across the whole District (on sites assessed as deliverable and *potentially* developable). There are some weaknesses in the Council's approach to assessing and classifying sites as *potentially* developable and the cumulative impact of developing all such sites, such as on infrastructure, has not been assessed. But the SHLAA does not support any conclusion that provision should be limited to around 10,500.

32. The SA/SEA (CD07/72 and earlier iterations) tested the outcomes of 3 Options in relation to overall housing provision: no policy; delivery of 11,000 dwellings; and allocating more than the RS requirement (SA Policy Paper *Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock* especially Appendix 1). Until November 2009, the Council believed that 11,000 dwellings might be the overall requirement, based on the SEP requirement and a shortfall against the Local Plan. But it was subsequently made clear that the SEP included consideration of past shortfalls (CD07/28). The SA/SEA concluded that providing 11,000 dwellings would have some positive impacts, with limited negative effects which could be mitigated. Allocating above 11,000 dwellings was the least sustainable option, with a number of constraints identified.
33. This SA/SEA work does not fulfil the requirement in NPPF paragraph 14 that objectively assessed needs should be met unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In the absence of an up-to-date assessment of needs and demands there can be no proper weighing between meeting those needs compared with the potential environmental impacts. In the comparison of options in the SA Policy Paper referred to above, the first objective against which the options are assessed is *to provide good quality housing to meet local needs*. The same benefit is ascribed to the provision of 11,000 dwellings as to allocating more than that figure. This is because the assessment regarded the 11,000/SEP requirement as the level of local need, whereas more up-to date evidence indicates needs and demand are greater. Accordingly, the provision of 10,500 cannot be justified on the basis of the potential environmental impact of providing significantly more because the necessary evidence is not available and the required balancing has not been undertaken.
34. The Council accepts that the figure of 10,500 should not be seen as a cap on provision. To make this clear the Council accepts that *at least* should be introduced as a preface to the figure in policy CS1 and elsewhere. The Council also accept that if the Core Strategy is adopted there would need to be an early review of housing provision on the basis of a new SHMA produced in co-operation with the other authorities in the HMA. The Council wants to be able to take into account results from the 2011 Census which are not yet available. Accordingly, the Council recognises that, in so far as housing provision is concerned, this Plan may only have a short life prior to a review.
35. The lack of justification for housing provision which complies fully with the requirements of the NPPF is a significant shortcoming and there is no specific main modification which I could make now to overcome this problem. What is required is a new SHMA which complies with NPPF paragraph 159, the apportionment of identified needs and demands between local authorities

within the HMA, coupled with an explicit balancing of meeting those needs against environmental impacts. Given that this work requires co-operative working between several authorities (where all except West Berkshire have no immediate need to undertake such work), the task is likely to be complex and take considerable time. It would require a very lengthy further suspension to secure this as part of this Examination.

36. Given the passage of time since the initial preparation of the Plan, evidence on other matters would also become increasingly out of date and need to be reviewed. This would add to the scale of the work and the complexity of the process. Further, possibly substantial, changes to the submitted Plan would add to the complexity of the Examination and make public consultation much harder to undertake effectively. The process would be at odds with the Government's objective of making the planning system simpler, easier to understand and more effective. A suspension to allow for this work is not a realistic way forward. Alternatively, the Council could withdraw the Plan. The process would have to be restarted at an appropriate pre-submission stage and, in due course, the Council would need to publish a new draft plan and subsequently submit it for Examination afresh. Clearly that would take even longer than allowing a suspension.
37. In my view, this Plan must be regarded as being unfortunately caught in the transitional period between the long contemplated demise of Regional Strategies which has still not concluded and the emergence of the NPPF as the sole higher tier guidance for the preparation of Local Plans. There is some force in the criticism that the Council could and should have responded more constructively to the changing planning context following publication of the draft NPPF last summer and my earlier preliminary conclusion about evidence of greater demand for housing. But the timescale for producing an agreed cross-border SHMA would still have been protracted, with probably greater difficulty than now in securing the immediate co-operation of the adjoining authorities, given the policy and legislative uncertainty at that time. The cost and effort that the Council and many other parties have put into the Examination would have been wasted if the plan had been withdrawn then or if it is withdrawn now, although withdrawal is what some parties seek.
38. I have considered what process would best achieve the aims of the NPPF, notwithstanding the identified shortcoming in relation to a fully compliant assessment of housing needs and demands. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out 12 core planning principles, which include that planning should be genuinely plan-led, a positive process to support sustainable economic development.
39. The Core Strategy would confirm the strategic allocation at Sandford (which I have found sound under issue 3 below, subject to detailed modifications). It would thus enable this very substantial development to proceed in a plan-led way and enable homes to be delivered on this site more quickly than if the Core Strategy is further delayed or withdrawn. It would also enable further allocations for housing and other uses to be made in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD, even though such allocations may need to be supplemented following a review of the Core Strategy, as sought by the Council. Substantial further delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy would mean that necessary greenfield housing would have to be judged primarily on the basis of the

guidance in the NPPF and would not be plan-led. It is not difficult to envisage a significant increase in the number of appeals, creating delay, uncertainty and additional costs for all parties involved. Needed homes would not be built any sooner.

40. I consider that seeking to advance the substantial strategic allocation at Sandlesford does represent a positive approach to planning by the Council, as encouraged in the NPPF. Although I have found that the Plan has not been positively prepared because of the lack of an up-to-date assessment of needs in relation to housing, the Council had been seeking to positively respond to the requirements of the SEP, when that was rightly seen as embodying such objectively assessed needs. The Council also recognises the importance of making progress on the work necessary to comply with NPPF paragraph 159. In my view, there are exceptional circumstances relating to this Plan, in the context of this protracted Examination, which should be taken into account in deciding the appropriate way forward.
41. On balance, I consider that the Government's planning aims, as set out in the NPPF, are best achieved in the short term in West Berkshire by the adoption of this Core Strategy (subject to the main modifications necessary for soundness), but amended to make clear that the 10,500 housing figure is a minimum and not a ceiling and requiring a review of housing provision. This review would be in 2 stages. Firstly, a review of needs and demands for housing to inform the appropriate scale of housing to be met in the District. This would be done through an update of the SHMA which complies with NPPF. This review is a stand-alone piece of work and a pre-requisite of any review of the Core Strategy itself. This SHMA should be completed within 3 years. Secondly, if the updated SHMA indicates that housing provision within the District needs to be greater than currently planned, a review of the scale of housing provision in the Core Strategy will be undertaken. It is not possible at present to set a realistic timetable for that to be completed. I have deleted from the changes proposed by the Council much of the supporting text which seeks to justify 10,500 dwellings as an appropriate scale of provision, since my conclusion suggests that it is not a justified long term basis for planning in West Berkshire. All these changes are made in **MMs 3.2, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.2**.
42. Strategic objective 3 aims to meet housing need and is consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The plan is not delivering that objective for the reasons given above. However, rather than modify and weaken that objective (as previously proposed by the Council) the objective should remain as an aim to be achieved in the intended review.
43. In making clear that 10,500 dwellings is a minimum and not a ceiling, I have considered whether provision in the various spatial areas in ADPPs 2, 3, 4, and 6 (ie outside the AONB) should also refer to *at least* the specified number of dwellings rather than *approximately*, as currently written. Whilst it is likely that, outside the AONB, the given figures may eventually be exceeded over the plan period, it would be unnecessarily prescriptive to specify that they are all a minimum. It is reasonable for the Council to have some flexibility in making the initial allocations in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. In addition, the change is not essential because I see no reason why those figures in ADPP policies would be used to resist an otherwise acceptable development solely because the planned provision would be exceeded.

Housing Delivery

44. I have already highlighted that there are likely to be more than sufficient sites to deliver at least 10,500 dwellings. The Council recognises that greenfield allocations will be needed adjoining the main settlements in all spatial areas to meet housing provision and modifications to make this clear in the relevant ADPPs are referred to under issue 2 below.
45. NPPF paragraph 47 requires the 5 year supply of housing to be supplemented by an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from a later period) or of 20% where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing. The latest *Annual Monitoring Report* (CD09/67, Table C.9) sets out net completions in the District compared with the Berkshire Structure Plan requirement up to 2005/6 and the SEP requirement thereafter. There was under delivery in 7 of the past 12 years. This is a reasonable period over which to assess delivery, but I give more weight to recent years than the early 2000s. Delivery need not be assessed within discrete Local Plan or Core Strategy periods. The current severe recession is inevitably part of the reason for under delivery in the past 2 years, but there was high delivery for the 5 years preceding those. It would not be reasonable currently to conclude that the Council has a record of persistent under delivery. Only a 5% buffer is therefore required.
46. The Council's current assessment of housing supply is 5.2 years (CD09/67, Table 3.2) which just about equates to 5 years plus 5%. This assessment includes a non-implementation allowance for sites with planning permission under 10 units. The assessment does not include any allowance for windfalls as the Council has not yet done the assessment of any such potential in the terms set out in the NPPF. Conversely, many parties consider that the Council has been too optimistic in its assumptions relating to delivery on identified sites. The precise figure for the 5 year requirement also depends on the method used for calculating the residual requirement.
47. I do not need to explore further the robustness of the current 5 year supply given that the SHLAA shows that there are sufficient sites to more than meet current planned provision and the Core Strategy acknowledges the need for greenfield sites on the edge of the main settlements. There is no modification that could immediately be made to the Core Strategy to enhance delivery in the short term. If the 5 year plus 5% cannot be achieved (or if a 20% buffer becomes required), the Council may need to permit schemes ahead of the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. The adopted Core Strategy would provide a framework for doing so. The potential fragility of the 5 year supply in the short term is not a reason to find the Core Strategy unsound. Given the passage of time since submission, the housing land supply information and the trajectory in Appendix B of the Plan needs to be updated, and the table showing distribution between settlements needs to be deleted (achieved by **MMs 7.1** and **7.2**).
48. If the plan were to be adopted in 2012, the plan period to 2026 would be less than the 15 year period considered preferable in the NPPF (paragraph 157). However, this is not a significant failing given the need for an early review of housing provision, the potential identified in the SHLAA and the ongoing contribution to housing supply provided by the Sandford strategic allocation. The Council intends to roll forward the existing annual average housing

requirement beyond 2026, assuming that the plan has not been reviewed in the meantime which clarifies its intentions. This is sufficient to make the plan sound on this matter (achieved by **MM 5.3**).

Issue 2 – Is the spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and housing distribution clearly expressed, appropriate and justified by evidence.

49. The strategy is the outcome of 3 spatial elements. Firstly, the identification of a settlement hierarchy in ADPP 1. Secondly, the division of the District into 4 spatial areas: Newbury and Thatcham (covered separately by ADPP policies 2 and 3 respectively); the Eastern Area (ADPP4); the North Wessex Downs AONB (ADPP5); and the East Kennet Valley (ADPP6). The third element is the chosen distribution of the housing requirement between these areas and the settlements within them, with various housing numbers being ascribed to groups of settlements in ADPP1 and to the spatial areas in ADPPs 2-6. Housing distribution figures are also largely repeated in policy CS2.
50. The complex presentation of different housing figures in different policies for different purposes in the submitted Core Strategy makes it confusing and ineffective in ensuring the right scale of development occurs in the right place. The confusing presentation is exacerbated by treating the Eastern Area as overlapping with the eastern part of the AONB spatial area resulting in double counting in some of the housing figures. The allocation of an overall figure for the Rural Service Centres (RSC) and Service Villages (SV) makes the final selection of housing provision something of a competition between very different centres, rather than what is appropriate for those settlements individually. The plan is not effective as submitted. Greater clarity and simplicity of presentation is required to be effective.
51. There are various ways that this unsoundness could be overcome. Changes proposed by the Council delete the whole of policy CS2 and supporting text (**MM 5.4**); adds to policy CS1 some of the relevant material that was in policy CS2, including making clear where development will take place and the need for allocating greenfield sites in all 4 spatial areas (**MM 5.1**); and adds new supporting text to policy ADPP1 (some of which was the supporting text to CS2) so as to explain how housing will be distributed to the different settlements in the settlement hierarchy (**MM 4.4**). The housing numbers are also removed from policy ADPP1 (**MM 4.3**). This leaves ADPP 2-6 providing broad housing numbers to guide the scale of development in each area. The distribution of housing is considered further below, but the changes highlighted here make the presentation effective.

Settlement hierarchy

52. ADPP1 groups named settlements into one of 3 categories. The highest tier of the settlement hierarchy is defined as the *urban areas* and encompasses: Newbury, Thatcham, and the Eastern Urban Area of Tilehurst, Calcot and Purley-on-Thames. The Eastern Urban Area is contiguous with the built-up part of Reading Borough. There is little dispute that all these areas should be identified as urban areas. Theale is very close to the edge of the Eastern Urban Area. Whilst a case could be made for it to be included within this area, the Council's approach of treating it as a distinct settlement in the next tier of the hierarchy is sufficiently justified by its physical separation from the edge of

greater Reading by the M4, Junction 12 and some parcels of undeveloped land, as well as historical and community factors.

53. Settlements outside the urban areas are regarded by the Council as rural settlements. Their sustainability/suitability for additional development has been assessed by detailed scoring based on services and facilities within the settlements and linkages to larger settlements/urban areas. The process was first set out in Background Paper: *A Rural Settlement Hierarchy for West Berkshire* May 2008 (CD07/05) and subsequently refined in the *Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper* July 2010 (CD08/07). The latter introduced additional factors, including size of population. This is not as good an indicator of sustainability as the assessment of actual facilities, but this factor did not significantly change the overall outcome. The range and scope of factors used was sufficient for the purpose and undue precision should not be expected or sought in such analysis. The Council acknowledged that the score for Hermitage should be 18 and not the 15 recorded in the Topic Paper. It should not be any higher. The Council's assessment of local facilities in that village is reasonable.
54. The Council explored several options by which to group the ranked settlements to form a simple hierarchy, as explained in the Topic Paper. The Council's approach is justified for the reasons given, provided that the differences in the size and sustainability of settlements within the same tier is recognised when considering the scale of development that should be accommodated.
55. Lambourn is included as a RSC, even though there is a gap between its score and that of the next centre in this group (Mortimer). The inclusion of Lambourn in this category was the focus of those promoting other villages as RSCs because of their similar scores (or similar scores if adjusted to fit suggested new scorings) particularly Compton, Kintbury, Chieveley and Hermitage. However, the Council explained that the inclusion of Lambourn as an RSC was not based solely on its score, but in recognition of its particular role serving the substantial horseracing industry which is based in the Lambourn Valley and its fairly remote location. Lambourn is a justified exception as an RSC, but its inclusion as a RSC does not justify the inclusion of other villages with similar scores or population. Including additional villages in this category would create a much more dispersed pattern to new housing which would not be justified on sustainability grounds.
56. The different characteristics of the urban areas and of the RSCs are highlighted by the classification of town/district centres in Policy CS12. This policy identifies Newbury as a major town centre; Thatcham and Hungerford as town centres and Pangbourne, Lambourn and Theale as district centres. Except for Lambourn, this hierarchy is justified by evidence in the *West Berkshire Retail and Leisure Study* July 2003 (CD09/19) and the *Retail Study Update* February 2010 (CD09/20) and there is little contrary evidence in relation to existing centres. Lambourn is justified, exceptionally, as a district centre for the reason already given for its inclusion as an RSC.
57. Below the 3 tiers of named locations, policy ADPP1 also indicates that smaller villages with settlement boundaries will be suitable for limited infill development, subject to the character and form of the settlement. The combination of RSCs and SVs (which are widely distributed throughout the

District), the smaller settlements where infilling is allowed, and rural exception sites for affordable housing will allow adequate opportunity for appropriate development within the rural area to sustain rural communities. Conversely, an excessively dispersed pattern of new development in isolated areas will be avoided. This element of the spatial strategy is consistent with the NPPF. More flexibility for development in smaller villages is not justified. For clarity a definition of infilling needs to be added to the Glossary (achieved in **MM 7.8**).

58. No settlements outside West Berkshire are identified as part of the settlement hierarchy. Reading is a major centre which meets many of the needs of the eastern part of West Berkshire, as well as higher order services for much of the District. Its location adjoining the Eastern Urban Area is part of the justification for that area being included in the highest tier of the settlement hierarchy. The dynamic interrelationship between Reading and the District was poorly reflected in the submitted plan, but is better drawn out in the proposed new text for cross boundary issues (**MM 2.2**) and in the changes to the SWOT table (**MM 2.3**). These changes are necessary for soundness. With these changes there is no need for Reading to be specifically identified as part of the settlement hierarchy. These matters relate to the wider issue of the overall scale and justification for housing in the District. Given the shortcomings of the evidence already highlighted and the need for a review, these cross border matters can be addressed only partially at this stage.
59. The built-up area of Tadley (within Basingstoke and Deane Borough) abuts the boundary of West Berkshire. Tadley is a district centre in that Borough's Local Plan. On the basis of the factors used to score rural settlements in West Berkshire, Tadley scores 32, making it comparable to the identified Rural Service Centres. The role of Tadley is not acknowledged in any policy and so the Core Strategy effectively precludes any development in West Berkshire abutting the built-up edge of this settlement, whereas for other settlements of comparable (and smaller size) some development adjoining the built-up edge would be acceptable in principle (depending on various settlement and site specific matters).
60. Whilst the Council emphasises that it cannot control what happens in Tadley, equally, Basingstoke and Deane Borough could not propose any development over its border. It is a situation which calls for a joint planned approach to how this settlement should develop. The omission of Tadley from the settlement hierarchy would need to be addressed were it not for the fact that there is currently an effective embargo on future development on this northern edge of Tadley because of the presence of the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) at Aldermaston, as discussed under the East Kennet Valley below.
61. Goring is another settlement which abuts the District boundary. Some facilities within this settlement were taken into account in the score for the smaller village of Streatley, but given the separation of these 2 settlements by the Thames and the single bridge linking them over the river, Goring does not justify any particular role in the settlement hierarchy of West Berkshire.

Spatial Areas and housing distribution

62. Apart from the inappropriate overlap between the Eastern Area and the AONB, there is no serious dispute that the 4 spatial areas are a reasonable way of

focusing the strategy. They do not, however, directly relate to the division of West Berkshire made in the SEP between the greater part of the District within the Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley sub-region and the remnant of rural West Berkshire. In the latter area, the SEP (policy AOSR1) ascribes 1,000 dwellings over the plan period. This rural remnant is all within the AONB, but the AONB covers a larger area. The 2,000 dwellings proposed for the AONB (see below) is sufficient to keep this part of the Plan in general conformity with the spatial strategy of the SEP, particularly as the division between the sub region and the rural remnant shown in the SEP is diagrammatic only.

63. The broad approach to the distribution of housing is to allocate 75% to the urban areas (Newbury, Thatcham and the Eastern Urban Area) with the balance of 25% to the various settlements in the rural area, mainly the RSCs and SVs. Subject to the need to manage provision in the AONB to conserve and enhance the landscape (see below) this broad distribution is sound. A significantly more dispersed distribution to lower order centres would not be sustainable in terms of accessibility. A much greater focus on the urban areas would undermine the vitality of rural settlements, particularly the larger settlements such as Hungerford and provision to meet at least some local needs in these settlements.

Newbury/Thatcham

64. These 2 towns are within the same spatial area but are addressed separately in ADPP 2 and 3 respectively. The Plan proposes about 5,400 dwellings at Newbury, but only about 900 homes at Thatcham. In making choices about where strategic scale development should go in the Newbury/Thatcham area, the Council choose to focus on Newbury. The reasons are set out in the SA Policy Paper for Strategic Sites (section 11). The SEP (policy WCBV1) identifies Newbury as one of the sub-regional hubs which are to be the focus of transport investment and development. Thatcham is not mentioned. Whilst Thatcham is an urban area closely related to Newbury, it is reasonable for the Council to consider that it is not part of the sub-regional hub. The Council also took into account the fact that Thatcham had seen considerable housing growth in recent years. It wants the focus to be on regeneration and renewal of facilities rather than further growth. These reasons resulted in the rejection of Thatcham as a location for a strategic site and provision for only a modest proportion of the growth apportioned to all urban areas.
65. The Council's focus on Newbury and the modest level of provision made at Thatcham is not the only approach that could have been pursued. Additional development at Thatcham might be able to contribute to some of the infrastructure improvements and other changes the Council seeks. In the light of the planned review of housing provision, the approach to Thatcham may need to be reviewed if additional housing has to be accommodated in the District. For the present, the approach in the Plan is a justified local choice made by the Council and a fundamental change is not required.
66. The Council accepts that the policy for Thatcham should acknowledge that the delivery of planned provision will include greenfield sites adjoining the settlement. This is necessary for effectiveness in subsequent delivery. The Council also accepts that one consequence of the policy for Thatcham is that, compared with Newbury, local needs will be addressed far less effectively.

The reference to development *addressing local needs* is thus misleading and needs to be more circumspect. These changes are incorporated in **MM 4.9** and are the only changes relating to housing in the Newbury/Thatcham area necessary to make the Plan sound.

67. At the hearing in June 2011, the Council indicated that Thatcham would be considered for greenfield extensions along with Newbury to meet the remaining requirement in this overall spatial area, after allowing for the development of the 2 Strategic Allocations. However, the Council has not suggested any change in response to this comment, apart from the acknowledgment of the need for greenfield development to accommodate the level of development planned for the town. As this comment was inconsistent with the Council's overall reasoning as to the balance of development between Thatcham and Newbury a further change is not needed for soundness. In any overall review to accommodate more housing, Thatcham would be a location to be considered again for additional housing, consistent with its position in the top tier of the settlement hierarchy.

Eastern Area

68. In the submitted plan, the Eastern Area consists of the Eastern Urban Area, the RSC of Theale and part of the eastern AONB, including the RSC of Pangbourne. Approximately 1500 dwellings are proposed in ADPP4. About half of this number have permission or have been built since 2006. On the diagram illustrating this area, there is hatching annotated as *Eastern Area broad location for development* which includes all the urban area; Theale and intervening land between that settlement and the urban edge; the edge of the AONB abutting the urban area and the surroundings of Pangbourne.
69. As indicated above, the overlap between this spatial area and the AONB is confusing and should be removed. This is also necessary to recognise the degree of constraint and landscape priority which should be applied to the AONB (see also below). There is no justification for extending the hatching of the *broad location for development* into the AONB and around Pangbourne, especially as the SHLAA identifies more than enough sites outside the AONB to accommodate the broad scale of development proposed in this area. The hatching should be retained outside the AONB as it confirms the acceptability in principle of searching for housing allocations beyond the built-up area. An explanation for the purpose of the remaining hatching is needed in the policy. The removal of the spatial overlap and thus of an element of double counting in the housing numbers reduces the housing figure to 1,400 dwellings in this spatial area. These changes are achieved by **MMs 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.12, 4.14, and 4.15.**
70. The Council also confirmed at the hearing that sites in the SHLAA (CD09/55) which are in the AONB, but which have retained their original prefix EUA are not intended to be part of the basket of potentially developable sites to assist delivery in the Eastern Area. Their inclusion in the schedule under the Eastern Area was an oversight. The Council should ensure that this correction is made in any future update of the SHLAA.
71. The Council agreed that the reference in ADPP4 that the permission for 350 homes at Theale Lakeside *will be delivered* should be removed as misleading.

Delivery is outside the Council's control and there is uncertainty arising from the permission for business development on the same site. Paragraph 4.28 refers to no strategic-scale development being proposed at Theale, which may give a misleading impression that no development is likely, when Theale and adjoining land is included in the identified *broad location for development*. The amendments necessary for clarity and effectiveness are in **MM 4.13** and part of **MM 4.15**.

72. Within the context of the overall scale of provision proposed in the Plan, the proportion to be provided in the Eastern Area is justified. There is potential to deliver more than proposed, subject to assessment of the cumulative impacts of nearby developments. The extent to which such potential should be explored further would best be addressed in the context of the required review of the plan and any subsequent increase in the overall housing requirement.

AONB

73. ADDP5 covers the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The submitted policy proposes 2,100 dwellings within the AONB over the plan period. This figure reflects the overlap with the Eastern Area. As a consequence of separating these areas, the Council's intended provision within the AONB is reduced to 2,000 dwellings and this is the figure I refer to in the following discussion. Also as a consequence of making the 2 spatial areas separate some changes are required to the text describing the role of Pangbourne and to the AONB Area Diagram. These are included in the modifications recommended at the end of this section.
74. The submitted policy and text make clear that the landscape will be conserved and enhanced. But the proportion of overall housing assigned to the AONB and the potential scale of development in different locations within the AONB had not specifically taken into account the potential landscape impact to see if the stated policy aim would be achieved by what is actually proposed. My note of 15 November 2010 indicated that this part of the Core Strategy was not compliant with national policy because it was not apparent that *great weight* has been given to the conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside (as then required by PPS7, paragraph 21). NPPF paragraph 115 continues to require *great weight* to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs.
75. The Council's subsequent *Landscape Sensitivity Assessment* January 2011 (CD09/57) gives some support to its view that the priority to be given to preserving and enhancing the landscape set out in the first sentence of ADPP5 can be met whilst still achieving the scale of development proposed. Whether or not a particular development on a particular site would achieve the policy objective will depend on the existing intrinsic qualities of the site; the scale, density and design of new buildings; integration of the new development with the existing built form and the wider countryside; and any cumulative impact with other planned developments. Acceptability will have to be judged on a site-by-site basis and is a matter for the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.
76. Over 1,200 dwellings had been built or were committed in the AONB as of March 2011 (CD09/67, Table 4.13). The SHLAA (CD09/55, Table 4) identifies potentially developable sites for about 187 dwellings within the main

settlements, where the landscape impact is likely to be acceptable. The SHLAA also identifies sites for up to 1,829 dwellings outside existing settlement boundaries, as informed by the landscape assessment. Achieving the landscape objective of ADPP5 on some, if not many, of the greenfield sites in the AONB may be very challenging or impossible. But only some greenfield sites need to be developed to deliver the scale of housing proposed.

77. The landscape assessment work undertaken on behalf of the North Wessex Downs AONB Unit is generally more critical of, or more sensitive to, landscape impacts, than the Council's study, but nonetheless broadly agrees with that evidence in respect of a number of modest greenfield sites adjoining settlements. There are also 2 large brownfield sites at Compton and Hermitage where substantial redevelopment for housing or mixed use might take place whilst achieving positive outcomes for the landscape. Accordingly, there is evidence to indicate that the scale of development could be delivered in a way likely to meet the aim of ADPP5.
78. It is unrealistic to seek to limit housing provision in the AONB to local needs only. Local needs, such as for affordable housing, are most likely to be met by securing a proportion of such housing from market housing developments. Equally, it would not be sound if provision of approximately 2,000 dwellings overrode the landscape objective. To be sound, the reference in policy ADPP5 to 2,000 dwellings needs to be prefaced with *up to* so as to make clear that it is not a minimum that has to be achieved and that delivering less is acceptable. Additional explanation of the landscape-led approach to be taken when progressing the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD is also required. There is sufficient capacity in the other spatial areas to make up any shortfall in the AONB so as to ensure that at least 10,500 dwellings are provided in the District. Two variations of possible changes to the policy to remedy this unsoundness were consulted on and I have incorporated the Council's preferred wording in **MM 4.21**. The other necessary and consequential modifications for soundness relating to the AONB are in **MMs 4.17, 4.19 and 4.25**.
79. Changes proposed by the Council (and now included in MM 4.21) provide an explanation for the approach to the relative scale of development to be accommodated in the various identified settlements in the AONB. These are necessary for the reasons already given in relation to the clarity of presentation in the plan. Given the landscape led approach that has to be taken there is not sufficient evidence to ascribe specific housing figures to the different settlements in the AONB.

East Kennet Valley

80. This spatial area contains 2 RSCs: Burghfield Common and Mortimer and 2 SVs: Aldermaston and Woolhampton. It is clearly the Council's intention that the 2 service centres of Burghfield Common and Mortimer will be the focus for development in the area. That focus is sound. A small change is needed to make this clear and to avoid the impression that there is any other focus for development. This is included in **MM 4.27** which also includes consequential changes arising from other matters discussed in this report. This part of the policy rightly acknowledges that there are a number of potentially developable sites which could be allocated as extensions to these villages.

81. Within the context of the overall scale of provision proposed in the Plan the proportion to be provided in the East Kennet Valley is justified by its more rural character, limited services and its separation from the built up area of greater Reading. It would not be justified for this location to be allocated a scale of development similar to that to be accommodated in the Eastern Area. The SHLAA has, however, identified the potential to deliver more than proposed, subject to the assessment of the cumulative impacts of nearby developments. The extent to which such potential should be explored further would best be addressed in the context of any subsequent increase in the overall housing requirement.
82. Policy ADPP 6 refers to the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD exploring opportunities for a more distinct centre offering shops and services in Burghfield Common. At present there is a scatter of small convenience shops across the settlement, but no specific centre and Burghfield Common is not an identified district centre in policy CS12. It is not essential for soundness for this issue to be answered in this Plan. It can be left to a subsequent part of what will be the overall Local Plan. Whilst the lack of local shops and services is cited by the Council as one reason for not allocating more housing than proposed, a new centre and/or additional provision is unlikely to change the overall accessibility and sustainability of this spatial area compared with the identified urban areas.
83. Policy ADPP6 refers to the presence of the 2 AWE sites in this spatial area, to the need for monitoring housing completions and population levels and the need to strictly control development within the zones set out in Appendix C of the Plan, which are the planning consultation zones defined by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) to ensure that the HSE is satisfied that there is capacity to accommodate an increase in population. Since submission of the Plan, the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) (an Executive Agency of the HSE) is the body which would provides advice in response to planning consultations around the AWE sites.
84. At the outset of the Examination I was concerned that the Core Strategy did not sufficiently grapple with this issue and focussed too much on the consultation process rather than the likely outcomes and any implications for the strategy. From all the information now available, I draw the following conclusions:
- The scale and general location of development proposed in the East Kennet Valley in ADPP6 is unlikely to result in the ONR advising against such development at a later stage of the development plan process or in response to a planning application.
 - The scale of housing in this spatial area does not need to be specifically capped at the figure proposed in ADPP6 on the grounds of the constraint of the AWE sites. There is scope to accommodate more housing than proposed in the Plan if required or otherwise justified. Whether or not ONR the advise against such proposals would depend on the scale and location of the proposal, other planned developments and future updates to its modelling process arising from changed circumstances.
 - At present, the ONR is highly likely to advise against nearly all applications

for additional dwellings within the inner land use planning zones defined around the 2 AWE sites. The Council intends to follow that advice and seeks to bring clarity to this matter through the development plan.

- The complexity of the ONR's modelling process, the scope for different outcomes from different inputs and the likely material changes in relevant data and other circumstances over the plan period preclude any firm policy beyond the inner zone.
- The need for the extendibility of countermeasures (arising from an incident at either site) beyond the detailed emergency planning zones (as outlined, for example, in CD10/98) does not need to be replicated in the land use planning approach.
- The Secretary of State's decision (16 June 2011) to allow 115 dwellings and other development at Boundary Hall, Tadley was a balanced decision on the particular circumstances of that case and does not undermine the ONR's policy approach or the need for the Council to make clear its intention to follow that advice in the inner zone. This decision does not justify the implications of the AWE sites and the ONR's views having to be considered solely on a case-by-case basis. The development plan should provide reasonable certainty for all interested parties as to the type and scale of development likely to be acceptable in different locations, avoiding the potentially wasted effort of proposals being pursued which had little prospect of success.

85. In the light of the above, I consider that the submitted plan is unsound in its response to the AWE sites. It is ineffective in addressing the likely spatial implications. A clear policy should be set out reflecting the high degree of constraint likely to be applied in the inner consultation zone, with a clear explanation of the implications over the wider area. A new policy to this effect was proposed by the Council as part of the first round of consultation on possible changes and refined again, with amplification of the text, following the hearings in June 2011. This new policy and related text is necessary to make the plan sound. The consolidated changes are set out in **MM 5.18**. Appropriate cross references to this policy are included in **MM 4.27**. The Council intends to show the consultation zones on the Proposals Map (as illustrated in CD07/46). As a consequence of this new policy Appendix C in the submitted plan is not needed. It is removed by **MM 7.3**.

Issue 3 – Is the allocation of the strategic site at Sandford justified in principle and appropriately addressed in detail?

The nature of the proposal

86. As submitted, policy CS4 gives no indication as to where development would take place at Sandford. The red line allocation on the submission Proposals Map encompasses a large area, even though the Council and site owner/promoter have consistently envisaged (since at least *Options for the Future*) built development only in the northern and western parts of the red line area. This lack of clarity makes the submitted policy unsound due to ineffectiveness.

87. Following the hearings in November 2010, the Council proposed (CD07/41) to

include in the Core Strategy a concept plan (to become Appendix Ci of the Core Strategy) which shows where development would take place and to amend the policy wording to similar effect (as well as making other changes). These 2 changes would overcome this element of unsoundness. The changes are included in the composite changes to policy CS4 that I recommend at the end of this section. I have amended the key on the concept plan to replace *residential area* with *development area*, since the area shown includes not just housing, but land for a new primary school, a local centre and elements of open space, such as wildlife buffers. The discussion below is based on the development broadly as illustrated on the concept plan. At the hearings in November 2010, discussion also had regard to the promoter's master plan (CD10/63 and /64) which show how 2,000 houses, along with other requirements, could be accommodated on the site. This master plan is consistent with the area for development shown on the concept plan.

Need for a strategic greenfield allocation

88. The proposed allocation at Sandford is for up to 2,000 dwellings. Half this number is proposed to be delivered by 2026, but there is no upper limit on what can be delivered in this period. The Council places particular emphasis on the benefit of long term planning beyond 2026 so as to give all parties some certainty about how Newbury will develop in the long term. Whilst the Council could have allocated a site for only 1,000 dwellings to 2026, it is a justified approach for the Council to take a longer term perspective and represents an element of positive planning. This has the benefit of ensuring that the optimum approach to development in this area is achieved, rather than development taking place over time in a series of smaller proposals resulting in a more piecemeal approach. The scale of the development also embeds an element of continuity for housing supply beyond the plan period, recognising that there will continue to be a need for new housing after 2026.
89. The Council's latest 5 year housing supply assessment (contained within CD09/67) assumes a contribution of 100 dwellings from Sandford in 2016/17 and 100 dwellings per year thereafter. The start date is not unrealistic. In the absence of any cap on the scale of development within the plan period, the Council's approach ensures that there is the opportunity, in favourable conditions, of the site making a greater contribution to housing supply to 2026 than currently envisaged. Consistent with the Council's expectations of the contribution that the Sandford allocation will make to housing supply, policy CS4 should refer to *at least* 1,000 dwellings being delivered by 2026 (rather than *approximately*).
90. The Council is justified in seeking to make a 2nd Strategic Allocation in the Core Strategy (in addition to the Newbury Racecourse) to assist with the delivery of the required housing, given the long lead time for large sites. In all these respects, the scale of the allocation is consistent with the aims of the NPPF for Council's to support, rather than inhibit, needed development.
91. Some of those opposed to development at Sandford suggest that sufficient dwellings could be accommodated by identifying a broad location for development in an arc to the south and east of Newbury town centre and other allocations elsewhere. The focus of such an arc would be the London Road Industrial Estate (LRIE), which is owned by the Council. Part of the LRIE

has planning permission for a mixed use redevelopment and is included in the SHLAA as delivering 160 dwellings within 5 years (CD09/55, p11).

92. There is not the evidence to demonstrate that a substantial number of additional dwellings could be successfully delivered on and around the LRIE during the plan period or, even if it could, that this is a preferable strategy to a strategic greenfield allocation. The Council highlight significant problems with delivery, including: leases to existing businesses; flood risk affecting part of the site (notwithstanding any improvements to flood defences); and the need to ensure that a mix of dwellings is achieved for the town. As landowner, the Council should be well informed about the potential deliverability of redevelopment at LRIE. The plan adopts a cautious approach to the protection of identified employment sites pending more detailed consideration in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. I have found the approach to employment land sound (subject to modifications) - see Issue 4.

The justification for the selection of Sandleford from the other site options

93. I have already concluded that the Council's *SA/SEA Update Report 2011* meets the regulatory requirements for the consideration of alternatives leading to the selection of Sandleford. I have found sound the broad distributional strategy with its focus for most development at Newbury. The Council's decision to focus on Newbury and reject Thatcham as the location for a strategic scale of development is a justified local choice.
94. The focus on Newbury left only 2 alternatives from the options that had previously been put forward – North Newbury and Sandleford. The Council's comparative re-assessment of these 2 sites (in conjunction with the Racecourse allocation in each option) is in the *SA Strategic Sites Policy Paper Appendix 8* (part of CD07/72) to which I have already referred. The summary of effects for both options is that they are predominantly neutral. There is not a fundamental difference in the suitability of these sites for major development, even though they have different characteristics.
95. Some of the issues regarding North Newbury highlighted by the Council were not followed-up to see if they had real substance or could be overcome. Some negative assessments should, or might have been, changed, but would not have resulted in positive scores on these matters. The critical difference in the assessments follows from the weight and planning judgment given to factors such as the greater accessibility of Sandleford because of the proximity of the nearby Tesco store and retail park; the benefit afforded by the opportunity to provide a country park or equivalent at Sandleford; and some of the disadvantages ascribed to North Newbury because of the dividing effect of the A339 dual carriageway and the effect on the setting of Donnington village. The Council's assessment of such factors is reasonable. There is not the evidence to demonstrate that North Newbury is a clearly preferable site. The Council's selection of Sandleford is a local choice which is justified.

Site specific considerations

Highway Infrastructure

96. Policy CS4 as submitted included reference to measures to mitigate the impact on the road network and measures to improve accessibility by non-car modes,

but no detail as to what might be involved. Following the hearings in November 2010, the Council proposed to delete these general references and refer to infrastructure improvements to be delivered in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (CD09/52 and /60). The Council also proposed to include in the Core Strategy a *Critical Infrastructure Schedule* as Appendix Cii which includes specific highway and transport measures for Sandleford. The submitted policy was unsound due to a lack of clarity in relation to transport which would have made it ineffective. The changes proposed by the Council would overcome this unsoundness. These changes are included in my recommendation at the end of this section.

97. There was no indication in the submitted plan of the number or location of access points in to the site. The Council is now proposing 2 accesses off Monks Lane and a link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses from Warren Road. Taking into account the location of development within the site, the consequences for the local network of different access locations and the importance of retaining the landscape character in the southern half of the site, these locations are justified and should be included in the policy.
98. The development of 2,000 dwellings in this location would inevitably add significantly to the volume of traffic using local roads. The proposals in the emerging Core Strategy have been successively assessed for their traffic impact by WSP on behalf of the Council in a series of *Transport Assessments* (CD09/24-28). The last assessment, Phase 4, July 2010 (CD09/28) takes into account the detailed mitigation measures agreed as part of the planning permission for the development at Newbury Racecourse and the full development of 2,000 houses at Sandleford to 2036. The Assessment identified the beneficial impact of various junction improvements and highlighted other junctions which would be over capacity.
99. Building on the conclusions of the Phase 4 Assessment, the Council has identified the most important highway improvements required to support the Sandleford development and these are included in the proposed *Critical Infrastructure Schedule*. Despite the keenly felt concerns of many local residents about present and future traffic congestion, there is no substantial evidence to undermine the Council's conclusion that traffic impacts can be reasonably mitigated. Further detail is not required at this stage. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan as required by policy CS14. The TA would be the time to consider any local highway safety measures, such as in relation to access to St Gabriel's School.
100. The Phase 4 Assessment did not assume a significant use of public transport (CD09/28, 2.5.3). Consistent with the aim of the NPPF to support sustainable transport, there is the opportunity to encourage modal shift away from the car in the development of this site. The proposed list of critical infrastructure includes an improved/new bus service linking the site to the town centre; bus access to Andover Road through Warren Road; and improved pedestrian/cycle crossing links at Monks Land and Newtown Road. These requirements are justified and inclusion in the Core Strategy is necessary for effectiveness. The bus link to the town and walking and cycling, particularly to the nearby Tesco store/retail park provide the opportunity for modal shift and thus of reducing traffic growth below that assumed in the Phase 4 Assessment. The long, steep

hill back up to Sandford from the station/town centre is likely to deter cycle use for journeys to the town, but that does not significantly undermine the potential for modal shift. The proposed primary school on site, the proposed expansion of the adjoining secondary school and a small local centre within the development would all help to reduce the need for car journeys.

Countryside, landscape and nature conservation

101. The proposed development would result in a loss of countryside on the southern edge of Newbury, but a loss of countryside somewhere around Newbury is inevitable as a result of the need for greenfield developments. The area is accessible via the public footpath from Warren Road, but over half of the length of this footpath (up to the A339) would continue to cross undeveloped land. The creation of a country park either side of this footpath would create additional opportunities for public access to the countryside. The location of the development to the north and west of the overall site would ensure that the undeveloped approach to Newbury seen from the A339 would be largely retained. The location of the built development and the retention of the southern part of the site as undeveloped land with public access distinguishes this proposal from that rejected by the Planning Inspector in 2000 when considering objections to the Newbury District Local Plan.
102. The grounds of the former Sandford Priory are included on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (Grade II). The walled kitchen garden is the only part of the registered park on the west side of the A339 and is not included within the proposed allocation. The former priory building, now St Gabriel's School, is a Grade I listed building. English Heritage was concerned with the lack of clarity in the submitted policy as to where development would take place and the potential for an adverse impact on the registered site (statement for hearings ref 32025, November 2010). This concern is addressed by the proposed changes to refer to development being limited to the north and west of the site. The protection of the historic landscape is one of the reasons given for controlling development in this way.
103. The proposed open space/country park provides the opportunity to complement the setting of the registered park and the listed building, such as through restoration of parkland features. However, the design of the country park and the balance to be achieved between landscape restoration, public access and nature conservation does not need to be specified in the policy and can be developed as part of a masterplan or planning application.
104. The proposed site consists mainly of arable farmland and discrete blocks of ancient woodland. All the woodland would be retained. The Council relies primarily on work undertaken by the site's promoters in relation to the ecological value of the area and how the development can be accommodated whilst retaining and enhancing nature conservation interest (CD10/50 and CD10/62). There is no substantial evidence to undermine the Council's conclusion that potential adverse impacts on nature conservation can be avoided or adequately mitigated.
105. The draft masterplan (CD10/63) illustrates that there is sufficient space to accommodate up to 2,000 dwellings whilst achieving the recommended buffers around the ancient woodland and retaining green corridors to link them. The

large area of land available for green space provides the opportunity for habitat enhancement compared with arable farmland. At submission, Natural England were concerned with the lack of any reference to the role of the proposed open space in avoiding increased recreational pressure on nearby Greenham and Crookham Common (SSSI) where protected birds are sensitive to disturbance. The bundle of proposed changes to the policy and supporting text includes adequate references to nature conservation matters. Natural England is satisfied with the proposed changes.

Schools

106. Policy CS4 as submitted refers to the provision of a new primary school and the extension of Park House School, which is the secondary school adjoining the north west corner of the site. The rewording of the policy proposed by the Council and incorporated in MM 5.6 retains these requirements. Given the scale of development proposed and the lack of a clear alternative solution, the requirement for an on-site primary school is justified. The education department preferred development at Sandleford from the other options in the Newbury/Thatcham area and proposed the extension or remodelling of Park House. A detailed scheme for such work is not required at this stage. There is no evidence to suggest that an acceptable solution could not be achieved. Park House School has recently become an Academy and is thus no longer under the direct control of the local authority. This makes achieving the extension/remodelling of the school more complicated than before, involving negotiations between the Council, the school and the central government funding body. There is an inevitable degree of uncertainty about this process compared with that prior to the school becoming an Academy, but this is not sufficient to make the proposal unsound.

Rugby Club Ground

107. The boundary of the site allocation shown on the submission Proposals Map includes a corner of the grounds of Newbury Rugby Club. This corner of land is important for providing access between the 2 main parts of the site to be developed (CD10/63). The promoters of the Sandleford site previously had an option on this land and have now acquired it. The Rugby Club have no objection to the development. The land does not include any current pitches. There is no evidence that the loss of this land would result in a harmful loss of recreational space.

108. Sport England has been consulted at each stage of the evolution of the Core Strategy. Detailed comments were provided only in respect of *Options for the Future* (2 July 2009, ref 318859). Sport England would need to be consulted on any planning application for development which included this land. On the evidence before me, the inclusion of this land is not an impediment to delivery. If it were subsequently found that replacement recreational land should be found for the land to be lost, there would be considerable scope to do so within the new open space in the proposed allocation.

Other matters

109. There is a deliverable solution for sewage treatment as confirmed by the Environment Agency (Representation 32027 for hearings, November 2010 and

Thames Water Study CD10/65). An upgrade to wastewater infrastructure is included in the proposed list of critical infrastructure. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) are also included. The large areas of green space within the allocated site provide ample scope to accommodate SUDS and thus to ensure that the development does not increase the risk of flooding to the River Enborne, which forms the southern boundary of the allocation.

110. The development of the site in the manner broadly set out in the Core Strategy has been actively promoted by the landowners over a number of years. Although the site it is not yet directly controlled by house builders there is nothing to suggest that the land will not be made available for development quickly so that it can contribute to land supply within 5 years. Being a greenfield site and in the absence of any particularly unusual infrastructure requirements (other than the somewhat elongated access road to the south western part of the site which is not required at the outset) there is no reason to doubt the development would be viable.

Overall conclusion on policy CS4

111. The aim of policy CS4 is sound, but the detailed wording of the policy needs elaboration to make it effective. The general extent of the area for development should be shown, at least diagrammatically on a plan, given the large red line allocation on the Proposals Map. In addition, it needs to be made clear that the total number of dwellings to be developed on the site will be dependent on adequately accommodating on the land the other elements of the proposal and any on-site mitigation. Critical infrastructure needs to be identified. These matters are addressed in **MMs 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 7.4 and 7.5**.

Issue 4 – Is the approach to economic development clear, consistent with national policy and justified by local evidence?

112. The strategy for business development is primarily informed by the *Employment Land Assessment* (ELA) 2007 CD09/21. Given the passage of time and the recession this evidence is becoming dated, but it was supplemented by some updated evidence in February 2011 (*Examination Proposed Focussed Changes Topic Paper* CD08/13). There is no better evidence with which to replace the ELA and the Council recognises the need to review this evidence in progressing employment policies in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. Overall, I consider that there is proportionate evidence to inform the strategic approach to be set out in this Core Strategy.

113. In summary, the ELA points to continued significant growth in B1 floorspace, a significant reduction in land for B2 uses and limited, but uncertain change in demand for B8 uses (3.130). No more employment land is needed if existing employment land can be recycled to meet the changing market needs. The ELA used a plot to floorspace ratio of 0.4 across all land use types (3.26) in relating changing floorspace requirements to land requirements. This ratio is consistent with an example given in the national guidance on such studies (CD04/09 Box D7). The actual ratio achieved in any redevelopment will vary considerably depending on the nature of the site and the proposals, but this ratio is reasonable for a district-wide study of this nature.

114. Policy CS10 in the submitted Plan is unsound. It does not properly reflect the

Council's intentions and does not significantly move forward planning policy on this matter. The policy does not provide any real direction for the further work in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD (but delegates all critical choices to that plan). In the interim, the policy would not usefully inform any decisions to be made on major employment applications. It is also too inflexible with regard to other types of economic development besides B class use. In relation to B1 office development, the policy treats all employment sites the same, wherever their location. This is not consistent with the NPPF, since office uses are town centre uses. Also, the mechanisms for monitoring are inadequate. The policy as submitted was not justified, effective, nor consistent with national policy.

115. The Council completely redrafted the policy and text in February 2011 (CD07/41) and the proposed changes were subject to further revisions in October 2011 (CD07/74), following the hearings in June 2011. The policy now proposes a clear aim, namely managing the nature of the change in business floorspace indicated in the ELA. It sets out a town centre first policy for office use and a sequential approach based on local circumstances for office development that cannot be accommodated in town centres. The town centres of the District have limited capacity to accommodate large scale office use and it is important to maximise their potential to accommodate such use as well as recognising that some office growth will need to be in edge of centre locations. The Council has identified an appropriate sequence of sustainable business locations outside the centres and these are listed in the new text.
116. The policy now sets a clear task for the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in reviewing the existing Protected Employment Areas (PEAs). In the meantime, it introduces necessary flexibility to accommodate other non-B class economic development. Consistent with this more flexible approach, saved Local Plan policy ECON1 is to be superseded as it is outdated and inflexible. The role of the strategically important employment locations of New Greenham Park, Vodafone (north Newbury) and the AWE sites are acknowledged. The Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will consider appropriate designations consistent with their importance. This is a sound approach.
117. The above changes are incorporated in **MM 5.19** and **MM 6.2** adds to the monitoring framework the floorspace targets for different B1 class uses. **MM 7.6** includes ECON1 in the list of local plan policies to be superseded in Appendix E of the Plan. **MM 7.7** lists in a new appendix the existing Protected Employment Areas to provide clarity with the additional new text. These changes are necessary to make the Plan sound. As a consequence, changes are needed to the references to the town centre and/or employment sections of ADPPs 2-6. The consequential changes are: **MMs 4.7, 4.8, 4.10, 4.16, 4.22, 4.28**. Some of the wording in these changes has been amended from that previously published by the Council to ensure clarity and consistency with the new CS10.

Issue 5 – Are other policies in the plan consistent with national advice, justified by the evidence and effective?

118. *Figure 3* in the Core Strategy is a diagram of *Newbury Town Centre* and illustrates the *Newbury 2025 Vision*. It is not seeking to allocate the quarters or areas for redevelopment shown. Flood zones 2 and 3 affect parts of

Newbury town centre which are shown as areas for change in Figure 3. There is a potential conflict between minimising flood risk and what is shown. The status of Figure 3 is ambiguous and since it is not seeking to illustrate what is specifically proposed in the Core Strategy, it is not required in the Plan. The Council has agreed to its deletion which is made in **MM 4.6**.

119. *Policy CS5 Housing Type and Mix*. The first part of policy CS5 imposes on applicants the task of having regard to a range of, in part, complex evidence and to demonstrate how this evidence has informed the dwelling mix. This is unreasonable and impractical, especially for small and medium scale proposals. The scope of the policy is not justified. This unsoundness is addressed by the deletion of the last 2 bullets of the first part of the policy. Nonetheless, it is important that local needs are addressed, especially in rural areas and additional text to highlight this is justified. These changes are made in **MMs 5.9** and **5.10**. The second part of the policy contains appropriate local guidance on density, consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 47).
120. *Policy CS6 Infrastructure*. The policy is expressed in very general terms and refers to the IDP which is separate from the Core Strategy. The policy is not effective in ensuring the needed infrastructure is secured. As mentioned above, the Council propose to include a new Appendix listing critical infrastructure and to refer to this Appendix in policy CS6. This would make the Core Strategy sound and is achieved by **MM 5.11** and **MM 7.5**.
121. The *Critical Infrastructure Schedule* in MM 7.5 is divided between the different spatial areas and different types of infrastructure. Some specific infrastructure required for the strategic allocations at Newbury Racecourse and Sandleford are also listed. Some items in the list are disputed by the developer of the Racecourse site. I previously commented on this disagreement in a note of 13 May 2011 and, having considered further comments, expressed preliminary conclusions in my note of 13 July 2011. Some of the changes accepted by the Council at that time were not made when the Plan was republished in November 2011.
122. The Council agreed to the deletion of the car club requirement and I have removed it from the list. The *sustainable travel route through the Racecourse site including bus gate* is a means to achieving other aims and does not need to be separately identified. The Council agreed that the reference under Waste Water to *upgrading the main terminal pumping station* in Newbury should be relocated under the Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area and not be specific to the Racecourse development. I have made this change. The reference to reinforcement of the substation appears justified. The changes from the Council's published list are included in **MM 7.5** which are necessary to make the list justified.
123. Policy CS3 proposes the Newbury Racecourse strategic allocation. The wording of the policy does not fully reflect the planning permission that has been granted for that development and the Council proposed some changes and updating. Given the addition to the Core Strategy of the Critical Infrastructure Schedule, which includes matters relevant to the Racecourse as discussed above, I see no need to change policy CS3.
124. *Policy CS7 Affordable Housing*. On the basis of the evidence in the BHMA

2007 (CD09/14) and given the absence of any evidence of substance which undermines its conclusions, there is a well justified need for a substantial scale of affordable housing. It is justified to seek to maximise the provision of affordable housing, subject to not adversely affecting the viability of development and the achievement of other planning objectives.

125. The *Economic Viability Assessment 2007* (CD09/17) and *Economic Viability Assessment Update 2009* (CD09/18) assessed the viability of various affordable housing requirements in relation to a range of house price bands typical of the District at the time of the studies. I have not seen substantial evidence to challenge the general approach or underlying assumptions made in these studies, but viability may critically change if such underlying inputs change. To be justified and effective the policy needs to explicitly indicate that the proportions of affordable housing set out will be sought by negotiation and will take into account the economics of provision. Also for effectiveness, changes are required to the wording of the policy with respect to integrating affordable units within the development and the recycling of subsidy when units cease to be affordable. These changes are made in **MM 5.12**.
126. Additions to the explanatory text to CS7 are necessary to explain how the policy will be applied in practice and to refer to Affordable Rent. These changes are made in **MM 5.13** and **5.14**. Also for clarity and to avoid inconsistency, the definition of affordable housing in the Glossary needs to be changed to that in the NPPF. This is done in **MM 7.9**.
127. *Policy CS8 Rural Exception Sites*. The policy is not consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 54) since criterion 3 states that proposals should not include any element of market housing. The Council has not addressed the potential benefit of some market housing being allowed so as to facilitate such schemes. However, Rural Exception sites are currently permitted by Local Plan policy HSG.11. This is similar to policy CS8, but does not expressly exclude market housing. Rather than try and amend policy CS8 at this late stage in the Examination, soundness can be achieved by deleting policy CS8 and the related section. The Council can then properly consider the matter afresh in a later DPD. This approach is acceptable to the Council. This change is made in **MM 5.15**. As a result of the deletion of CS8, policy HSG.11 needs to be removed from Appendix E which lists the Local Plan policies to be replaced by the Core Strategy. This is achieved in **MM 7.6**. It also needs to be removed from the Monitoring Framework, which is achieved through **MM 6.1**.
128. *Policy CS9 Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople*. I have considered the soundness of this policy in the light of national guidance in *Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* March 2012 and the NPPF. The policy rightly makes clear that identified needs will be met by allocations in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. The criteria for allocations and any other applications are reasonable for sites outside settlement boundaries, but would be unjustified within settlement boundaries, where such sites should be treated in the same way as other residential development. Their applicability only outside settlement boundaries is needed for the policy to be justified and is made clear in **MM 5.17**.
129. *CS13 Equestrian/Racehorse Industry*. The aim of policy CS13 to favour the retention of suitable existing equestrian establishments is appropriate, but as

submitted it is neither justified nor effective because it does not take into account whether there is a need or demand to retain the facility. There is no benefit in retaining unused sites for long periods and likely negative consequences in doing so. Furthermore, the criteria for considering "suitability" should be explained. It is necessary to strike a balance between the protection of stable yards and sufficient flexibility so as to allow new uses if there is no need for them. Soundness is achieved by the changes to the policy and text in **MMs 5.20** and **5.21**.

130. *Policy CS14 Transport*. The first sentence is ambiguous as to the intended scope and application of the policy, making it ineffective. A new opening sentence is required to make clear that the policy contains criteria that are to apply to development, so far as relevant to the scale of development proposed. Complementary additional supporting text is needed to ensure clarity and effectiveness of the policy. These changes are included in **MMs 5.22** and **5.23**.
131. *Policy CS16 Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency*. Following the hearings in November 2010, I requested that the Council consult on a change to this policy to delete the requirements relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) and BREEAM. This was because I was not satisfied that these requirements were justified in relation to then national policy in the Supplement to PPS1 (December 2007) particularly paragraphs 30-32. That Supplement has been replaced by the NPPF.
132. The NPPF requires (paragraphs 94 - 95) local authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. When setting any local requirements for a building's sustainability they should do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon policy and to adopt national standards. The particular tests for the justification of such local standards previously in the Supplement have been dropped. The NPPF does however require (paragraph 21) investment not to be overburdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.
133. The requirements in CS16 refer to nationally described standards consistent with the Government's zero carbon policy. There is an additional administrative cost burden in providing the supporting evidence at application stage and subsequently demonstrating compliance with such a policy. The energy efficiency levels required by the Code are currently planned to be achieved by further tightening of the Building Regulations to 2016. Meeting these energy levels represents the most significant aspects of meeting the Code in construction terms. As the Council is not proposing any acceleration of this element compared with what is likely to be required under the Building Regulations, the additional cost burden of the Council's policy is unlikely to be substantial.
134. The Environment Agency expressed strong support for the policy because of the need to limit domestic water use in this area of water stress. Code levels 3-4 introduce tighter water restrictions than currently required by the Building Regulations. On balance, in the light of the changed national guidance, CS16 is sound as submitted.
135. *Policy CS17 Flooding*. The policy confirms the need to adhere to national

guidance on minimising and managing flood risk. The requirement in relation to SUDS is not appropriately worded or located within the structure of the policy to be effective. This is overcome by the change in **MM 5.26**.

136. *Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)*. Paragraph 5.91 of the submitted Core Strategy refers to a 5km zone from the nearest part of the TBH SPA within which it is possible certain developments may affect the SPA. No part of the SPA is within the District, but 5km and 7km zones from the edge of the SPA extend across a small rural area in the south east corner. The plan does not adequately explain the necessary planning approach within these zones to ensure that there is no significant effect on the SPA. This ineffectiveness is overcome by additional text in the Environment section of ADPP6 covering the East Kennet Valley, the related text for that policy and in the section on Biodiversity. These changes are in **MMs 4.26, 4.29 and 5.27**.
137. *CS20 Historic Environment and Landscape Character*. Part b) of the policy refers to *the retention of the individual identity of separate settlements and parts thereof*. Given the need for significant greenfield developments on the edges of the main settlements this statement is too absolute. It is also not focussed on securing identified and desirable outcomes, particularly as policy CS20 is intended to replace the Local Plan local gap policy which is no longer appropriate. The wording is not justified or effective. Replacement wording has been proposed by the Council which is more in keeping with the overall aims of the policy. This change is made in **MM 5.28** along with consequential amendments to the supporting text.
138. *Minerals and Waste*. The Core Strategy does not address Minerals and Waste planning. At submission, the Council was working with the other Berkshire authorities on a Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework (to include a Core Strategy and a Development Control and Preferred Area DPD). In October 2011 this joint work ceased. The Council has now amended its LDS (May 2012, CD07/87) to include a *West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan*. This will ensure that all relevant matters are eventually covered by other DPDs making up the future overall Local Plan for the area. **MM 2.1** is necessary to explain how Minerals and Waste will be addressed.
139. *Monitoring*. As a result of the various changes to the plan already highlighted there are consequential changes required to the Monitoring Framework. These are made in **MMs 6.1 and 6.2**. Monitoring should not be made unduly onerous or disproportionate. Overall, with the changes proposed, the plan is sound in relation to monitoring.
140. *Sustainable development*. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is necessary for soundness to make clear that the Council's approach to decision-making will accord with this presumption. The Planning Inspectorate considers that a suggested model policy will, if incorporated into a Local Plan, be an appropriate way of meeting this expectation. Whilst the Council and others consider that the policy is not needed, the absence of such a policy in this plan might imply that the Council was intending to take a different approach, which is not the case. To be effective and therefore sound, a policy is required. The Council suggested a transposition of the 1st and 2nd paragraphs of the model policy and reference to the *development plan* so as to be more inclusive than the references to

local plan and neighbourhood plan in the model wording. This change is an acceptable local preference. I have, however, retained the word *always* from the model policy in the sentence referring to the Council working proactively with applicants, since this emphasis is an important part of the approach advocated by the NPPF. The finalised wording for the policy is in **MM 1.1**.

141.No changes are required to any other policies in the Plan.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

142.My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The LDS at submission was dated April 2010 (CD07/21). This expected the Core Strategy to be adopted in March 2011. Given the extended nature of this Examination, this date soon become unachievable. The Council's latest LDS is May 2012 (CD07/87) which envisages adoption in September 2012, which is still possible. The Core Strategy's content is compliant with the LDS.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI (CD07/22) was adopted in July 2006 and consultation has been compliant with the requirements therein, including the consultation on the post-submission proposed changes incorporated in the main modifications.
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	The SA/SEA report at submission failed to meet the requirements of the Regulations. For the reasons set out earlier in this report, the <i>SA/SEA Update October 2011</i> and the Council's consideration of the consultation responses on this report now satisfy the requirements.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	Natural England had some concerns with the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment at submission (CD07/15B), but it was subsequently satisfied with a revised AA in August 2010 (CD07/15). The AA concludes that there would be no significant adverse effects on protected habitats. The AA is fit for purpose.
National Policy	The Core Strategy complies with national policy except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Regional Strategy (RS)	The Core Strategy is in general conformity with the RS, the SEP.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	The SCS - <i>A Breath of Fresh Air</i> (CD10/02 & CD10/03) is referred to in paragraph 2.9 of the CS. Sufficient regard has been given to this document in the overall objectives and policies of the CS for this requirement to be met.
2004 Act (as amended)	The Core Strategy complies with the Act and the

and 2012 Regulations.

Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

143. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness for the reasons set out above which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

144. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Annex (and its Appendices) the West Berkshire Core Strategy satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and, on balance, sufficiently meets the aims of the NPPF to be considered sound.

Simon Emerson

Inspector

The report is accompanied by an Annex setting out the Main Modifications and Appendices to the Annex.

Appendix C

Schedule of Main Modifications to the West Berkshire Submission Core Strategy DPD

This Schedule of Main Modifications draws on the previous focused changes (PFC/EPFC/FEPFC) consulted on throughout the Examination. However, only those changes necessary to make the Plan sound, in accordance with the conclusions of the report, are included in this Schedule. Some amendments have been made to the wording of previously published changes as noted in the Origin column.

The Main Modifications are expressed within this Schedule in the conventional form of ~~striketrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text.

There is an accompanying separate schedule of Appendices to this Schedule.

Section 1: What is the Core Strategy

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 1.1	Inspector change	After para.1.4	1	<p><i>Insert</i></p> <p><u>1.5 The Government published the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council intends to achieve this presumption in accordance with the following policy:</u></p> <p><i>(In new policy box)</i></p> <p><u>Planning applications that accord with the policies in the development plan for West Berkshire will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</u></p> <p><u>When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</u></p> <p><u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</u> • <u>Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</u>

Section 2: Background and Challenges

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 2.1	FEPFC1 amended to reflect revised LDS	Relationship with Other Strategies Para. 2.8	8	<p><i>Delete existing text in paragraph 2.8 and replace with:</i></p> <p><u>Following the closure of the Berkshire Joint Strategic Unit in October 2011, work on a joint minerals and waste development plan for Berkshire has ceased. A West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be prepared to set out planning policies relating to minerals and waste activities and development for West Berkshire. This Local Plan is included in the LDS, May 2012.</u></p>
MM 2.2	EPFC1 (fpmc151 embedded for clarity) Includes minor amendments, May 2012	Cross Boundary Issues Paras. 2.26 - 2.31	10	<p><i>Delete existing text and replace with:</i></p> <p><u>West Berkshire does not exist in isolation from its neighbours. The Core Strategy needs to take account of the wider challenges, issues and opportunities affecting neighbouring areas as well as in the wider region. Cross-boundary working has taken place during the preparation of the Core Strategy, both through ongoing liaison with neighbouring authorities and at sub-regional level and through the review of proposals within adjoining Core Strategies and other DPDs. This will continue with the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as a number of infrastructure issues will require joint working.</u></p> <p><u>In looking at cross boundary issues in West Berkshire, it is important to understand that there are various influences that have a bearing on various parts of the District.</u></p> <p><u>Economic influences are particularly significant. The County of Berkshire has a number of defining characteristics underpinned by a significant concentration of high technology industries and high Gross Value Added per capita. However, the</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>County of Berkshire is seen to comprise three separate Functional Economic Areas (FEA) of which West Berkshire (excluding the far eastern part of the District) is one. In identifying these three distinct areas, it is recognised that the boundaries of each are porous and that there is significant movement between each as well as across the County boundary itself. The West Berkshire FEA is characterised by a mixed economy far more rural in nature than the rest of Berkshire.</u></p> <p><u>The Sustainable Community Strategy for West Berkshire highlights a number of economic objectives, some of which, such as enhanced skills and better transportation, are reflected in similar documents not only across the rest of Berkshire but potentially across the wider sub region. Others, such as enhancing employment opportunities within rural communities and regenerating town centres, have a more local flavour. The underlying aim of promoting regeneration in some of the District's more significant centres such as Newbury, highlights a move towards creating a more sustainable District with improved employment, leisure, and cultural opportunities thereby potentially reducing some of the cross boundary movements.</u></p> <p><u>The economic domination of the Thames Valley within the sub region means that the most significant economic influences lie to the east, notably Reading. Commuting data highlights the fact that 14% of West Berkshire's resident working population work within the Borough of Reading - by far the most significant single flow of outward commuting. Partnership working generally reflects West Berkshire's presence within the Thames Valley. The Government's recent (2010) approval of a Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for Berkshire highlights the interconnectivity not only within Berkshire, but also of some of the surrounding areas, notably Southern Buckinghamshire and North Hampshire. The Berkshire Economic Strategy Board has also produced a set of transport</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>investment priorities for Berkshire which again highlight the economic challenges and opportunities that exist across much of the County and more widely across the Thames Valley.</u></p> <p><u>The economic linkages to the north, south and west of the District are less strong, although there is significant economic movement between West Berkshire and North Hampshire. A cross-border working group exists between West Berkshire Council, Hampshire County Council, and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council on areas of common concern – including the exploration of sustainable solutions to the growth of traffic on the A339.</u></p> <p><u>Rural issues do create synergies and a range of cross border activity does exist between West Berkshire, Wiltshire, Oxfordshire and Hampshire often associated with the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The FEA for Reading and Central Berkshire does include the eastern parts of West Berkshire notably Calcot, Theale and Pangbourne, and it is this part of the District that inevitably has the strongest links with Reading. The Council works in partnership on various transport related joint activities given some of the eastern communities of West Berkshire have a boundary co-terminus with the urban area of Reading. This work is particularly related to the need to deliver sustainable transport solutions to reduce and manage the growth of congestion around the A4 and the M4 and surrounding transport corridors.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst many residents in the most eastern communities of West Berkshire will use facilities and services in Reading, there is a significant movement the other way in terms of school children, with West Berkshire schools educating a significant number of Reading pupils. This most prevalent movement relates to children of secondary school age.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Kennet Valley Meadows are an important part of West Berkshire and Reading's green infrastructure, so joint working is important to conserve and enhance the management of this area. Joint working also takes place with Reading in respect of crime and community safety. Crime rates are much higher in Reading than in West Berkshire but some of the District's more eastern communities are affected in a similar way to Reading by criminal activity thereby necessitating a joint approach.</u></p> <p><u>Additional cross border working takes place with Basingstoke and Deane, Wokingham, and Reading relating to the monitoring of housing completions within the consultation zones of AWE in Aldermaston and AWE in Burghfield.</u></p> <p><u>It is important to realise that geography also plays an important role in shaping cross border movements in West Berkshire. Some of the western and northern parts of West Berkshire look towards Swindon and Oxford. Some of the southern communities gravitate towards Basingstoke highlighting the complex nature of cross border arrangements that inevitably have to exist.</u></p>
MM 2.3	EPFC2	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats	12	<p><i>Amend SWOT Table with deletions and new text as follows:</i></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategic location of West Berkshire. • The strategic transport links connecting West Berkshire to London and to the West. • <u>The District's location in relation to major economic centres including Reading, Oxford, Swindon and Basingstoke, and its relative proximity to</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>London.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The strategic road network with the M4 and A34 providing links in all directions north, south, east and west, and a major interchange in the centre of the District at Chieveley.</u> • <u>The rail network which provides strategic links to Reading, London and the south west, as well as important local connections.</u> • <u>The District's position in the buoyant Thames Valley sub-regional economy which is known for its clustering of world-class knowledge based companies.</u> • <u>A strong pool of labour available for businesses to draw upon resulting from being part of the Thames Valley economic sub-region.</u> <p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Being a member of the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership represents an opportunity for sharing knowledge throughout the sub-region.</u> • <u>Attracting inward investment through the co-location of businesses within the Thames Valley economic sub-region due to the District's comparatively cheaper rents and the focus on small and medium sized enterprises.</u> • <u>Improving sustainable transport links to Reading through joint working, particularly bus, cycle and pedestrian routes along the A4 corridor and the proposed new station at Green Park.</u> <p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>West Berkshire and Reading are in the housing market area but average house prices in Reading are cheaper so could draw young</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>people away from the District.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reading has a large retail and leisure offer and this currently draws spending away from West Berkshire.</u>

Section 3: Shaping West Berkshire – Vision and Objectives

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
(3.1) Reference for clarity only.	FEPFC2	Strategic Objectives Para 3.9	16	<i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness.</i>
MM 3.2	FEPFC2	Strategic Objectives Para 3.10	16	<p><i>Amend second objective:</i></p> <p><i>Insert text to first sentence as follows:</i> To deliver <u>at least</u> 10,500 homes ...</p> <p><i>Insert text to second sentence as follows:</i> will maximise the use of <u>suitable</u> brownfield land</p>

Section 4: The Spatial Strategy

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 4.1	EPFC4	Introduction Paras 4.9 and 4.10	19	<p><i>Amend bullet points in paragraph 4.9 and delete paragraph 4.10 as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Delete text from second bullet as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... Rural Service Centres of Pangbourne and Theale. <p><i>Insert text to end of third bullet as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lambourn <u>and Pangbourne</u>. <p><u>4.10 Pangbourne lies within 2 spatial areas, due to its inclusion within the North Wessex Downs AONB, and its functional relationship with the Eastern Area of the District.</u></p>
MM 4.2	EPFC5 FEPFC3	Area Delivery Plan Policy 1	19	<p><i>Amend beginning of policy as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Insert text after first sentence as follows:</i> <u>Provision will be made for the delivery of at least 10,500 net additional dwellings and associated infrastructure over the period 2006 to 2026.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text into second sentence as follows:</i>their level of services <u>and the availability of suitable sites for development.</u></p>
MM 4.3	EPFC5	Area Delivery	20	<p><i>Amend table (District Settlement hierarchy) within policy as follows:</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change		
		Plan Policy 1 District Settlement Hierarchy sub-heading		Urban Areas	Wide range of services and the focus for the majority of development delivery of approximately 6,900 new homes between 2006 and 2026. ⁽²³⁾	Newbury, Thatcham, Eastern Urban Area (Tileburst, Calcot and Purley-on-Thames)
				Rural Service Centres	Range of services and reasonable public transport provision - opportunities to strengthen role in meeting requirements of surrounding communities delivery of approximately 2,000 new homes between 2006 and 2026. ⁽²⁴⁾	Burghfield Common, Hungerford, Lambourn, Mortimer, Pangbourne, Theale
				Service Villages	More limited range of services and some limited development potential delivery of approximately 1,100 new homes between 2006 and 2026. ⁽²⁵⁾	Aldermaston, Bradfield Southend, Chieveley, Cold Ash, Compton, Great Shefford, Hermitage, Kintbury, Woolhampton
				Delete footnotes 23 Appendix B sets out the housing land supply position at 31 st December 2009 (to be updated to March 2010)		

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p>24 – Appendix B sets out the housing land supply position at 31st December 2009 (to be updated to March 2010)</p> <p>25 – Appendix B sets out the housing land supply position at 31st December 2009 (to be updated to March 2010)</p>
MM 4.4	<p>EPFC5</p> <p>FEPFC4</p> <p>(fpmc184 embedded for clarity)</p>	Area Delivery Plan Policy 1	n/a as this is new text, but would be on page 20	<p><i>Insert the following as supporting text to the Policy:</i></p> <p><u>The Core Strategy Vision aims to build upon the existing settlement pattern and direct most development to those urban areas which have the infrastructure and facilities to support sustainable growth. The main focus for housing growth will therefore be Newbury, Thatcham and the east of the District. Within the Newbury and Thatcham urban areas, two strategic urban extensions are proposed: the first to be developed will be the site at Newbury Racecourse to the east of Newbury which gained planning consent in April 2010, for up to 1,500 dwellings, partly on land within the existing settlement boundary, and the second will be a greenfield site at Sandleford, to the south of Newbury where up to 2,000 homes could be developed, with delivery commencing in the second half of the plan period and extending beyond 2026. The allocation of this strategic site introduces some flexibility into the housing delivery with the opportunity to amend the phasing to respond to changing circumstances. Additional non-strategic scale sites in Newbury and Thatcham will be allocated in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD based on the evidence base in the SHLAA.</u></p> <p><u>In the Eastern Area there are significant constraints to development, including floodplain and the adjoining AONB. A broad location has been defined within this spatial area, encompassing the urban area, Theale and intervening land. Sites will be allocated within this broad location, informed by the SHLAA and any more up to date evidence about the suitability and deliverability of sites.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>In the rural areas of the North Wessex Downs AONB and the East Kennet Valley, the distribution of housing reflects the District wide settlement hierarchy, which takes account of the function and sustainability of settlements and is set out in Policy ADPP1. The proposed housing distribution reflects recent completions and existing residential commitments as well as the constraints and opportunities for development in the rural settlements. Within the AONB, housing is focused on meeting identified local needs in accordance with government policy. The result of this is that although 74% of West Berkshire lies within the North Wessex Downs AONB, and 29% of the District's population live in the AONB; only 19% of the housing has been allocated to this area. Within the AONB, the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the protected landscape will be the primary consideration in any allocation of sites to be made through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD or any subsequent document. Landscape sensitivity analysis has been carried out to inform this process.</u></p> <p><u>Development within the East Kennet Valley will take into account the presence of AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield, as set out in Policy CS9a.</u></p> <p><u>The number of dwellings proposed in the different spatial areas forms a basis for the allocation of sites in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. Within the 4 spatial areas, the focus of development will follow the settlement hierarchy.</u></p> <p><u>The rural service centres provide the role of a focal point for the surrounding villages and rural areas in terms of the provision of services and facilities and will accommodate some additional housing. The level of development in the individual settlements will vary depending on the character and function of the settlement and on assessment of the potential sites available for housing.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Villages identified in the District settlement hierarchy as service villages will accommodate more limited development: these villages would benefit from small-scale development, appropriate to the character and function of the village, in order to meet local needs, including residential infill or minor development adjacent to the settlement, which will be allocated in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p> <p><u>The characteristics of the individual Rural Service Centres and Service Villages vary, reflective of the diverse nature of West Berkshire. They are not intended to have the same amount of growth as each other; instead, the level of growth will depend on the role and function that they perform for the surrounding spatial area, and will be related to their size, range of facilities and services as well as the availability of suitable development opportunities. This is set out in more detail in the Area Delivery Plan policies.</u></p> <p><u>Settlements below the service village level in the hierarchy would deliver additional housing but this would be limited to infill or minor development where a settlement boundary has been defined, and to rural exception schemes for affordable housing to meet local needs. Some limited development is important for the long-term sustainability of rural communities. As no allocations are proposed for villages that are not listed in the settlement hierarchy, infill and rural exceptions sites in these settlements would be additional sources of housing supply which would introduce a further element of flexibility to help meet the development objectives of the strategy. Outside these settlements, in the countryside, a more restrictive approach to development will be taken. Specific exceptions to this approach could include barn conversions and agricultural workers dwellings to support the rural economy. Any development within the North Wessex Downs AONB will be</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>more restrictive than in the general countryside, reflecting the national designation of the landscape.</u></p> <p><u>It is anticipated that part of the housing supply throughout the rural areas of the District, will be affordable homes to meet local identified needs, which may come forward as rural exception sites rather than through site allocations.</u></p>
MM 4.5	FEPFC5	Figure 2 (Key Diagram)	21	<p><i>Remove hatching from the AONB, including Pangbourne. Hatching to remain in area outside AONB.</i></p> <p>See Appendix A for updated diagram.</p>
MM 4.6	EPFC7	Figure 3 Newbury Town Centre	23	<p><i>Delete Figure 3.</i></p>
MM 4.7	FEPFC19 Amended - consistency with new CS10	Area Delivery Plan Policy 2 Town Centre sub-heading	24	<p><i>Delete fourth bullet point of Town Centre section and insert:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New office developments and changes of use/redevelopment of existing offices will be guided by Policy CS 10.</u>
MM 4.8	EPFC8	Area Delivery Plan Policy 2 Employment sub-heading	24	<p><i>Amend policy text under Employment sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Newbury will be the main focus for business development over the plan period. Protected Employment Areas, especially those in more accessible locations, will play a vital role in meeting the existing and future economic demands of the District. The role, function and boundaries of these Protected Employment Areas will be reviewed</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Business development within other existing employment areas, including New Greenham Park and the Vodafone HQ site at The Connection will be supported to ensure the vitality of the District's economy is maintained.</u> Existing employment areas including New Greenham Park and the Vodafone site will continue to play a crucial role in the economy of the District. There may be limited opportunities for re-allocation to residential or mixed uses in appropriate locations and this will be assessed through the Sites Allocation and Delivery DPD.
MM 4.9	FEPFC6	Area Delivery Plan Policy 3 Housing sub-heading	26	<p><i>Amend 3rd sentence of 1st bullet point of Housing sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <p>The rest will be delivered through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD <u>and will include greenfield sites adjoining the settlement</u>, with schemes contributing to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities and <u>helping to addressing</u> local housing need.</p>
MM 4.10	EPFC9	Area Delivery Plan Policy 3 Employment sub-heading	27	<p><i>Add 2nd bullet point under Employment sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Thatcham town centre will accommodate small scale office development in keeping with the scale and character of the existing centre.</u>
MM 4.11	FEPFC7	Eastern Area – The Vision Para. 4.26	28	<p><i>Amend 1st sentence to insert text as follows:</i></p> <p>..... and the <u>adjoining</u> North Wessex Downs AONB...</p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 4.12	EPFC10 fpmc169	Eastern Area – The Vision Para. 4.27	29	<p><i>Amend paragraph 4.27 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Whilst Pangbourne lies within the North Wessex Downs AONB, it maintains strong functional linkages with the Eastern Area. There are therefore references to these linkages within this policy.</u></p>
MM 4.13	FEPFC7 Amended for clarity.	Eastern Area – The Vision Para. 4.28	29	<p><i>Amend text in 2nd and 3rd sentences as follows:</i></p> <p><u>The new-Lakeside development has planning permission to will provide 350 homes in a range of different sizes and types, which would of houses and will become a well integrated part of the Theale community. If this development goes ahead, Following this development, Theale would will need to undergo a period of consolidation without further strategic scale development, to provide an opportunity for facilities and services to be upgraded.</u></p>
MM 4.14	FEPFC5	Figure 5 Eastern Area	29	<p><i>Remove hatching from the AONB, including Pangbourne. Hatching to remain in area outside AONB.</i></p> <p>See Appendix B for updated diagram.</p>
MM 4.15	EPFC12 FEPFC8 (fpmc75 & 167 embedded for clarity)	Area Delivery Plan Policy 4 Housing sub-heading	30	<p><i>Amend policy text under the Housing sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Eastern Area of West Berkshire will accommodate approximately 1500 <u>1400</u> new homes during the plan period, in order to support the growth of the Reading area and to sustain services in the rural service centre of Theale. A significant development of 350 homes which already has planning permission will be delivered at Theale Lakeside. Further development will take place through the implementation of existing commitments, infill development, and sites allocated through

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	Amended for clarity			<p>the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. <u>A broad location has been identified on the Key and Area Diagrams which covers the Eastern Area, Theale and the intervening land within which to find sites for the housing required.</u> A number of sites which have future potential for development have been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)^(footnote).</p> <p>Footnote: SHLAA: http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16276</p>
MM 4.16	EPFC12 (fpmc154 embedded for clarity)	Area Delivery Plan Policy 4 Employment sub-heading	30	<p><i>Amend policy text under the Employment sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Theale town centre will accommodate small scale office development, whilst Arlington Business Park, Station Road and adjacent estates in Theale, which comprise of a mix of high quality office and distribution floorspace, and Horseshoe Park in Pangbourne will continue to provide sustainable employment opportunities for local residents.</u> • Protected employment areas will be reviewed in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. • <u>The role, function and boundaries of the Protected Employment Areas of Arlington Business Park, Station Road and adjacent estates will be reviewed through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u>
MM 4.17	EPFC13 which amends Inspector embedded minor change	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – The Vision 1 st paragraph	31	<p><i>Delete last sentence of paragraph:</i></p> <p>Pangbourne is located within the North Wessex Downs AONB and also functions as part of the Eastern Area in Policy SP4.</p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	pmc31			
4.18 Ref for clarity only	EPFC13	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – The Vision Para. 4.30	31	<i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness.</i>
MM 4.19	EPFC13 Minor change in 2 nd sentence.	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – The Vision Para. 4.33	n/a as this is new text, but would be on page 32	<i>Insert new paragraph prior to 4.33 as follows:</i> <u>Pangbourne will remain an accessible thriving village community in an attractive and accessible setting within the AONB, and which will serve as a Rural Service Centre for the surrounding villages. Small scale extensions in keeping with the existing character and pattern of development and in line with Pangbourne’s role as a Rural Service Centre will help address local housing need and provide opportunities for local people to buy a home in the village. The thriving district centre will continue to provide a good range of retail and leisure facilities, in the form of shops, pubs and restaurants. The diverse range of retail and leisure outlets will also help to form an important tourism base.</u>
4.20 Ref for clarity only.	EPFC13	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – The Vision Para 4.33	32	<i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness.</i>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 4.21	EPFC14 FEPFC9 (fpmc175, part of fpmc81 and fpmc205 embedded for clarity) Includes minor amendment, May 2012	Area Delivery Plan Policy 5 Development sub-heading (now titled Housing)	33	<p><i>Amend text under Housing sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North Wessex Downs AONB will have appropriate and sustainable growth that conserves and enhances its special landscape qualities. During the Core Strategy period the area will accommodate approximately 2,100 dwellings <u>provision will be made for the delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings</u>, of which over half have already been built or have planning permission. <u>Provision of this scale of housing is subject to the overarching objective for the AONB set out at the beginning of this policy. If preparation of the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD indicates that there are insufficient developable sites to provide the balance of the 2,000 dwellings whilst adhering to the landscape priority of the policy, any shortfall will be provided on sites allocated outside the AONB.</u> • There will be further opportunities for infill development and for development on previously developed land. <u>New housing allocations will be focused on the Rural Service Centres and Service Villages within the North Wessex Downs, with the emphasis on meeting identified local needs. The development will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD or a subsequent planning document, and will depend on the role and function that the settlement performs, supported by suitable development opportunities, identified through the SHLAA.</u> The conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape will be the paramount consideration in assessing these sites. • <u>The SHLAA has assessed the future development opportunities in the AONB. Landscape sensitivity work has been a critical part of the assessment, given the 'great weight' to be given to the conservation</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside within the AONB. The outcome of this work has shown a ‘basket’ of potentially developable sites from which to select at the Site Allocations stage.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Within the North Wessex Downs AONB there are 3 Rural Service Centres; Hungerford and Lambourn in the west of the District and Pangbourne in the east. In the western part of the AONB, development will be focused in Hungerford as the more sustainable Rural Service Centre. Hungerford is considerably larger than Lambourn and performs a more significant function for a large catchment area. Hungerford town centre is defined as one of only two town centres in the District, reflecting the range of goods and services which it provides for the surrounding area. More information is set out below which describes Hungerford’s role, and these factors will be used to inform decisions about the level of growth to be allocated to the town. The capacity for growth on the edge of Hungerford has been assessed.</u> • <u>Lambourn, whilst performing the role of a Rural Service Centre, does so at a more local level, due to its size and location, and this will influence the future level of growth. In terms of services and facilities, there is a particular emphasis in Lambourn on the needs of the equestrian industry. More limited growth will take place in Lambourn due to the town’s comparatively smaller district centre and relative remoteness.</u> • <u>Pangbourne, in the east, is a thriving community similar in size to Lambourn. It plays an important role as a service centre for the eastern areas of the AONB and provides a district centre shopping function with a range of services and facilities. Whilst there are some opportunities for growth at Pangbourne, those outside the current settlement boundary are partly constrained by environmental</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>considerations in terms of the floodplain and the sensitivity of the landscape. This will restrict the amount of development to take place at Pangbourne.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are 6 service villages within the AONB in West Berkshire. The service villages will continue to provide a range of services to their communities and surrounding areas. A limited level of development will be accommodated to meet local needs, including employment, housing, amenity and community facilities, to maintain the areas as vibrant and balanced communities with their own sense of identity.</u> • <u>The level of development to be allocated to each will depend on the role and function which they are to perform for the surrounding area and the availability of suitable sites identified through the SHLAA. Compton and Hermitage have opportunity sites adjacent to the existing village settlement boundary at Compton Institute for Animal Health and Dennison Barracks as set out above. These could potentially provide a greater level of growth than that normally expected in a service village, which will have implications for the distribution of development. However, as well as infrastructure and sustainability issues associated with these sites, there is not yet any clarity about any timescales for developing them or the appropriate scale of development. Therefore the extent of any contribution from these sites cannot be clarified at this stage.</u> • <u>In terms of the “basket of sites” identified by the SHLAA, no further development opportunities have been identified at this time in Bradfield Southend, so development opportunities here may be more limited. Great Shefford shows limited future development opportunities through the SHLAA, whilst Kintbury and Chieveley demonstrate a wider range of opportunities to be assessed through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 4.22	EPFC14 Addition for consistency with new CS10	Area Delivery Plan Policy 5 Economy sub-heading	33	<p><i>Amend 3rd bullet:</i></p> <p>town centre. and existing office developments will be protected. <u>Changes of use/redevelopment of existing offices will be guided by Policy CS 10.</u></p> <p><i>Insert new bullet point under Economy sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The Protected Employment Areas within the AONB will continue to play a vital role in supporting the local economy, especially those in edge of centre locations. The role, function and boundaries of these Protected Employment Areas will be reviewed through Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u>
(4.23) Reference for clarity only	EPFC14	Area Delivery Plan Policy 5 Accessibility sub-heading	34	<p><i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness.</i></p>
(4.24) Reference for clarity only	EPFC14 (fpmc175 embedded for clarity)	Area Delivery Plan Policy 5 Community Infrastructure and Services sub-heading	34	<p><i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 4.25	EPFC15 FEPFC5	Figure 7 East Kennet Valley	36	<p><i>Remove hatching from the AONB, including Pangbourne. Hatching to remain in area outside AONB.</i></p> <p>See Appendix C for updated diagram.</p>
MM 4.26	PFC5 PFC7	Paragraph 4.36	37	<p><i>Amend second sentence as follows:</i></p> <p><u>A small area in the very south east around Beech Hill is within the designated Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area for birds. A small area in the very south east around Beech Hill falls within the 5km boundary of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). The 5km boundary^(insert footnote) has been determined by Natural England as a buffer area to regulate development near the SPA. However, it is possible that certain types of development up to 7km from the boundary of the SPA^(insert footnote) could have an impact on the SPA.</u></p> <p><i>Footnotes:</i> <u>as shown on the Proposals Map</u> <u>as shown on the Proposals Map</u></p>
MM 4.27	EPFC16 FEPFC10 (fpmc85, fpmc155 and fpmc156 embedded)	Area Delivery Plan Policy 6 Housing sub-heading	37	<p><i>Amend bullet points under Housing sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some growth is planned for this area to help meet the needs of the village communities and to assist with the viability of village shops and services. This amounts to approximately 800 homes between 2006 and 2026, an average of 40 new homes a year. <u>The relatively low growth proposed for this area of the District reflects the more limited services and poorer transport connections. At March 2010 there have already been considerable housing commitments and completions in</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	<p>for clarity)</p> <p>1st bullet amended to reflect conclusion on AWE.</p>			<p><u>the East Kennet Valley, leaving only about 330 dwellings to be allocated.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to the presence of AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield, the Council will monitor housing completions and population levels in conjunction with the <u>ONR and neighbouring authorities. Development will be strictly controlled for health and safety reasons within the zones set out in AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield until the HSE/NII is satisfied that there is capacity to accommodate an increase in population with safety. Residential development in the inner land use planning consultation zone is likely to be refused planning permission in accordance with policy CS9a, unless advice from the HSE/NII changes. This has implications for the service village of Aldermaston, where new permissions will be limited to new isolated single dwellings and some residential extensions. However, Aldermaston will continue to play the wider role of a service village, in terms of the provision of a range of services to the community and surrounding areas.</u> • The two identified rural service centres of Burghfield Common and Mortimer will be a <u>the</u> focus for development in this area, together with the more modest development of the identified service villages of Woolhampton and Aldermaston . There will be opportunities for infill development and for development on previously developed land. Further Development may take the form of small extensions to these villages, <u>based on information set out in the SHLAA, which has shown a 'basket' of potentially developable sites from which to select through and infill development and the location and detail of this will be set out in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u>
MM 4.28	EPFC16	Area Delivery	37	<i>Amend bullet point under Employment sub-heading as follows:</i>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	(fpmc86 embedded for clarity)	Plan Policy 6 Employment sub-heading		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing <u>Protected Employment Areas</u>, such as Young's Industrial Estate and Calleva Park near Aldermaston, Beenham <u>Industrial Area</u> and Theale Lakes Business Park at Sheffield Bottom will <u>continue to play a vital role in the local economy</u>. The <u>role, function and boundaries of these Protected Employment Areas will be reviewed through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD</u>.
MM 4.29	PFC7 EPFC16	Area Delivery Plan Policy 6 Environment sub-heading	37	<p><i>Add two new bullet points under Environment sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>New residential development of one or more net additional dwellings proposed up to 5km from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA will require screening to assess whether it will have a likely significant effect on the SPA. Where a significant effect exists or cannot be excluded, an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010^(insert footnote) should be undertaken. Proposals will only be permitted if they do not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework will be used to guide assessment and any avoidance or mitigation measures that may be needed.</u> <u>Residential development of over 50 dwellings located between 5 and 7km of the boundary of the SPA will require screening to assess whether it will have a likely significant effect on the SPA. Where a significant effect exists or cannot be excluded, an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010^(insert footnote) should be undertaken. Proposals will only be permitted if they do not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework will be used to guide assessment and any avoidance or mitigation measures that may be needed.</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><i>Footnotes:</i></p> <p><u>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010</u> http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2010/uksi_20100490_en_1</p> <p><u>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010</u> http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2010/uksi_20100490_en_1</p>

Section 5: Core Policies

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 5.1	<p>EPFC17</p> <p>FEPFC11 (with fpmc27 embedded)</p> <p>FEPFC12</p> <p>FEPFC13</p> <p>1st new paragraph amended.</p>	Policy CS1 1 st para	39	<p><i>Amend Policy CS1 to read as follows:</i></p> <p>Provision will be made for the delivery of <u>at least</u> 10,500 net additional dwellings and associated infrastructure over the period 2006 to 2026. Delivery will be phased and managed in order to meet <u>at least an</u> annual average net additional dwelling requirement of 525 dwellings per annum and to maintain a rolling five year supply of housing land.</p> <p><u>An update of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (so that it accords with the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 159) will be undertaken within 3 years of the adoption of the Core Strategy. This will be carried out in co-operation with neighbouring authorities within the Housing Market Area. If the updated SHMA indicates that housing provision within the District needs to be greater than currently planned, a review of the scale of housing provision in the Core Strategy will be undertaken.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>New homes will be located in accordance with the settlement hierarchy outlined in the spatial strategy and area delivery plan policies.</u></p> <p><u>New homes will be primarily developed on</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suitable previously developed land within settlement boundaries.</u> • <u>Other suitable land within settlement boundaries.</u> • <u>Strategic sites and broad locations identified on the Core Strategy Key Diagram.</u> • <u>Land allocated for residential development in subsequent Development Plan Documents.</u> <p><u>The Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document will identify specific sites to accommodate the broad distribution of housing set out in the Area Delivery Plan policies. Greenfield sites will need to be allocated adjoining settlements in all four of the spatial areas to accommodate the required housing. Taking into account the SHLAA, updated by any further evidence, such sites will be selected to achieve the most sustainable pattern of development consistent with the other policies in the Core Strategy.</u></p> <p><u>All settlement boundaries will be reviewed in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p>
MM 5.2	EPFC17 (with fpmc189 embedded for clarity) and amended by FEPFC14	Policy CS1 Explanatory Text Para 5.1 and new paras.	39	<p><i>Amend the explanatory text of policy CS1 with the following paragraphs after the first sentence of paragraph 5.1 to read as follows:</i></p> <p>Explanation of the Policy</p> <p><u>The amount of new homes which the Core Strategy plans to provide is that set out in Policy H1 of the South East Plan. This requires provision for 10,500 net additional</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	<p>FEPFC11</p> <p>Significant deletions from the published changes and additions so as to accord with the conclusions of the Report.</p>	<p>following</p>		<p><u> dwellings over the period 2006 - 2026. The Government intends to abolish all Regional Strategies, but the South East Plan currently remains part of the Development Plan. The Core Strategy is required to be in general conformity with the RS.</u></p> <p><u> National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 159) requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area through the preparation of a SHMA. The Berkshire Housing Market Assessment 2007 (BHMA) does not fully meet the requirements of the NPPF, but it does demonstrate a high level of affordable need which is not being met. More recent evidence indicates that housing provision may need to be higher than currently planned. For example, the most recent household projections (2008-based, DCLG 2010) project an increase of 16,000 households in the District between 2006 and 2026.</u></p> <p><u> In the light of the above, the Council will undertake an update of the SHMA so that it accords with the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 159. This will be carried out in co-operation with neighbouring authorities within the Housing Market Area. This work will be completed within 3 years of the adoption of the plan. If the updated SHMA indicates that housing provision within the District needs to be greater than currently planned, a review of the scale of housing provision in the Core Strategy will be undertaken. Such a review will need to take into account the South East Plan if it has not been revoked.</u></p> <p><u> The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has indicated that, though sufficient sites can be identified to more than meet the 10,500 requirement, the potential cumulative impacts need careful consideration.</u></p>
<p>MM 5.3</p>	<p>FEPFC15</p>	<p>Policy CS1 Explanatory</p>	<p>39</p>	<p><i>Insert new paragraph to explanatory text as follows:</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	Includes minor amendment in light of the NPPF, May 2012	Text		<u>The development plan should be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, taking account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date. Policy CS1 states that a rolling five year supply of housing land will be maintained. Pending any review of housing numbers, an annual average net additional dwelling requirement of 525 dwellings per annum will be carried forward beyond 2026.</u>
MM 5.4	EPFC18	Policy CS2 and Explanatory Text	40	<i>Delete CS2 and supporting text as content now covered in Section 4: The Spatial Strategy</i>
(5.5) Reference for clarity only	PFC9	Policy CS3	42	<i>Proposed Council change not needed for soundness.</i>
MM 5.6	EPFC20 (with fpmc91, fpmc92, fpmc93 and fpmc157 embedded for clarity) PFC10	Policy CS4	43	<p><i>Amend policy as follows:</i></p> <p>Within the area identified at Sandlesford Park, a sustainable and high quality mixed use development will be delivered including in accordance with the following parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phased delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings, of which at least 40% will be affordable and with an emphasis on family housing. <u>Approximately At least half the housing is planned to be delivered by 2026;</u> • <u>Development to be limited to the north and west of the site in order to respect the landscape sensitivity of the wider site and to protect the historic landscape of Sandlesford Priory and the surrounding historic parkland.</u> • <u>Residential densities on the site to be in an average range of between 30 and 50</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u> dwellings per hectare to reflect the predominant mix of family sized homes;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generation of on-site renewable energy. • <u>Two vehicular accesses will be provided off Monks Lane with an additional sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses provided from Warren Road onto the Andover Road;</u> • <u>Further infrastructure improvements will be delivered in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Any infrastructure needs which are critical to the delivery of the site are set out in Appendix Cii</u> • Social and physical infrastructure (including provision for a new primary school and extension of Park House School); • Measures to mitigate the impact of development on the road network; • Measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes particularly to Newbury town centre and along the A339 route to Basingstoke; • <u>Provision of a new primary school on site and the extension of Park House School</u> • Provision for retail facilities <u>in the form of a local centre</u> and business employment; • A network of green infrastructure to be provided which will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>conserve the areas of ancient woodland and provide appropriate buffers between the development and the ancient woodland;</u> ○ <u>mitigate the increased recreational pressure on nearby sensitive wildlife sites, secure strategic biodiversity enhancements;</u> ○ <u>provide a country park or equivalent area of public open space in the southern part of the site; and</u> ○ respect the landscape significance of the site on the A339 approach road into Newbury.
MM 5.7	EPFC20 (with fpmc94 and	CS4 Explanation	43	<i>Amend Explanatory Text as follows:</i>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	<p>fpmc157 embedded)</p> <p>PFC11</p> <p>PFC12</p> <p>Includes minor amendment, May 2012</p> <p>Additional sentence at end.</p>	<p>of Policy Para 5.9</p>		<p>Explanation of the Policy</p> <p>The Sandleford Park site to the south of Newbury comprises approximately 134 hectares of land. It is bordered to the north by existing development along Monks Lane and could accommodate around 2,000 dwellings with associated community facilities and services. <u>Some flexibility in delivery is anticipated, with at least 1,000 dwellings proposed to be delivered by 2026, but with the ability to increase this amount if monitoring or changing circumstances indicate that this is necessary.</u></p> <p><u>A concept plan (set out at Appendix Ci) has been produced which shows how the development on the site could be delivered, taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site. Only 39% of the site is proposed for development in this concept plan with the rest taken up by open space and woodland.</u> The concept plan is indicative only and a masterplan or SPD will be prepared to set out the detailed guidelines for the distribution of uses and design of the site.</p> <p>The area is accessible to facilities and services in Newbury town centre and is also close to other retail and educational facilities. <u>A local centre is proposed for the site to deliver day-to-day shopping needs, and employment provision will be made at the site to assist in the creation of a sustainable community.</u></p> <p>The development would need to be designed with significant green infrastructure, taking account of the site's <u>location, topography and landscape importance.</u> <u>The site is located within the Greenham and Crookham Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity Area and will be expected to deliver strategic biodiversity enhancements in line with Policy CS 18. It is also close to the Greenham and Crookham Common SSSI which supports a range of important species including ground nesting birds which are particularly sensitive to disturbance and will be expected to mitigate against increased recreational pressure.</u> Sandleford Park has the potential to form a high quality southern gateway to Newbury.</p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>The formation of a country park or equivalent area of public open space in the southern part of the site will protect that sensitive landscape area in perpetuity as well as protecting views and vistas from the former Sandleford Priory. It will also protect the views when approaching Newbury along the A339.</u></p> <p><u>Infrastructure requirements, set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include junction improvements on the A339 and on Monks Lane/Andover Road, improvements to the bus service and to pedestrian/cycle links and road crossings. A new primary school (one-form entry to accommodate the first 1,000 dwellings to 2026, and expanding to two-form entry to accommodate the rest of the development beyond 2026) will need to be provided along with an increase in early years provision, alterations to Park House School and increased primary health care provision. Green Infrastructure including open space and sports facilities will be incorporated into the masterplanning of the site.</u></p> <p><u>Further details about any non-critical infrastructure which has site specific implications will be set out within an SPD or other supporting document to the Masterplan for the site, as will detailed planning requirements and parameters for the development of the site. The total number of dwellings to be developed will depend on adequately accommodating the other requirements of the policy and the required mitigation.</u></p>
MM 5.8	EPFC20	CS4 Delivery and Monitoring Box	43	<p><i>Amend 1st sentence as follows:</i></p> <p>It is envisaged that the implementation of the Sandleford Site would commence in the latter half of the plan period with approximately <u>at least</u> 1,000 homes delivered by the end of the plan period with development continuing beyond 2026</p>
MM 5.9	EPFC21	Policy CS5	44	<p><i>Delete 4th and 5th bullet points of the policy as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Forecast demographic changes;

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market considerations.
MM 5.10	EPFC21 Minor amendment	Policy CS5 Para 5.10	44	<p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.10 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Developers will therefore be expected to consider housing mix in their proposals, including any existing local evidence of housing needs or evidence in Parish Plans which may be important considerations even for small sites, particularly in rural areas.</u></p>
MM 5.11	FEPFC16	Policy CS6	46	<p><i>Insert text to the end of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p><u>A schedule of the infrastructure which has been assessed as critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy is included within the Core Strategy as Appendix Cii.</u></p>
MM 5.12	PFC14 EPFC22 Includes minor amendment in light of the NPPF, May 2012	Policy CS7	47	<p><i>Amend the text of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>In order to address the need for affordable housing in West Berkshire a proportion of affordable homes will be sought from residential development. Affordable housing will be provided on-site, apart from in exceptional circumstances. <u>The Council's priority and starting expectation will be for affordable housing to be provided on-site in line with Government guidance.</u> <small>(insert footnote)</small></p> <p>Subject to the economics of provision, the following levels of affordable housing provision will be sought <u>by negotiation</u> :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On development sites of 15 dwellings or more (or 0.5 hectares or more) a proportion of <u>30% provision</u> will be sought on previously developed land, and 40% on greenfield land; On development sites of less than 15 dwellings a sliding scale approach will be used to calculate affordable housing provision, as follows:-

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p>30% provision on sites of 10 – 14 dwellings; and 20% provision on sites of 5 – 9 dwellings.</p> <p>Where schemes fall short of the policy requirements specified, an open book approach will be taken and the onus will be on the developer/landowner to clearly demonstrate the circumstances justifying a lower affordable housing contribution. Proposed provision below the levels set out above should be fully justified by the applicant through clear evidence set out in a viability assessment (using an agreed toolkit) which will be used to help inform the negotiated process.</p> <p>In determining residential applications the Council will assess the site size, suitability and type of units to be delivered. The Council will seek a tenure split of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate affordable units, <u>taking but will take</u> into consideration the identified local need and the site specifics, <u>including funding and the economics of provision.</u></p> <p>The affordable units will be dispersed throughout <u>appropriately integrated within</u> the development and remain affordable in perpetuity. <u>The Council will expect units to remain affordable so as to meet the needs of both current and future occupiers. Where this is not relevant or possible, the subsidy will be recycled for the provision of future affordable housing.</u></p> <p><i>Footnote:</i> <u>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</u></p>
MM 5.13	EPFC22	Policy CS7 Para 5.21	48	<p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.21 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>The requirement for affordable housing will be applied to the total number of gross dwellings on the proposed development site.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 5.14	EPFC22 FEPFC17	Policy CS7 Para 5.22	48	<p><i>Insert text after the third sentence of paragraph 5.22 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>The Council recognise the new Affordable Rent tenure introduced by the Government in April 2011 and this tenure will be taken into account when determining applications.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text after the last sentence of paragraph 5.22 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Given the nature of the policy there will be instances when the proportion of affordable housing sought will result in the provision of a part unit. In these cases, the part unit will be rounded up or down to provide the nearest whole unit. On small schemes, any rounding will be considered along with the appropriate size and tenure of the units required.</u></p>
MM 5.15	New deletion	Policy CS8	49	<i>Delete all of Section: Rural Exception Sites, including policy CS8 and paragraphs 5.24-5.26 and Delivery and Monitoring:</i>
(5.16) Ref for clarity only	EPFC23	Policy CS8 Para 5.25 & Para 5.26	50	<i>Proposed Council change superseded by above deletion.</i>
MM 5.17	EPFC24	Policy CS9	50	<p><i>Amend second paragraph of policy to read:</i></p> <p>In allocating sites and for the purpose of considering planning applications relating to sites not identified in the relevant DPD, the following criteria will need to be satisfied <u>for sites outside settlement boundaries:</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change																								
MM 5.18	EPFC25 FEPFC18 (fpmc166 embedded for clarity)	New Policy Policy CS9a, Explanatory Text, and Delivery and Monitoring	n/a - new policy, but would be located on page 52	<p><i>Insert new policy, explanatory text, and delivery and monitoring:</i></p> <p><u>New Policy CS9a</u></p> <p><u>Nuclear Installations - AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield</u></p> <p><u>In the interests of public safety, residential^(insert footnote) development in the inner land use planning consultation zones^(insert footnote) of AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield is likely to be refused planning permission by the Council when the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)^(insert footnote) has advised against that development. All other development proposals in the consultation zones will be considered in consultation with the ONR, having regard to the scale of development proposed, its location, population distribution of the area and the impact on public safety, to include how the development would impact on “Blue Light Services” and the emergency off site plan in the event of an emergency as well as other planning criteria. Consultation arrangements for planning applications will be undertaken with the ONR using the table below.</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 991 2123 1332"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6"><u>Development within the Land Use Planning Consultation Zones: Office for Nuclear Regulation</u></th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3"><u>AWE Aldermaston</u></th> <th colspan="3"><u>AWE Burghfield</u></th> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Zone</u></th> <th><u>Distance</u></th> <th><u>Development Type</u></th> <th><u>Zone</u></th> <th><u>Distance</u></th> <th><u>Development Type</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Inner</u></td> <td><u>0 – 3 km</u></td> <td><u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all</u></td> <td><u>Inner</u></td> <td><u>1 – 1.5 km</u></td> <td><u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all applications save</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Development within the Land Use Planning Consultation Zones: Office for Nuclear Regulation</u>						<u>AWE Aldermaston</u>			<u>AWE Burghfield</u>			<u>Zone</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Development Type</u>	<u>Zone</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Development Type</u>	<u>Inner</u>	<u>0 – 3 km</u>	<u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all</u>	<u>Inner</u>	<u>1 – 1.5 km</u>	<u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all applications save</u>
<u>Development within the Land Use Planning Consultation Zones: Office for Nuclear Regulation</u>																												
<u>AWE Aldermaston</u>			<u>AWE Burghfield</u>																									
<u>Zone</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Development Type</u>	<u>Zone</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Development Type</u>																							
<u>Inner</u>	<u>0 – 3 km</u>	<u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all</u>	<u>Inner</u>	<u>1 – 1.5 km</u>	<u>All residential or non residential - Where one or more additional person may live, work, shop (all applications save</u>																							

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change					
						<u>applications save listed buildings, conservation area consent, house extensions, shop fronts, prior notifications and telecommunications)</u>			<u>listed buildings, conservation area consent, house extensions, shop fronts, prior notifications and telecommunications).</u>
				<u>Middle</u>	<u>3 – 5 km</u>	<u>Residential accommodation or non residential accommodation exceeding 50 people</u> - <u>20 or more dwellings;</u> - <u>1,000m2 B1</u> <u>2,400m2 B8</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>1.5 – 3 km</u>	<u>Residential accommodation or non residential accommodation exceeding 50 people</u> - <u>20 or more dwellings;</u> - <u>1,000m2 B1</u> - <u>2,400m2 B8</u>
				<u>Outer</u>	<u>5 – 8 km</u>	<u>Residential accommodation or non residential accommodation exceeding 500 people.</u> - <u>200 or more dwellings;</u> - <u>11,000m2</u>	<u>Outer</u>	<u>3 – 5 km</u>	<u>Residential accommodation or non residential accommodation exceeding 500 people.</u> - <u>200 or more dwellings;</u> - <u>11,000m2 B1</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change								
					<p style="text-align: center;">B1 - 24,000m2 B8</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">- 24,000m2 B8</p>						
<p><u>Explanation of the Policy</u></p>				<p><u>There are two licensed nuclear installations located in West Berkshire the Atomic Weapons Establishment in Aldermaston (AWE A) and in Burghfield (AWE B).</u></p>			<p><u>The United Kingdom’s Fifth National Report on Compliance with the Convention on Nuclear Safety Obligations (Department of Energy and Climate Change, Sept 2010) states in its forward that “The safety of the other UK nuclear facilities that fall outside the scope of this Convention are also regulated to the same standards, so as to ensure that they are operated in a manner that maintains a high level of safety”. Paragraph 17.30 refers to development control policy in the vicinity of nuclear installations.</u></p>			<p><u>Circular 04/00 ‘Planning Controls for Hazardous Substances’, (sections A17 and A18) provides general advice about the need for consultation about proposed developments in the vicinity of licensed nuclear installations. This is a requirement of longstanding Government policy regarding local demographics which would limit the radiological consequences to the public in the unlikely event of an accident involving the spread of radioactive materials beyond the nuclear site boundary. This policy is a measure of prudence over and above the stringent regulatory requirements imposed on nuclear operators to prevent such accidents. The ONR administers the Government’s policy on the control of development and provides advice to the Local Planning Authority, who take this into account in considering whether or not to approve planning applications. Applicants considering new development within the land use planning consultation zones provided by the ONR, and as shown on the proposals map are strongly encouraged to enter into early discussions with the Council.</u></p>		

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>The land use planning consultation zones for the installations cross over into the following neighbouring councils: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Reading Borough Council and Wokingham Borough Council. Given the potential cumulative effects of any population increase surrounding the installations, it will be necessary to monitor committed and future development proposals in partnership with neighbouring councils and the ONR. The Councils will monitor housing completions and commitments as part of the Annual Monitoring Report and send this information directly to the ONR for them to make informed judgements when assessing future development proposals.</u></p> <p><u>The ONR has no objection to the overall scale of development proposed in the East Kennet Valley in policy ADPP6. The ONR's decision whether to advise against a particular development is based on complex modelling. The ONR has indicated that on the basis of its current model for testing the acceptability of residential developments around the AWE sites, it would advise against nearly all new residential development within the inner land use planning zones defined on the Proposals Map. Policy CS9a reflects the Council's intention to normally follow the ONR's advice in the inner zones. The inner zones largely encompass countryside, but the service village of Aldermaston is within the inner zone around AWE (A). Whether or not the ONR would advise against a particular proposal beyond the inner zones depends on a variety of factors, including the scale of the development, distance from the relevant AWE site and the relationship to existing and planned developments. It is not therefore practical to express the ONR's likely advice, or the Council's response, in any further policy in this Plan.</u></p> <p><u>During the plan period there are likely to be changes of inputs to the ONR's model which may result in a less restrictive approach being taken by the ONR. Such changes would include information on population and household size from the 2011 Census. The successful completion and full operation of the PEGASUS Project at AWE (A) (currently scheduled for completion in 2021) and the MENSA Project at AWE (B) (currently</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>scheduled for completion in 2016) would enable the ONR to take into account the revised safety case for those projects in the modelling process and may enable a less constraining population density criteria to be applied. As a result, the consultation zones may change as well as the ONR's advice on particular proposals.</u></p> <p>Delivery and Monitoring</p> <p><u>New development within the land use planning consultation zones will be monitored on an annual basis and monitoring results passed to the ONR. This will enable the ONR to give up to date advice to individual Councils regarding subsequent development applications.</u></p> <p><i>Footnotes:</i> <u>Residential for the purpose of this policy includes any development resulting in a permanent resident night time population, e.g. residential institutions. This policy does not preclude normal residential extensions.</u></p> <p><u>Consultation Zones as defined by the ONR and shown on the West Berkshire Proposals Map.</u></p> <p><u>Consultation arrangements with the ONR.</u></p>
MM 5.19	EPFC26 FEPFC19 (fpmc162 and 178 embedded for	Policy CS10 and Explanatory Text (paras. 5.33 – 5.45)	52	<p><i>Delete Policy CS10 and explanatory text and replace new text as follows:</i></p> <p>Policy CS10 Location and type of business development</p> <p><u>The Council seeks to facilitate and promote the growth and forecasted change of business development in the plan period in order to:</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
	<p>clarity)</p> <p>Includes minor amendments in light of the NPPF, May 2012.</p> <p>Minor amendment to text under sub heading: <i>the appropriate location of business development.</i></p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>manage the growth of B1 floorspace to meet future requirements;</u> - <u>manage the reduction of land for B2 uses, whilst maintaining a sufficient portfolio of sites suitable for such uses; and</u> - <u>retain a portfolio of sites for B8 uses in suitable locations.</u> <p><u>This will be achieved through the following:</u></p> <p><u>(a) The appropriate location of business development:</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for industry, distribution and storage uses will be directed to the District's defined Protected Employment Areas^(insert footnote) and existing suitably located employment sites and premises. Any proposals for such uses outside these areas/locations will be assessed by the Council against the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>compatibility with uses in the area surrounding the proposals and potential impacts on those uses; and</u> • <u>capacity and impact on the road network and access by sustainable modes of transport.</u> <p><u>New office development will be directed towards West Berkshire's town and district centres as outlined in policy CS12. The scale of development will be appropriate to the size and character of the centre.</u></p> <p><u>If no suitable sites are available within an existing centre, then the following sequential approach will be taken for accommodating additional offices in the review of Protected Employment Areas and any allocations in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. This sequential approach should also be used in support of any planning application for office development outside defined centres:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Edge of centre: suitably located brownfield site or Protected Employment Area</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>within an edge of centre location, and Newbury Business Park.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Out of centre: brownfield site or Protected Employment Area within an out of centre location, with good accessibility by alternative modes of transport.</u> • <u>Other existing employment sites and premises not in an edge of centre or out of centre location.</u> <p><u>Proposals for non town centre uses which seek the loss of office floorspace within defined town and district centres will need to demonstrate that the proposal maintains the vitality of the existing centre and would not substantially prejudice the overall supply of office floorspace over the Core Strategy period in that centre.</u></p> <p><u>In making allocations for residential development in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD the need for any complementary element of business development or other economic use to achieve an appropriate sustainable development, commensurate with the scale of any proposed allocation will be considered.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Protecting Employment Areas:</u> <u>Protected Employment Areas are parcels of land throughout the District designated for B uses^(insert footnote). The continued designation, role and boundaries of existing Protected Employment Areas will be reviewed in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD (or other subsequent Development Plan Document) to achieve a balanced portfolio of fit for purpose sites to meet future requirements. In the interim, subject to the application of the sequential test for any proposed town centre uses, proposals for employment generating uses other than B class uses, within Protected Employment Areas will be favourably considered where these would be complementary to the existing business use in that location and consistent with the integrity and function of the location for employment purposes. Proposals for such non B class employment generating uses which are likely to substantially prejudice the strategy set out at the start of this policy will not be permitted.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Business development will be supported on existing employment sites, particularly on those sites seen as strategically important for the District's economy – New Greenham Park, Vodafone and the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE). The Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will assess the role and function of these three sites to determine whether they should be designated as Protected Employment Areas or an alternative bespoke designation consistent with their importance to the local economy.</u></p> <p><u>(c) Managing the scale, type and intensification of business development:</u> <u>A range of types and sizes of employment sites and premises will be encouraged throughout the District to meet the needs of the local economy. Proposals for business development should be in keeping with the surrounding environment, not conflict with existing uses and promote sustainable transport.</u></p> <p><u>More efficient use of existing sites and premises should be made in order to attract inward investment, respond to modern business requirements and meet the demand for employment land over the plan period. The Council will promote the intensification, redevelopment and upgrade of existing, vacant and/or derelict employment sites and premises for business development.</u></p> <p><u>Explanation of the Policy</u> <u>The overall aim of this policy is to set the framework to facilitate and promote the growth and forecasted change of business development across the District over the plan period.</u></p> <p><u>Evidence^(insert footnote) indicates that West Berkshire has a sufficient supply of employment land to meet demand to 2026, and thus no need to plan for a net increase in employment land stock. Whilst a sufficient supply exists, it is not necessarily in the correct use class. The Employment Land Assessment (ELA) concludes that over the</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>plan period there is a shortfall of B1 floorspace by approximately 121,000sqm, a surplus of B2 space by approximately 65,000sqm due to declining demand and a potential shortfall in the longer term of B8 floorspace of approximately 24,000sqm. Policy CS10 therefore sets out the framework to ensure this imbalance in employment land supply is addressed over the plan period, through the effective utilisation of existing employment sites and premises. The Council seek to ensure that sufficient sites are provided in the right locations to foster sustainable economic growth. This means maintaining a portfolio of sites suitable to meet demand for B8 in suitable locations; managing an excess supply of B2 floorspace whilst ensuring enough sites and premises are retained for such uses; and, facilitating the growth of B1 floorspace to meet future requirements.</u></p> <p><u>As the Core Strategy sets out a long term approach to business development, and circumstances surrounding economic development are constantly changing, the scale of development required within each use class to meet economic demands will be monitored^(insert footnote). Through the Annual Monitoring Report the supply of employment land for B uses will be updated annually to reflect any market changes.</u></p> <p><u>National guidance sets out the definition of economic development which goes beyond B class uses to include main town centre uses, as well as community and public uses. This policy (CS10) specifically deals with business development (B1/B2/B8) in order to ensure the health of the District's business areas and Protected Employment Areas are maintained. Other uses falling under the definition within national guidance are addressed through policy CS12 and/or the Area Delivery Plan policies.</u></p> <p><u>Policy CS10 applies to business uses throughout the whole District. Given the rural nature of West Berkshire and the importance of sustaining the District's rural areas, policy CS11 presents additional policy provision for the rural economy/enterprises.</u></p> <p><u>The appropriate location of business development:</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>The policy seeks to support and build upon West Berkshire’s vibrant and successful economy through continued business development in sustainable locations.</u></p> <p><u>Industrial, warehousing and distribution developments will be focused in areas of existing employment activity and within defined Protected Employment Areas. The location of any B2 and B8 uses should be in areas with good access to major road/freight route networks and should not conflict with surrounding uses. The Council’s ELA highlights that although the level of B2 activity in the District is low, most of the B2 floorspace is located to the east of Newbury, south east Thatcham mainly at Colthrop, and close to the A4 at Beenham. It also indicates that the majority of B8 floorspace is located to the south of Newbury at New Greenham Park, to the south east of Thatcham and in the west of the District near Hungerford and north of the M4 near Lambourn.</u></p> <p><u>Office development will be directed towards West Berkshire’s town and district centres, where development will be accessible and well served by a choice of transport modes in accordance with national policy. Policy CS12 sets out the District’s hierarchy of centres based on their scale, character and function. The main focus for office development is Newbury town centre given its role within the District and the nature and size of development which already exists. With Newbury being the focus for housing development over the plan period it is important that any new employment development is balanced with housing locations and is suitably located to cater for future demand and reduce out-commuting from the District. More limited office development will also be directed towards West Berkshire’s other town and district centres, Thatcham, Hungerford, Pangbourne, Lambourn and Theale. As the character of these centres is more rural in nature with small unit sizes and low density development, it is important that the scale of any new office development in these locations is appropriate to the size and character of the centre.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Policy CS10 takes a sequential approach to office development in accordance with national guidance. This means the Council will seek to locate office development within existing centres in the first instance. However, given the size and character of existing centres not all office development can be accommodated within the District's centres and therefore flexibility must be applied to the location of B1a office space through the sequential approach. If no suitable available sites can be found within an existing centre then a suitable edge of centre location will be sought, followed by an accessible out of centre location. Such locations, for example Newbury Business Park, Hambridge Road/Lane and Arlington Business Park, already host some of the District's office floorspace and play a strategic role in providing offices for businesses that demand large floorplates and modern accommodation. Other edge of centre locations, such as London Road Industrial Estates, have the potential for redevelopment and the ability to deliver a greater employment base on these sites. It is the Council's preferred approach that if an edge of centre or out of centre site must be utilised for office development, then the site should be located within an existing Protected Employment Area or suitable brownfield site which is in a sustainable location, well served by a choice of transport modes.</u></p> <p><u>In terms of sequentially preferable locations for office development, the following sequence is appropriate in accordance with national guidance:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Sites within existing town and district centres;</u> <u>2. Suitably located brownfield sites or Protected Employment Area within an edge of centre location, and Newbury Business Park. Protected Employment Areas in such locations are: London Road Industrial Estates; Hambridge Road/Lane; Green Lane; Charnham Park; Station Yard; Arlington Business Park; Station Road and adjacent Estates.</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>3. Brownfield sites or Protected Employment Area within an out of centre location, with good accessibility by alternative modes of transport. Protected Employment Areas in such locations are: Turnpike Estate; Castle Estate; Colthrop Estate; Smitham Bridge Hungerford Trading Estate; Horseshoe Park; Calleva Park</u></p> <p><u>4. Other existing employment sites and premises not in an edge of centre or out of centre location.</u></p> <p><u>Newbury Business Park, although located in an out of centre location in accordance with the definitions set out in national guidance, has been placed within the edge of centre category in terms of the sequential approach to B1a uses. The Council feel that given the characteristics of the Business Park and the scale of B1a floorspace which currently exists, the sequential approach could undermine the role, vitality and function of the site if it was to be considered as an out of centre location, second to those sites in edge of centre locations.</u></p> <p><u>To ensure the vitality of West Berkshire's town and district centres, the loss of office floorspace to a non town centre use will be resisted, where the loss of such floorspace would impact upon the vitality of the centre and/or would substantially prejudice the overall supply of floorspace within that centre.</u></p> <p><u>Protecting Employment Areas:</u> <u>In order to address the imbalance in employment land supply mentioned above, a comprehensive assessment of existing Protected Employment Areas and their boundaries will take place as part of the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. The review of the Protected Employment Areas will provide the scope and flexibility to reinforce the existing employment land stock to provide a balanced portfolio of sites to meet future demand.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>The Employment Land Assessment (and any subsequent updates) will be used as a starting point for the review of the role and function of each Protected Employment Area. Evidence such as business surveys, Annual Monitoring Reports and the composition of each Protected Employment Area, including the age, quality, location and capacity of sites and premises, must be taken into account, together with the surrounding uses. The review will also assess the suitability of Protected Employment Areas for B1a uses through a sequential approach to site location and any potential impact upon existing centres. This holistic review may result in some land becoming available for alternative uses, however this will need to be reassessed at the time taking into account any changes which may arise in the supply of and demand for employment land through an update to the Employment Land Assessment to inform the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p> <p><u>As mentioned above Protected Employment Areas have been designated for B class uses to ensure sufficient sites are provided in suitable locations to foster business development and promote sustainable economic growth across the District. In the meantime, prior to the review of the Protected Employment Areas, policy CS10 allows for employment generating uses other than B class uses to be located within Protected Employment Areas if they are complementary to the existing business use in that location and where they are consistent with the integrity and function of the location for employment purposes. This is subject to the application of the sequential test for town centre uses. However, proposals for such employment generating uses, which are not a B class use, will not be permitted within Protected Employment Areas if they are likely to substantially prejudice the strategy set out within this policy, in terms of managing the changing needs for B class use.</u></p> <p><u>New Greenham Park, Vodafone HQ at The Connection and the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) are three strategically important employment locations for the</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>West Berkshire economy. All three sites comprise of a large amount of business floorspace and are large local employers, but at the same time their role and functionality within the economy differ. The Council will support business development within these sites, particularly that which enhances the contribution to the local economy. The Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will assess their role and function to determine whether they should be designated as Protected Employment Areas or be given an alternative bespoke designation consistent with their importance to the local economy.</u></p> <p><u>Managing the scale, type and intensification of business development:</u></p> <p><u>Policy CS10 promotes appropriate intensification and redevelopment of existing sites and premises in accordance with national guidance. The approach encourages a strong mix/range of premises and promotes the redevelopment of vacant and/or derelict buildings in order to keep the market attractive to modern investment.</u></p> <p><u>To ensure the health of the local economy is maintained it is important to provide a variety of size and type of employment premises of an appropriate scale and intensity. The Council will therefore encourage proposals which seek to upgrade or redevelop existing or vacant premises, especially within Protected Employment Areas, which will enhance the flexibility and availability of employment space.</u></p> <p><u>Intensification of office development will be looked upon favourably, especially within existing centres and edge of centre locations in Newbury and Theale where demand for office space is high, provided the scale and intensity is not out of proportion with the character of the surrounding areas.</u></p> <p><u>Business development within the District is dominated by small and medium sized units, typically in B1 use. Demand for such accommodation is likely to be met through smaller</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>individual sites and within multi-occupancy employment areas. The Council will encourage proposals for small and medium sized businesses and ensure that opportunities are provided for them to grow within the District.</u></p> <p><i>Footnotes:</i> <u>Protected Employment Areas are currently outlined within the West Berkshire District Local Plan, Saved Policies. These designations will continue to be in use until reviewed under the site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p> <p><u>B uses refer to those uses identified within The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) – B1; B2; B8).</u></p> <p><u>Employment Land Assessment, DTZ 2007</u></p> <p><u>See Monitoring Framework, Section 6.</u></p>
MM 5.20	EPFC27 FEPFC20	Policy CS13 North Wessex Downs AONB Racehorse Industry sub-heading	59	<p><i>Insert text to the start of the North Wessex Downs AONB Racehorse Industry sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Whilst conserving environmental quality and countryside character, the...</u></p> <p><i>Amend bullet points under the sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <p><u>For suitable Within this context:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>suitable</u> existing establishments or facilities <u>are expected to be retained;</u> • <u>permanent</u> fragmentation will be resisted; and • redevelopment away from uses essential to the horseracing industry will <u>be subject to the tests of suitability and necessity outlined in the explanation of the policy.</u> not be permitted.

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 5.21	EPFC27 FEPFC20 (fpmc176 and 177 embedded for clarity) Includes minor amendment, May 2012. Some text deleted as not necessary for soundness.	Policy CS13 Para. 5.55	60	<p><u>Applying the policy</u></p> <p><u>In terms of interpreting Policy CS13, existing establishments or facilities includes land and buildings relating to the racehorse industry, including residential development.</u></p> <p><u>Suitability test:</u> <u>In considering the suitability of existing establishments the key factors to consider will be:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. the location of the site relating to the form and character of the settlement;</u> <u>2. the existing range of facilities on the site and their adequacy for the purpose of training and/or breeding horses, or their capability for adaptation to meet such needs;</u> <u>3. the availability of and access to (including the potential for improved access) suitable gallops and training areas;</u> <u>4. the impact on local roads including the safety of horses and riders and traffic using the highway;</u> <u>5. the availability of sources of labour and the accommodation of personnel on site or in the locality.</u> <p><u>It is not the intention of the policy to retain training and breeding establishments that are no longer appropriate. The Council accepts that it cannot control the closure of businesses where there is little or no support and which are not economically viable. However, it can ensure that racehorse industry facilities are not displaced by redevelopment or changes to other land uses without first considering the</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>consequences and potential loss to the industry first. It can also ensure that applications for re-use or redevelopment should conserve the character and amenities of the settlement, the landscape and rural quality of the surrounding countryside and not materially harm the availability of local employment opportunities.</u></p> <p><u>Necessity test:</u> <u>Proposals for redevelopment or change of use will need to show that it is no longer necessary to retain the yard or facility in its current use. In order to show that there is no longer a demand for the yard or facility in that particular location a robust marketing plan, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, will be required as evidence from the applicant to show that all reasonable attempts have been made to sell or let the site at a realistic price. Any proposal for the loss of a training yard will need to demonstrate how it will not detrimentally alter the critical balance and/or range of yard sizes available in the area. It is important to retain a supply of yards which are of various sizes to allow for market churn.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for fragmentation of existing establishments and facilities should not adversely affect the operational use of the site or the industry as a whole.</u></p>
MM 5.22	EPFC28	Policy CS14	61	<p><i>Amend the 1st sentence of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>The Council will use its planning and transport powers to:</p> <p><u>Development that generates a transport impact will be required to:*</u></p> <p><i>Insert note after bullet points of policy as follows:</i></p> <p><u>*Development proposals may not need to fulfil each bullet point. The supporting text</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>below clarifies the types and scale of development which will be required to meet the specific parts of this policy.</u></p>
MM 5.23	EPFC28 FEPFC21 (fpmc122 and fpmc125 embedded for clarity)	Policy CS14 Paras. 5.58, 5.61-5.64, 5.66-5.69	61	<p><i>Insert text after second sentence of paragraph 5.58 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the key infrastructure projects required to support the delivery of the LDF, and infrastructure that is critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy is set out in Appendix Cii. The LTP is supported by an Implementation Plan which sets out how schemes and initiatives will deliver the LTP, and this will be updated annually.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.61 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>All development will be required to demonstrate how it will reduce the need to travel.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.62 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>All development will be required to show how it promotes safer and healthy travel.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.63 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>All development will be required to show how it improves travel choice and reduces the use of single occupancy cars.</u></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph 5.64 as follows (with part of fpmc122 embedded):</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Residential development should seek to demonstrate good accessibility by :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting development <u>Locating</u> where there is already good access to key services and facilities • safeguarding essential local services and facilities • <u>Contributing towards</u> improving connections between communities and key services and facilities <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.66 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>All development will be required to demonstrate how it minimises the impact of travel on the environment and helps to tackle climate change.</u></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph 5.67 as follows (with part of fpmc125 embedded):</i></p> <p>... <u>All development proposals will be required</u> have to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect these networks or that <u>they can mitigate</u> the adverse impact can be suitably mitigated. ...</p> <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.68 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Development which results in freight movements, including construction traffic should take into consideration the FRN.</u></p> <p><i>Insert text to the end of paragraph 5.69 as follows:</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<u>All development which meets the thresholds set out in national guidance will be required to prepare the appropriate Transport Assessments / Statements and Travel Plans.</u>
(5.24) Reference for clarity only		Policy CS16 and Explanatory Text	65	<i>No change needed for soundness.</i>
(5.25)		CS16 Explanatory Text	66	<i>No change needed for soundness.</i>
MM 5.26	PFC15 (fpmc128 embedded for clarity)	Policy CS17	67	<p><i>Delete 4th bullet point of policy as follows:</i></p> <p>Surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner through the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS)^(footnote) and to provide attenuation to Greenfield run-off rates and volumes, for all new development and re-development.</p> <p><i>Insert text at the end of the policy (which incorporates the deleted bullet point above) as follows:</i></p> <p><u>On all development sites surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner through the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Methods (SuDS)^(footnote) in accordance with best practice and the proposed national standards and to provide attenuation to greenfield run-off rates and volumes, for all new development and re-development and provide other benefits where possible such as water quality, biodiversity and amenity.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><i>Footnote:</i> Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) is a term used to describe the various approaches that can be used to manage surface water drainage in a way that mimics the natural environment.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) is a term used to describe the various approaches that can be used to manage surface water drainage in a way that mimics the natural environment.</u></p>
MM 5.27	PFC16 EPFC29	Policy CS18 Explanatory Text Para.5.91	70	<p><i>Amend paragraph 5.91 after second sentence as follows::</i></p> <p>It is possible that certain types of development within this area may affect the SPA. They would therefore require an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) to determine whether or not they would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. However, it is possible that certain types of development up to 7km from the boundary of the SPA^(footnote) could have an impact on the SPA. Proposals for new residential development of one or more net additional dwellings up to 5km from the boundary of the SPA and residential development of over 50 dwellings located between 5 and 7km of the boundary of the SPA will therefore require screening to assess whether they will have a likely significant effect on the SPA. Where a significant effect exists or cannot be excluded, an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 would need to be undertaken. Proposals will only be permitted if they do not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework will be used to guide assessment and any avoidance or mitigation measures that may be needed. The provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to attract new residents away from the SPA is a key part of these avoidance measures together with strategic access management on the SPA and monitoring. Since the level of development expected to come forward in this area of the</p> <p><u>It is possible that certain types of development up to 7km from the boundary of the SPA^(footnote) could have an impact on the SPA. Proposals for new residential development of one or more net additional dwellings up to 5km from the boundary of the SPA and residential development of over 50 dwellings located between 5 and 7km of the boundary of the SPA will therefore require screening to assess whether they will have a likely significant effect on the SPA. Where a significant effect exists or cannot be excluded, an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 would need to be undertaken. Proposals will only be permitted if they do not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework will be used to guide assessment and any avoidance or mitigation measures that may be needed. The provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to attract new residents away from the SPA is a key part of these avoidance measures together with strategic access management on the SPA and monitoring. Since the level of development expected to come forward in this area of the</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>District is extremely low, the Council will explore opportunities for cross boundary working in this regard. Alternatively, SANG may be provided by developers for individual developments where it complies with Natural England's guidelines and there is an appropriate contribution to strategic access management and monitoring. In all cases SANGs will need to be agreed with Natural England.</u></p> <p><i>Footnote:</i> <u>As shown on the Proposals Map</u></p>
MM 5.28	<p>EPFC30</p> <p>Part of proposed text deleted as unrealistic expectation about change.</p>	<p>Policy CS20 and Explanatory Text</p> <p>Paras 5.111, 5.112, 5.115 and 5.116.</p>	75	<p><i>Amend point (b) of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p><u>b) The retention of the individual identity of separate settlements and parts thereof Ensuring that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character</u></p> <p><i>Amend second sentence of paragraph 5.111 as follows:</i></p> <p>Having an understanding of these processes and the way the historic environment of the District has influenced settlement patterns, the individual identity of separate settlements and their <u>the sense of place of particular areas</u>, is essential when accommodating future development.</p> <p><i>Delete the first two sentences of paragraph 5.112 as follows:</i></p> <p>The ability of a particular area to accommodate future growth without it having any adverse effects on its character will continue to be an important factor when considering the future location and nature of development. It is essential that new development</p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p>should help sustain and/or create landscapes with a strong sense of place and local identity.</p> <p><i>Amend paragraph 5.116 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>It is essential that new development should help sustain and/or create landscapes with a strong sense of place and local identity and this is another key element of the policy. The policy will protect and enhance this diversity and local distinctiveness through the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) rather than through the use of local landscape designations.</u></p>

Section 6: Monitoring Framework

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 6.1	<p>EPFC31</p> <p>(with fpmc 155 and 196 embedded for clarity)</p> <p>Amended to delete CS8.</p>	Monitoring Framework – Policy CS9A	n/a - this is new text but would be on page 81	<p><i>Delete whole section under CS8 Rural Exception sites.</i></p> <p><i>Insert new table for policy CS9A with the following text:</i></p> <p><u>Policy CS9A - Nuclear Installations - AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield</u></p> <p><u>Linked Objectives - 3: Housing Growth</u></p> <p><u>Core Strategy Outcome: ONR advice on development within land use planning consultation zones</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Delivery Indicators: Commitments and completions of residential and commercial development within the defined boundaries of the land use planning consultation zones</u></p> <p><u>Target: To take account of ONR advice in the interests of public safety</u></p> <p><u>Data Source: In house monitoring in conjunction with the ONR and the Planning Departments of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Wokingham Borough Council on an annual basis.</u></p>
MM 6.2	EPFC31	Monitoring Framework – Policy CS10	82	<p><i>Amend text within table for policy CS10 - Employment and the Economy and CS 11 The Rural Economy to read:</i></p> <p><u>Target set out in ELA 2007. Requirements to 2026:</u></p> <p><u>B1 = 121,000sqm</u> <u>B8 = 24,000sqm</u> <u>B2 = -65,000sqm</u></p> <p><u>Targets may be updated in any future ELA or as a result of future monitoring.</u></p>
6.3 Ref for clarity only.	EPFC37	Monitoring Framework – Policy CS16	83	<p><i>Proposed change not needed for soundness.</i></p>

Section: Appendices / Glossary

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 7.1	EPFC32	Appendix B: Housing Land Supply	90	<i>Delete table titled 'Housing Distribution: Settlement Hierarchy'</i> <i>Amend table titled 'Housing Distribution: Spatial Areas' to reflect the revised distribution set out within the Area Delivery Plan Policies.</i>
MM 7.2		Appendix B: Housing Land Supply Figure 8	92	<i>Replace figure 8 with most up-to-date Housing Trajectory.</i> <i>See Appendix D of this Main Modifications Schedule for details of Figure 8.</i>
MM 7.3	FEPFC18	Appendix C: AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield	94	<i>Delete Appendix C: 'AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield' as no longer required.</i>
MM 7.4	EPFC33	Appendix Ci	n/a - this is new text but would go on page 94	<i>Insert new Appendix – 'Appendix Ci: Sandleford Concept Plan'</i> <i>See Appendix E of this Main Modifications Schedule for details of Appendix Ci.</i>
MM 7.5	EPFC34 and FEPFC22	Appendix Cii	n/a – this is new text but would go on page 94	<i>Insert new Appendix – 'Appendix Cii: Critical Infrastructure Schedule of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan' to read:</i> <u>APPENDIX Cii: Critical Infrastructure Schedule of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Critical Infrastructure schedule</u></p> <p><u>The following schedule sets out, in summary form, the infrastructure that is required to deliver the strategy. It is drawn from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and reflects the position at adoption. The IDP is a separate document to the Core Strategy and will be updated in the light of changing circumstances.</u></p> <p><u>This summary is intended to assist the proper long term planning of the District. For any particular development proposal, the need for, and nature of, any contribution to any of the items listed will be considered in accordance with relevant national policy on planning obligations and the CIL Regulations.</u></p> <p><u>Specific infrastructure provisions have already been secured for the major housing scheme that has been granted planning permission at Newbury Racecourse.</u></p> <p><u>ROAD NETWORK</u></p> <p><u>Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Junction improvements along the A339 in Newbury: Robin Hood gyratory</u> • <u>Junction improvements along the A339 in Newbury: Bear Lane / B3421</u> • <u>Junction improvements along the A339 in Newbury: Greenham Rd / St John's Rd A343</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intelligent Transport Systems in relation to traffic signals.</u> <p><u>Newbury Racecourse:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Junction improvements Racecourse Road Site access</u> • <u>Junction / route improvements along the A4: Hambridge Road (Newbury) and Lower Way, Newbury.</u> • <u>Bridge over the railway line lining the Racecourse site to Hambridge Road/Hambridge Lane.</u> <p><u>Sandleford Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>2 accesses at Sandleford onto Monks Lane</u> • <u>Junction improvements along the A339 in Newbury: Pinchington Lane</u> • <u>Junction improvement: Monks Lane / Newtown Road</u> • <u>Junction improvement: Monks Lane / A343 Andover road (including pedestrian and cycle improvements)</u> • <u>Junction improvement: A34 / A343 south</u> <p><u>RAIL</u></p> <p><u>Newbury / Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improvements at Newbury Racecourse Station</u> • <u>Improvements at Newbury Station</u> <p><u>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</u></p> <p><u>West Berkshire-wide and Strategic Sites:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bus infrastructure improvements in connection with strategic sites</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>and other areas (real time passenger information, Kassel kerbs, shelters, etc.)</u></p> <p><u>Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Newbury to Basingstoke bus link improvements</u> <p><u>Sandleford Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improved / new service linking Sandleford and Newbury Town Centre</u> • <u>Bus access from Sandleford to Andover Road through Warren Road</u> <p><u>Newbury Racecourse:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New shuttle bus service between Newbury and Thatcham</u> <p><u>CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE</u></p> <p><u>Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <p><u>Newbury Racecourse:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improved pedestrian/cycle access to/from Racecourse</u> • <u>Improvements to National Cycle Route 4 on Canal tow path western area</u> <p><u>Sandleford Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improved pedestrian/cycle crossing links at Monks Lane and Newtown Road (College roundabout and other crossing points)</u> <p><u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>West Berkshire-wide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>District-wide requirement for up to 40% affordable housing to be provided as part of new residential development.</u> • <u>Actual levels of provision to be negotiated on a site by site basis.</u> <p><u>WASTE MANAGEMENT</u></p> <p><u>East Kennet Valley Spatial Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Integrated Waste Management Facility, Padworth Sidings</u> <p><u>ENERGY SUPPLY</u></p> <p><u>West Berkshire-wide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Various upgrades to existing off site 11KV infrastructure across West Berkshire</u> • <u>Various upgrades to gas infrastructure across West Berkshire</u> <p><u>Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <p><u>Newbury Racecourse:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Offsite improvements to 11kv infrastructure in the form of 1 or 2 cable circuits from the Riverside Primary S/S to site.</u> • <u>33kv Reinforcement of the Substation also likely</u> <p><u>Sandleford Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Offsite 11kv infrastructure in the form or 1 or 2 cable circuits from the</u>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p style="text-align: center;"><u>St Johns Primary S/S to site</u></p> <p><u>WATER AND WASTE WATER</u></p> <p><u>West Berkshire-wide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some upgrades to existing waste water infrastructure across West Berkshire</u> <p><u>Newbury/Thatcham Spatial Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Upgrade to the main terminal pumping station in Newbury.</u> <p><u>Sandleford Park:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Upgrade to wastewater infrastructure will be required.</u> <p><u>DRAINAGE</u></p> <p><u>West Berkshire-wide including Strategic Sites:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems</u>
MM 7.6	FEPFC23 Amendment re CS8/HSG.11	Appendix E	96	<p><i>Amend Appendix E: 'Local Plan Policies replaced by Core Strategy' as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Delete CS8 and HSG.11 from the table.</i></p> <p><i>Core Strategy Policy CS10 under 'Superseded West Berkshire District Local</i></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><i>Plan Policy' include <u>ECON1</u></i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph E.2 by inserting the following text:</i></p> <p><i>.... Local Plan will <u>remain in force until</u> be replaced ...</i></p>
MM 7.7	<p>FEPFC24</p> <p>Includes minor amendment, May 2012</p>	Appendix H	<p>n/a - this is new text but would go on page 97</p>	<p><i>Insert new Appendix – 'Appendix H: List of Protected Employment Areas' to read:</i></p> <p><u>List of Protected Employment Areas</u></p> <p><u>Protected Employment Areas were designated through the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006, Saved Policies and are shown on the LDF Proposals Map. Protected Employment Areas are parcels of land designated for B class uses as defined within the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). These designations are carried forward into this Core Strategy and will continue to be used until reviewed under the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</u></p> <p><u>Protected Employment Areas are as follows:</u></p> <p><u>Aldermaston: Calleva Park</u> <u>Paices Hill/Youngs Industrial Estate</u></p> <p><u>Beenham: Beenham Industrial Area</u></p> <p><u>Hermitage: Red Shute Hill</u></p> <p><u>Hungerford: Station Yard</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Smitham Bridge Hungerford Trading Estate</u> <u>Charnham Park</u></p> <p><u>Lambourn:</u> <u>Membury Estate</u> <u>Lowesdon Works</u></p> <p><u>Newbury:</u> <u>Hambridge Road/Lane</u> <u>London Road Estates</u> <u>Newbury Business Park</u> <u>Turnpike Estate</u> <u>Castle Estate</u></p> <p><u>Pangbourne:</u> <u>Horseshoe Park</u></p> <p><u>Thatcham:</u> <u>Green Lane</u> <u>Colthrop Estate</u></p> <p><u>Theale:</u> <u>Arlington Business Park</u> <u>Station Road and adjacent estates</u> <u>Theale Lakes at Sheffield Bottom</u></p>
MM 7.8	EPFC35	Glossary	100	<p><i>Insert new definition into Glossary as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Limited Infill Development</u></p> <p><u>Minor development within settlement boundaries which may consist of development in a gap in an otherwise built-up frontage, development on previous undeveloped land or small-scale redevelopment.</u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
MM 7.9	FEPFC25 Replaced in light of the NPPF, May 2012	Glossary	102	<p><i>Amend text of Affordable housing definition in the Glossary as listed:</i></p> <p><i>Insert affordable rented into definition:</i> 'Affordable housing includes social rented, affordable rented</p> <p><i>Insert the word 'cost' and delete the word 'price' from the first bullet point:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • availability at a price low enough price for them to afford... <p><i>Insert the date after the word 'PPS3' in second bullet point:</i> (PPS3, 2011).</p> <p><i>Amend the second set of bullet points as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social rented accommodation: housing provided at or below the Homes and Communities Agency target rent levels. • Affordable rented accommodation: housing provided on the same basis as social rented housing but with rent levels at no more than 80 per cent of the local market rent. • Intermediate accommodation: housing provided at prices and rent levels above those of social rent but below market prices and rents and meet the above criteria as set out in PPS3. This can include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intermediate rented accommodation: housing provided on the same basis as social rented housing, but at rent levels above target rents and below open market rents. ○ Shared ownership accommodation: housing provided on a part rent and part sale basis, as both the occupier and a housing association own equity in the property. Shared ownership is commonly referred to as Homebuy. ○ Rent to Buy: accommodation whereby the property is let at an intermediate or affordable rent, with an option to purchase as

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p style="text-align: center;">shared ownership at a later date.</p> <p><i>Replace the whole of the Affordable Housing Definition in the Glossary with the following text to ensure the definition is the same as that set out within the NPPF:</i></p> <p><u>Affordable Housing is defined in the NPPF as:</u></p> <p><u><i>Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Social rented housing is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in Section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Intermediate housing is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the Affordable</i></u></p>

Main Modification	Origin	Section / Policy / Paragraph	Page (Submission Document)	Description of Proposed Focused Change
				<p><u>Housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing.</u></p> <p><u>Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as 'low cost market' housing may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.</u></p> <p><u>The Council uses the above definition of affordable housing and defines the term affordable as accommodation which is available at a price or rent which is not more than 30% of a household's net income.</u></p> <p>Affordable housing is normally and preferably provided on-site and through Housing Associations (Registered Providers; RP Social Landlord; RSL). Affordable housing can sometimes be provided on sites owned by the Housing Associations, but more often the provision comes through obligations placed on developments by the planning system.</p>