

**Appendix 5 of Consultation Statement**  
**Feedback from Consultation on Pre-Submission Plan**

Respondent	Comment	Response to Comments	Action Taken
Resident 1	<p>IRS Comments:            Whilst the draft plan makes an attempt to cover the special rural character of the area, it should be more definitive and prescriptive in certain areas.</p> <p>One thing in particular that needs to be added is the concept that ANY “Areas of Special Character” are protected as at the moment only existing ones are covered - there is the potential for others to be added in the future and this needs to be catered for.</p> <p>In addition there needs to be recognition that land to the west of the village, ie Hall Farm and the land the other side of the Loddon towards the Magpie and Parrot to the north of the A327, forms a key rural land barrier that preserves the rural nature of the village and keeps it distinct from Shinfield.</p> <p>Finally the ruined church, the associated tree lined avenue from the listed Rectory and the surrounding former parkland should be mentioned in the plan and recognised as a key village landscape.</p> <p>TC Comments:            Given the scale of development new medical facilities are Essential,</p>	<p>National and local planning rules limit what the NP can do.            This has been taken on board by introducing non designated locations</p> <p>This is recognised by introducing concept of important landscape views.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>IRS3 and IRS4 amended</p> <p>See IRS1 f)</p> <p>IRS4 e) as amended refers</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p>
Resident 2	<p>IRS Comments:            The area is a rural area. It should stay that way.</p> <p>TC Comments:            With all the building at Arborfield Garrison, the existing communities should benefit from some facilities. There is not even a shop yet.</p> <p>AH Comments:            Houses better than scrap yards, but the countryside needs to be protected</p> <p>GA Comments:            Hmm. More building does not just mean more traffic, it means more roadworks too!</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies are intended to strengthen protection of rural environment            That is gist of TC policies, also AH1, AH2, AH3</p> <p>Agreed            Planning rules do not recognise road works as a constraint!</p>	<p>Refer revised IRS policies</p>

Resident 3	<p>IRS Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) So much is still left open to interpretation - can this be tightened?</li> <li>2) IRS 2 - Basic start-point</li> <li>3) IRS 4 - should include setting and stress that examples given are not exclusive.</li> </ol> <p>AH Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Presume AH1 refers to existing settlement boundaries and not those that may redefined down the way?</li> <li>2) AH2 It must be stressed throughout that the existing building planned more than caters for A&amp;B needs.</li> </ol> <p>GA Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) GA1 - what is meant by unsuitable roads?</li> <li>2) GA3 - is this really a policy or good intentions?</li> <li>3) GA4 - and frequency and suitability of routes to encourage use</li> </ol>	<p>National and local planning rules limit what the NP can do. Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need That is the intention</p> <p>GA1 amended to specify which roads are unsuitable and why Intention!</p> <p>In the end routes and frequencies will be determined by viability or subsidy</p>	<p>Refer revised IRS policies</p> <p>See AH1 as amended</p> <p>See AH2 as amended</p> <p>See GA1 as amended</p> <p>Original GA3 moved to Project List. PCs will support as best they can</p> <p>Refer GA3 as amended</p>
Resident 4	<p>GA Comments:</p> <p>The relief roads and bridge widening are an absolute must - the Bearwood road and surrounding areas are a nightmare at peak times currently and cannot support any more traffic</p> <p>In addition the debacle that is the traffic outside the Bearwood road school during morning and evening has to be solved</p>	<p>Agreed. The NP cannot solve these problems but the PCs will keep pressure on WBC to address congestion.</p>	<p>Revised GA1 highlights some of the issues</p>
Resident 5	<p>IRS Comments:</p> <p>I have witnessed with disbelief and horror at the criminal volcanic eruption and spread of development and destruction of green fields and wildlife in Arborfield and surrounding areas. This will cripple the already grid locked roads and put pressure on other infrastructure.</p> <p>Enough is enough.</p>	<p>Agreed. The NP cannot solve these problems but the PCs will keep pressure on WBC to address congestion.</p>	<p>Revised GA1 highlights roads not suited to absorb additional traffic</p> <p>See revised GA2</p>

	<p>Development of new SANGS is all well and good but there has been NO improvements for decades to the disjointed, inadequate byways and bridleways that already exist. These now are completely cut off for vulnerable users who are not prepared to access them from the lethal road network. Simple solutions to these problems are ignored and kicked and lost in the long grass.</p> <p>TC Comments: A new medical centre is essential for Arborfield Green, existing medical centres are stretched beyond capacity.</p> <p>AH Comments: I would not support any further development as we are already at saturation point. Affordable housing and key worker homes should have already been included surely?</p>	<p>GA2 attempts to provide a strategy</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need</p>	<p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>AH2 as amended refers.</p>
Resident 6	<p>TC Comments: I have written to John Redwood on several occasions regarding the future plans for healthcare facilities for the Wokingham area and he has in turn written to the CEO of RBH Trust but after 3 months, we are still waiting for a response. This is absolutely a priority as RBH is bursting at the seams.</p>	<p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p>	<p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p>
Resident 7	<p>IRS Comments: Maintain undeveloped area between Shinfield Swallowfield Farley hill and Arborfield/ Barkham</p> <p>TC Comments: What local facilities in Arborfield?</p> <p>GA Comments: GA3 Arborfield x relief road will destroy one of the main areas of beauty, the hill it is cutting through.</p> <p>GA1. How can you have development without increasing traffic on unsuitable roads</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This was dealt with in separate consultation. The route selected was preferred by Arborfield residents. Agree – with current road network, possibilities are very limited.</p>	<p>IRS2 as amended</p> <p>Refer TC1 and TC2 for specific proposals</p> <p>GA1 refers to roads considered unsuitable and why.</p>
Resident 8	<p>IRS Comments: Protect the Coombes. We are so lucky to have such a special natural area which is also a habitat for wildlife.</p>		<p>IRS3 f) as amended</p>

	<p>Please add a clause to the Neighbourhood Plan to preserve it and totally restrict any development there.</p> <p>AH Comments: NO MORE HOUSING! We have enough housing in this area. The roads cannot cope with any more development</p>	<p>The Coombes to be treated as a "non designated area of natural interest"</p> <p>Agree – with current road network, possibilities are very limited</p>	<p>GA1 as amended refers to roads considered unsuitable and why.</p>
Resident 9	<p>IRS Comments: Fully support and agree with IRS1-4</p> <p>TC Comments: TC2 is essential in particular a medical centre at Arborfield Green. The other medical centres are Finchampstead &amp; Arborfield will not be able to cope with the increased number of new residents.</p> <p>AH Comments: All on all Counts but in particular AH1 &amp; AH2</p> <p>GA Comments: These are all important points for a sustainable development, especially GA1</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p>
Resident 10	<p>IRS Comments: Given the size and importance of the Coombes Woods to the area, I believe it would be beneficial and important to explicitly call out protection of the Coombes as an unspoilt natural area which should be protected from development and settlement of any kind.</p>	<p>The Coombes to be treated as a "non-designated area of natural interest"</p>	<p>IRS3 f) as amended</p>
Resident 11	<p>IRS Comments: Stop building, Wokingham is a little market town, regardless of how many houses the council and developers think they can keep on building, it is still a little market town. Likewise the villages on its fringes being swallowed up in the sprawl. A minor relief road won't touch the sides of the traffic issues, mile for mile worse than the Piccadilly or Hammersmith. We liked having cricket greens rather than blocks of flats, we liked having open fields rather than cinemas, we liked having GP surgeries you could call up and expect to be seen that week.</p>	<p>Comments appear to refer to Wokingham as a whole A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need</p>	<p>Refer AH2 as amended</p>

	<p>Where's the infrastructure, where are the new GP practices, where are the schools (doubling the size of a town and then throwing in one extra school does not cut the mustard), where are the cycle lanes? Has anyone sampled the toxicity of the air along Finchampstead Road at 8.30am, I'd be very surprised if it didn't contravene several air quality requirements.</p> <p>Need I go on. A weak and venal council, and corrupt developers with politicians and councillors in their pockets – that sums up Wokingham Borough and its current course.</p>	<p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p>	<p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p>
Resident 12	<p>IRS Comments:</p> <p>Personally I would like to see included a clause specifically relating to restricting development of the Coombes woods and that area. It is a real asset to the community, providing much needed green space, and is an area of natural beauty. Regularly used by Rambling groups, dog walkers, families, community scouting groups, Horse riders and cyclists to name but a few,. it should be preserved for community use.</p>	<p>The Coombes to be treated as a "non-designated area of natural interest"</p>	<p>IRS3 f) as amended</p>
Resident 13	<p>AH Comments:</p> <p>Developers must be made to follow development rules and not ride roughshod over planning officials</p> <p>GA Comments:</p> <p>Infrastructure must be in place before any developments take place. Not just promises</p>	<p>Agree but this is a failure of national policy and legislation, beyond scope of NP.</p>	
Resident 14	<p>AH Comments:</p> <p>AH4 to include sufficient parking.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Refer AH4 k) as amended</p>
Resident 15	<p>GA Comments:</p> <p>HGV's should be restricted to the main roads through the villages, or diverted on to the new relief road, they are a particular problem and increasing in number along school road. The 30mph limits on roads need to be enforced, traffic regularly breaks the 30 mph limit along School road</p>	<p>Agree, but beyond scope of the NP</p>	
Resident 16	<p>IRS Comments:</p> <p>The environment must be preserved at all cost. It is a well known fact that greenery enhances wellbeing. We have already lost far too much around this part of Berkshire.</p> <p>TC Comments:</p> <p>There must be a medical centre at Arborfield. Local doctors already struggle.</p> <p>AH Comments:</p> <p>I support no development whatsoever. The land around this area needs to be preserved for the current inhabitants and wildlife. The area cannot support any further development.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>AH2 as amended refers</p>

	However, if it must happen it has to be on brownfield only and be affordable, and that doesn't mean affordable for London commuters on massive salaries....	already approved is double local need	
Resident 17	AH Comments: Brownfield development only - green space must be preserved.	Noted	AH2 as amended refers
Resident 18	GA Comments: Commonfield Lane is in a disgraceful unsafe condition and cannot possibly take any more traffic. Barkham Ride and Barkham Street are too narrow for the amount of traffic and buses it takes. A lower speed limit and footpaths down the Barkham Ride are needed. Before there is a catastrophic accident !!! Why wasn't the infrastructure built before Arborfield Green was constructed?	Noted  Because it costs money!	GA1 as amended refers to roads considered unsuitable and why
Resident 19	IRS Comments: Very important to keep the village an actual village. Too much destruction of the countryside.  AH Comments: Too much housing already ruining a once beautiful village.	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment A&B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need	Refer IRS policies as amended  AH2 as amended refers...
Resident 20	AH Comments: Also on AH4 - adequate parking arrangements. One space per house is not enough for a home. There will be at least 2 cars in a 2 bed home and possibly up to 6 or 7 in 4 bed homes.	Noted	AH4 k) as amended refers
Resident 21	IRS Comments: Where there are existing sites within or on the border of separation gaps that may have had previous development which may have been demolished. Would those sites automatically be given Brownfield status which would then encourage new development and may have the effect of closing Settlement Gaps? Should we not consider that after an appropriate amount of time an existing Brownfield site loses its status and becomes Greenfield?  TC Comments: The Swan and The Bramshill Hunt come to mind. We have lost the Swan and according to rumours Greene King are about to market the Bramshill Hunt. Therefore our Village will have lost its last Pub!	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment  Interesting suggestion but controlled by National Policy  Noted, but NP not able to control commercial decisions such as these.	Refer IRS policies as amended

	<p>AH Comments: As above can we tighten the definition of Brownfield sites? The sewage farm in Arborfield is already at capacity, have you approached them to get a statement based on the current level of development going on?</p> <p>GA Comments: Bearing in mind most of the roads around Arborfield and Barkham are unsuitable you should stress the need for proper and proportional infrastructure development to be constructed in advance of new development.</p>	<p>Noted but definition is determined by national policy</p> <p>In practice viability of development (as determined by national policy) limits scope to fulfil this sensible suggestion</p>	
Resident 22	<p>IRS Comments: It is important to maintain the separate identity of the settlements Arborfield, Barkham, Shinfield, Swallowfield and Arborfield Green ( sadly this name does not help but too late to change it now ) It is important that the plan makes specific reference to the unsuitability of Arborfield as the site of a cement works and a gravel pit</p> <p>TC Comments: As before it is important that the community facilities of Arborfield and Arborfield Green are kept distinctly separate</p> <p>GA Comments: Whilst I have said yes to GA3 it really only the ACRR I support. I know little of the Nine Mile Ride Extension and am rather fond of the Barkham Bridge as it is now. When I first arrived in Arborfield all routes seemed to have hump back bridges sadly they are going one by one</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Unfortunately this cannot be addressed by NP</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>TC2 as amended attempts to address this point</p> <p>Refer TC1 and TC2 for specific proposals</p> <p>GA3 as originally shown has been removed and moved to Project List for PCs.</p>
Resident 23	<p>IRS Comments: Firstly, thanks for all the hard work done by the committee in producing this document. In section 1.8 there needs to be reference to CP11. Point 4.9(f) second sentence could I suggest alternative wording ' These solutions are not popular with local residents and have been deemed inappropriate by WBC'. Section 5.22 Separation Zones quotes from Inspectors report, but the policy matrix talks about zone. It should read 'zones' to ensure it relates also to separation between Shinfield</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Reference to CP11 included in 1.8. Wording revised, see 3.9 f) Matrix refers to "areas"</p>

	<p>and Arborfield and Arborfield and Swallowfield. Similarly Identity and Rural setting states zone when it should be zones.</p> <p>Policy IRS2 should read Arborfield Green, Shinfield and Swallowfield to reflect what the inspector said. There should be more reference in the document to CP11 reflect the fact that the Land Update consultation document recognises the importance of this, as does the inspectors report and where these policies apply is clearly shown in the interactive map which is part of WBC current planning policy. Page 28 2037 should read 2036. In general, there is some duplication of information that might have been included for emphasis but if not the document could be reduced in size.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Wording revised to be non- specific</p> <p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>Table has been amended</p>
Resident 24	<p>TC Comments: Why are new surgeries not built at the same time as the houses as part of large planning permissions. The current situation puts a huge strain on existing surgeries locally</p> <p>AH Comments: We need more affordable housing for young people or those on low incomes and help to buy schemes</p> <p>GA Comments: Some roads , particularly in Barkham, are already struggling with the amount of traffic on very narrow roads particularly when buses and lorries are passing</p>	<p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>GA1 amended to specify which roads are unsuitable and why</p>	<p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>AH2 as amended refers</p> <p>GA1 as amended refers</p>
Resident 25	<p>GA Comments: GA 1,3 and 4 are all linked by the common factor of increased traffic and a current infrastructure that cannot cope with large vehicles already being utilised. This includes the current No3 service, and even larger 53 seat school coaches. When these buses meet in opposite directions particularly on Barkham Ride and Park Lane there is a guaranteed hold up which is exacerbated when a pair of coaches meet on these roads</p> <p>Your policy should be extended to include a highway widening study along these routes where necessary and installation where required, and include access for emergency service vehicles due to the lack of consideration that is already apparent for parking on the new developments.</p> <p>GA2 is positive from a recreational and environmental point of view but will have little impact on congestion</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A emphasis on unsuitable roads is included in GA1 and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.</p> <p>Highway widening is unlikely to be financially viable and anyway would be used as an opportunity for yet more development.</p> <p>There will be limited commuting opportunities but agree it will not solve the congestion problem</p>	<p>Refer GA1, GA2 and GA3 as amended.</p>
Resident 26	<p>AH Comments:</p>		

	<p>Strongly agree, particularly with regards to drainage and sewage impacts. We don't want the area becoming urbanised GA Comments: V keen on development of green routes that go into Reading and Wokingham</p>	Noted	<p>AH5 as amended refers  GA2 as amended provides proposed strategy</p>
Resident 27	<p>IRS Comments: IRS1. Totally agree that the rural setting of Arborfield and Barkham should be conserved, but we would also like to see the protection of existing farmland to ensure we keep the rural setting. IRS2. We would also like to see separation between Arborfield and Sindlesham borders to prevent Sindlesham spilling into Arborfield. IRS3. The green space around Carter's Hill, Arborfield through Barretts Lane and up to Church Lane, Arborfield should be preserved as this area is widely used by walkers, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists for recreation. The Ford at Carters Hill, Arborfield is widely used by families during weekends and School holidays and should be preserved for recreation. IRS4. Important Landscape views such as Carters Hill and Barkham Brook at Carter's Hill should be preserved.</p> <p>TC Comments: TC3. We would also like to see a clamp down on any unlawful businesses in the area.</p> <p>AH Comments: AH1. Any new development should also not cause flooding to any existing residential areas. Not enough emphasis is placed on ensuring that surrounding areas are not flooded when building new houses. AH3. Development on open farm land away from existing settlements should be avoided.</p> <p>GA Comments: GA3. Arborfield Cross Relief Road, and Nine Mile Ride Extension should be used to support new housing and other development rather than driving even more traffic up the Mole Road.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment and</p> <p>This should be an objective but weakness of the enforcement process lies with legislation (or lack of it) which is beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>Agree, this is an objective</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Hopefully there will be some benefit but it will not be a total solution.</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended.</p> <p>Hopefully his is better covered by the revisions to AH5 Refer IRS policies as amended</p>
Resident 28	<p>IRS Comments: In general I support this NP, however there are some elements which need strengthening and sustainability needs to be returned to its heart, to truly reflect the wishes of the</p>		

	<p>community as was expressed in the numerous consultations and questionnaires which have clearly been conducted over the years.</p> <p>Areas the plan needs to strengthen and sharpen through better wording of its Policies; unlawful development, encouraging rural enterprise, protection of the countryside and farming activities, and dedicated GP surgery provision. A high priority is also Greenways expansion, especially disabled and vulnerable user access as WBC does not have a 'gates gaps and stiles policy' and developers have recently been installing products without the basic British Safety Standards. These subjects have a common theme in that they are areas where although I understand that there is proven local support on these issues identified during the NP process, the LA does not have a good track record of supporting residents over these matters. The NP has a role to guide how National Policy should be applied locally therefore support for these issues should be bolder than what has been produced here. The issue of flooding resulting from inappropriate development in the past is a case in point eg the Costain estate in nearby Lower Earley.</p> <p>In order to protect residents from unlawful development the following statement should be included as a Policy;</p> <p><b>ALL PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THIS NP AREA MUST ALSO CONFORM TO THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b></p> <p>I support protection of land of 'landscape or heritage value' where reuse of brownfield or previously developed land is concerned through a strongly worded policy.</p> <p>Protection from predatory developers needs to be provided by measures to protect the countryside. Stronger and more careful wording of Policies is needed. Supporting CP11, especially correct the wording re separation zones to include areas of the villages away from the SDLs, best and most versatile farmland, protection for heritage assets within their setting and for enhancing the feeling of 'remoteness' valued by residents. The NP area does not have a Railway Station and infrastructure is already inadequate. Although housing will be needed for those working locally or from home, there is nothing that can be done to improve road connections easily. Recent increased housebuilding in surrounding areas has caused a drop in property values and the Call for Sites in Wokingham has encouraged speculative moves by profit seekers, all evidence that our area needs some certainty from a set of well worded robust Policies.</p> <p>Regarding Housing Need, I support the measures included to provide only for local need. Policies for Keyworker housing should be included too, and houses designed for disabled living, and lifetime homes.</p> <p>Stronger support for the Village Design Statement, disappointing that developers are tending to ignore it when designing estates, and for Wokingham's Landscape Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Sustainability is given prominence in the Policy Matrix</p> <p>Eliminating unlawful development should be an objective but weakness of the enforcement process lies with legislation (or lack of it) which is beyond the scope of the NP. Sadly, national planning policy takes a top down approach.</p> <p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment, especially with regard to sites requiring further protection.</p> <p>These are all concepts included in AH2 and AH4</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>Refer AH2 and AH4 as amended</p> <p>VDS is referenced in IRS1 and AH4 g)</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Lastly, there is a new NPPF which gives greater protection for trees ie ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees. The NP could apply this at a local level by defining which trees fall into this category using the local Veteran Tree Society's list. There is currently some dispute in a nearby planning application where different 'experts' categorise veteran trees differently. It is said (by the Woodland Trust) to be this issue which will be decided by the Courts, so the clearer our intension, the better our protection.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This is effectively a matter of local enforcement of national rules.</p>	
Resident 29	<p>IRS Comments:  IRS1. I would seriously question calling the area around Arborfield, and indeed Shinfield, a "Rural Setting" owing to the explosion of housing estates everywhere one looks. Sadly, in the years to come I can envisage Wokingham looking like another Milton Keynes.</p> <p>TC Comments:  TC3. I believe it to be imperative that a Medical Centre is included within the massive Arborfield Green development. I cannot see the Swallowfield Medical Practice being able to cope with the resultant thousands of extra patients that all these new developments, and not just Arborfield Green, are going to amass.</p> <p>AH Comments:  AH2. When driving past several of the new housing estates currently being developed, I notice that a very large proportion of the "Affordable Homes" are substantial detached houses. Not sure what one can comment about this!  AH5. There has already been extensive development on the flood plains around Wokingham and I do not suppose that this will change in the near future.</p> <p>GA Comments:  GA1. The roads in this area are already seriously grid-locked for several hours of the day. At 9 am this morning I had to visit the doctors for an annual check-up and it took me over five minutes to turn right out of our lane onto the B3030.  GA2. If we are going to have a "New Town" (which is fait accompli), then it must not be to the detriment of walkers and horse riders</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>The Coombes to be treated as a "non-designated area of natural interest"</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>Refer IRS3 as amended</p>
Resident 30	<p>IRS Comments:  I bought an existing house in this area so that I could enjoy the countryside which provides habitat for animals, a peaceful setting and great walks.  Arborfield Cross should not be swallowed by surrounding development, it should be protected as a village in the countryside - why should everywhere become a suburb of Reading?</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p>

	<p>AH Comments: Do not build on Coombes Woods or any other woodland, green belt or green areas. Don't join villages, settlements or areas together. Maintain somewhere for recreation (walking etc) within the countryside - farming is important as is woodland, wetlands, hedging - not only to wildlife, but also to pollution prevention.</p> <p>GA Comments: Sit in a car in Swallowfield or Hyde End Road and wait for an extra wide bus to come towards you - look at that as an example of how it should NOT be done! Traffic in Farley Hill has increased as a result of building in the wider area - there have been no improvements to those roads - they are pot holed and there hasn't been a speed reduction or any traffic calming methods employed.</p>	<p>IRS3 is designed to give The Coombes added protection as a "Non-designated area of natural interest or of special character"</p> <p>GA3 attempts to address the problem of large vehicles though in the context of the SDL.</p>	Refer GA3 as amended
Resident 31	<p>IRS Comments: Please help protect the Coombes, one of the last reasonably sized areas of ancient woodland in the area, by not allowing sale for development.</p>	The Coombes to be treated as a "non-designated area of natural interest"	IRS3 f) as amended
Resident 32	<p>IRS Comments: Fully support and agree with IRS1-4</p> <p>TC Comments: TC2 is essential in particular a medical centre at Arborfield Green. The other medical centres are Finchampstead &amp; Arborfield will not be able to cope with the increased number of new residents.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p>
Resident 33	<p>IRS Comments: Barkham has already become just a suburb of Wokingham and Arborfield is heading that way, in spite of the efforts of local people to foster a village atmosphere and community spirit. The area is still quite rural in part, so please let us preserve what remains.</p> <p>TC Comments: It is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment locally, so it is essential that medical facilities are provided for the large numbers of incomers to the area.</p> <p>GA Comments: I already find it much more difficult to get out of my house by car than it was only a few years ago, and I don't travel at peak times. I have also noticed a great increase in traffic on</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>An emphasis on unsuitable roads is included in GA1 and</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>Refer GA1 as amended</p>

	local roads generally. The planned development is very far from complete so the final picture as regards congestion is bleak.	supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.	
Resident 34	<p>IRS Comments: There is enough housing being built in surrounding areas such as Bracknell and Wokingham with roads that can accommodate increasing traffic. Here in Barkham we don't have the capacity for more traffic on our very narrow roads. People who live in these new estates come to walk in our lovely woodlands and fields so we would be depriving them of recreational needs.</p> <p>TC Comments: The new Arborfield community needs essential facilities such as shops, schools and medical centre which would alleviate the need to travel on our already busy roads.</p> <p>AH Comments: Brownfield sites should be utilised to accommodate affordable housing for key workers as long as it doesn't impact of flood areas.</p> <p>GA Comments: Widening roads and bridges will only encourage more traffic and as for more bus routes...why! I never see more than half a dozen people at any one time on the buses and if you start widening the roads and junctions... the next development will be more housing!!!</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>True. Widening is addressed in the context of the SDL only.</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>Refer AH1 as amended</p> <p>Refer GA3 as amended</p>
Resident 35	<p>TC Comments: Has a medical centre been re-instated??? Last I heard the developers had dropped it.</p> <p>AH Comments: More open space required or protection of open spaces...e.g. Coombes plot a up for sale need protecting</p> <p>GA Comments: Improved bus routes required! And running later...last bus from Wokingham/Bracknell is not adequate as cannot even go out and watch a movie past 8.30 (a lot at 8.40/9pm) and expect to catch a bus home.</p>	<p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>IRS3 is designed to give The Coombes added protection as a "Non-designated area of natural interest or of special character"</p> <p>NP will support public transport, though ultimately routes will depend on viability.</p>	<p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>Refer IRS3 as amended</p> <p>Refer GA3 as amended.</p>
Resident 36	IRS Comments:		

	A good plan for the community would be the mandatory preservation of green and woodland areas around Barkham and Arborfield. It should be a must that areas of such importance would be protect under any plan of further development. Areas such as the Coombes woods are vital to the community as they are a good source of physical and mental exercise, fresh air and leisure.	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment	Refer IRS policies as amended
Resident 37	<p>IRS Comments: After the recent 'expansion' of Arborfield with a massive increase in new developments, I recently heard of the plans to sell land in the Coombes woods for possible development. I feel this is a tragedy and needs to be protected. Thus, could there be a specific, restrictive plan to protect these grounds from any future development within this plan? Not just for the green space and natural beauty but also for the wild life to be allowed to continue to thrive. An awful lot of which have lost a large amount of their land to recent developments throughout the area.</p> <p>TC Comments: Relying on an already over subscribed general practice seems ludicrous and may lead to peoples health concerns being missed, GPs; moving area, resigning or worse, and otherwise lengthy waiting times on an already stretched service.</p> <p>AH Comments: There have been enough developments locally at present. I don't feel we can support anything further.</p> <p>GA Comments: There needs to be improved non motorised routes in and out of Arborfield cross. It's dangerous for children in the area at present.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG.</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need</p> <p>Agreed. GA2 provides a strategy</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>AH2 as amended refers</p> <p>Refer GA2 as amended</p>
Resident 38	<p>AH Comments: Developers must be made to follow development rules and not ride roughshod over planning officials</p> <p>GA Comments: Infrastructure must be in place before any developments take place. Not just promises</p>		
Resident 39	<p>IRS Comments: We have lots and lots of new houses in the Arborfield area at the moment with the redevelopment of the garrison. There are also more houses proposed along school road.</p>	A&B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing	Refer IRS policies as amended

	<p>Surely as a small area we have now fulfilled our quota of new housing without plots now being available within the Coombes wood. Although areas of greenery have been included in the development plans of all the new housing the massive increase in population means we all need ample space to walk dogs, get away from the traffic and have safe places to enjoy with our children. At some point we need to stop building and save the areas of beauty that we have. Please leave the woodland as woods.</p>	<p>already approved is double local need</p> <p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p>	<p>Refer AH2 as amended</p>
Resident 40	<p>IRS Comments: This is what characterises the village and its setting</p> <p>AH Comments: We don't need any more houses - enough are already permitted.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need Refer IRS policies as amended</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>Refer AH2 as amended</p>
Resident 41	<p>IRS Comments: We have lived here 40 years and recently have seen it change from a semi rural area to areas of high density housing with little regard for keeping the identity of the area. Open spaces are few and all seem to be under threat of development eg the Coombes. Eventually it could become one big housing sprawl with no individual identity.</p> <p>GA Comments: The local roads have not changed since we came here and their names reflect this eg Barkham Ride, Commonfield Lane, Evendons Lane etc Commonfield Lane is dangerous as it is used as a cut through by so many cars from the new Arborfield development. We were recently forced off the road by a car travelling the other way. I am amazed the highways authority consider this a safe route and planning are contemplating even more housing next to this lane. I would not move here now - I would prefer an urban area with a properly planned road network It seems builders here do not have to contribute sufficiently to the cost of improving the road network in the area</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p>
Resident 42	<p>IRS Comments: Already the nature and appeal of Wokingham has changed from a rural market town setting that we all enjoyed and benefited from to a busy congested over capacitated non descript larger town.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p>

	<p>TC Comments: The new developments must not intrude on local amenities that are already overstretched</p> <p>AH Comments: The new developments planned seem to be aimed at incoming London overspill rather than providing adequate affordable housing for people already in the area that are being out priced by the upper market. What will happen in 15-20 years time when another generation will require homes.</p> <p>GA Comments: My main concerns on the planned developments in our area is that the roads and lanes are grossly inadequate for the proposed housing and are already showing a greater increase, even widening the roads will not make much improvement and will be detrimental to the keeping of a rural area. Particular concern is the safety of vehicles and pedestrians along Barkham ride with the larger lorries and buses. With the constant maintaining and digging up of roads on all routes into Wokingham (mainly due to inbuilding) our roads are constantly gridlocked without further traffic congestion. California Crossroads will be a nightmare and totally unsafe for pedestrians and the 2 primary schools bordering the vicinity</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>A&amp;B Housing Needs Analysis addresses point that housing already approved is double local need</p> <p>An emphasis on unsuitable roads is included in GA1 and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.</p>	<p>TC1 and TC2 refer</p> <p>Refer AH2 as amended</p> <p>Refer GA1 as amended</p>
Resident 43	<p>GA Comments: No planning should be provided until our roads are in good condition. Or planning should be on the proviso that roads should be brought up to the safe level prior to building commencing. With even more planning on the agenda at Barkham Square the roads will not cope and all hope of a 'village' will have gone forever. Enforce width restriction on Barkham Road/Ride</p>	<p>An emphasis on unsuitable roads is included in GA1 and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.</p>	<p>Refer GA1 as amended</p>
Resident 44	<p>IRS Comments: I wonder whether existing new development and approved future development has not already negated some of these wishes.</p> <p>TC Comments: Having been a resident of Arborfield for almost 50 years, the village and local area have changed markedly - it is no longer the tight-knit community it once was and now seems to be populated by "Commuters" who have little interest in the community.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment Noted</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p>

	AH Comments: Admirable wishes but I question what is defined as affordable.	Noted	
Resident 45	GA Comments: On public transport, at present we have buses at Wokingham station going to Arborfield due at the same time or a couple of minutes before the train from London is due it would be good if they were at least five minutes after it. Also there is a period of about 90 minutes in the evening where you can't get to Arborfield from either Bracknell or Wokingham stations. Once the development is finished within Wokingham town centre, it would be good if we could get in & home later in the evening & on Sundays. Not covered in the survey, but it is ridiculous that Arborfield Green is split between 3 electoral wards, definitely needs to be its own ward.	NP will support public transport, though ultimately routes will depend on viability.	Refer GA3 as amended
Resident 46	At the end of IRS3, reference is made to Local Green Space maps. I know that a number of maps were produced just before the Exhibition on 23 June. None of those appear to have Local Green Space in their title. Can the policy and map naming be aligned (if it isn't already)? Policy AH5 clause b) mentions SuDS a few times which I did not understand. The meaning comes up in clause c). I imagine that the order of items got changed during the drafting process. The meaning needs to be clarified with the first use of the abbreviation, now clause b). (There may be equivalent situations for other abbreviations but if I was familiar with them (e.g. PROW) I would not have noticed.) Policy GA1 is perhaps over ambitious. Few developments would reduce traffic or leave it unchanged on unsuitable routes or totally avoid impacting road safety at known traffic hazards. Those unsuitable roads and hazards may be well away from the development itself so difficult for the applicant to mitigate against. That is going to leave the majority of proposals unsupported, even if they are beneficial in other ways. One likely outcome would be that Appeals against rejections that cite this policy as a reason would be successful on the basis that the policy is unreasonable. The sentiments are good but I think the wording is worth reconsideration.	Noted, this was missing at the time of the public event  Policy AH5 has been amended.  GA1 has been amended, along with supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13 to specify the type of roads which are considered unsuitable and why	Refer Map 4 which is now on website <a href="http://www.arbarplan.com">www.arbarplan.com</a>  SuDs defined in Glossary  Refer GA1 as amended and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13
Resident 47	IRS Comments: The policies listed here are all excellent and I support them 100% if our parishes are to retain their character and identity at all, given the planned development of the Arborfield Garrison SDL, and beyond. Separation between Arborfield, Barkham and Arborfield Green is essential but is not achievable at all if Wokingham Borough Council permits "bolt-on" developments such as	Noted  Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen	Refer IRS policies as amended

	<p>the proposed Barkham Square proposal. If this not achieved, then none of the below policies on Getting About and Thriving Communities, will be achievable.</p> <p>Retaining green spaces that residents of all ages can enjoy will support the delivery of Thriving Communities. Green separation zones could also double as green routes - such as the new path that enables pupils living in Finchampstead - to cycle and walk to the new Bohunt School. People of all ages will be using the new leisure centre, so the more people can reach the places they want to go, on foot and bike the better.</p> <p>TC Comments: It is important that local facilities such as post offices are provided within future development. Online shopping means that this is a service that will continue to be essential to modern daily life. This could be within the planned local district centres, within a local shop - e.g. news agents, convenience stores. If people have local shops and services they can easily access by foot/bicycle/bus then they won't be so reliant on cars, which will aid "Getting About".</p> <p>Planned clusters of local amenities and shops, including a health centre, village hall for groups such as Brownies/cubs, plus a children's centre, library, playground and nursery would support sustainability and provide spaces that bring people of all ages together socially - which is how communities thrive. The Finchampstead Baptist Centre provides an excellent model on which to build.</p> <p>AH Comments: There is a conflict between the concept of Sustainability, the "golden thread" of planning principles, and my views on appropriate housing. Affordability will be key - it is hard to see how key workers on moderate salaries would be able to afford to live in our parishes in future, given the current prices of the new homes being built within Arborfield SDL. Housing Association and shared ownership are one way of bridging the affordability gap, but other approaches - e.g. new Council-owned and operated housing should seriously be considered by Wokingham Borough Council. This might be difficult for a tory-run borough to consider, but given the growing pressure to build more and more housing, that satisfies the AH policy criteria, all ideas should be seriously considered.</p> <p>GA Comments: It is difficult to see how, given the Neighbourhood Plan is considering this issue beyond the delivery of the current SDL, it will be possible to get about at all in decades to come.</p>	<p>protection of rural environment</p> <p>This is a consideration in the requirement for 50% open spaces in AH3.</p> <p>Agree with this principle</p> <p>Agree, especially re issue of affordability. This is to a great extent a function of national planning policy and is beyond the scope of the NP</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Refer AH3 and para 6.24</p> <p>Refer TC2 and para 5.8 re facilities to be provided under existing S106 agreement</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Arborfield Green is one of 4 SDLs in Wokingham Borough, plus Reading and Bracknell are all ambitiously building new housing estates. People living in Arborfield and Barkham will need to be able to get to work, school, use public services, shop etc in neighbouring parishes. Even given the provision of new roads as stated in GA3, the impact and pressure on traffic and roads (both existing and new) will be immense.</p> <p>Green routes within Arborfield and Barkham (see my comments on Identity and Rural policies above) are absolutely essential - very short local car journeys should be avoided at all costs, or in decades to come, we will all be gridlocked on a daily basis, unable to get where we want and need to.</p> <p>Decent bus services are essential to minimise car journeys - going by foot, bicycle or bus should be the best way of getting about the 2 parishes and beyond.</p>	<p>Agree. It is the intention that layouts (especially in the SDL) should encourage travel by means other than car for short journeys.</p>	<p>Refer AH4 i)</p>
Resident 48	<p>IRS2 - The development of previously developed land should be strictly controlled to prevent out-of-scale development compared to what is being replaced.</p> <p>AH2 - I suggest that some target figure for percentage of affordable and key worker homes should be given to strengthen this requirement</p> <p>AH3 - Proposed housing on previously developed land should be strictly controlled to prevent out-of-scale development compared to what is being replaced.</p> <p>GA Comments: GA1 - I suggest that development should where feasible actually discourage traffic on unsuitable roads (such as Commonfield Lane), or if not feasible then provide mitigation measures such as passing places.</p> <p>GA2 - Delete the words "take available opportunities to" in clause GA2 of the booklet as this only weakens the requirement. More importantly, I suggest that the provision of better connectivity with ROWs outside the Arborfield and Barkham area should be specifically mentioned and encouraged.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>That would be desirable but not sure it is possible to define a specific target.</p> <p>An emphasis on unsuitable roads is included in GA1 and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.</p> <p>Noted. Not sure it weakens the statement because developing the network will depend upon opportunism</p>	<p>Refer GA1 as amended and supporting text paras 7.10 to 7.13.</p>
Resident 49	<p>GA Comments: GA2. Currently impossible to safely walk from Langley common road (no pavement) to Wokingham or catch a bus ( 20 minutes walk ) this will be made worse by current developments .No doubt all facilities promised by any developers will be last if ever built .</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>See revised GA2</p>
Resident 50	<p>IRS Comments: IRS1 - More support and protection though.</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p>

	<p>TC Comments: TC3 - conditional support, yes, but not for businesses operating without permission, nor a multitude of businesses operating from one address!</p> <p>GA Comments: GA4 - current buses through Barkham are just too wide and dangerous already.</p>	<p>protection of rural environment Noted</p> <p>GA3 attempts to some extent addresses the problem of large vehicles though in the context of the SDL.</p>	<p>Refer GA3 as amended</p>
Resident 51	<p>IRS Comments IRS1 - Must not be destroyed IRS2 – would prefer amalgamation not separation as in Happening to Them and Us IRS3 – Must be IRS4 – Ditto</p> <p>TC Comments TC1 – All facilities open to all!! Cheaply i.e. Swimming pool</p> <p>TC2 – Great if Doctors can be found to run it</p> <p>TC3 – Essential if they are to survive. No Wokingham mess up here!!</p> <p>AH Comments AH2 – Essential far too many highly priced AH3 – Must not happen AH4 – Will obviously be or no one will buy AH5 – Will present sewage works be adequate?</p> <p>GA Comments GA1 – Surely new developments have sustainable roads GA2 – current footpaths must be retained GA3 – Absolutely essential GA4 – Buses not required on estates of £400,000 houses</p>	<p>Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment</p> <p>Swimming pool is proposed by WBC Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted Noted Noted There will be requirement to create additional capacity</p> <p>Agree Agree Agree Fair point!</p>	<p>Refer IRS policies as amended</p> <p>TC2 e) as amended refers</p> <p>Refer AH5 c) as amended and supporting text 6.29</p>
Resident 52	<p>IRS Comments</p>		

	<p>IRS1 – Imperative  IRS2 – Yes to maintain the character of the area  IRS4 – for future generations</p> <p>TC Policies  TC2 – Yes, very imperative</p> <p>AH Comments  AH2 – Where are our young people going to live?  AH4 – Aim high</p> <p>GA Policies  GA1 – The road network is already at bursting point  GA2 – make cycling safe  GA3 – Supported  GA4 – Fundamental</p>	<p>Noted  Noted  Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree, but the issue of affordability is beyond scope of NP</p> <p>Agree  Agree  Noted  Noted  Noted</p>	
Resident 53	<p>IRS Comments  IRS2 – we are with this  IRS3 – This is very important</p> <p>TC Comments  TC2 – Essential</p> <p>AH Comments  AH5 – so important</p>	<p>Noted  Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted  Noted</p>	No action
Resident 54	<p>AH Comments  AH5 – No development without more sewers</p> <p>GA Comments  GA4 – upkeep of maintain roads</p>	<p>Agree, the wording is strengthened  Agreed, but beyond scope of NP</p>	<p>Refer AH5 as amended</p> <p>No action</p>
Resident 55	<p>AH Comments  AH5 – upgrade drainage</p> <p>GA Comments  GA4 – upkeeping or better roads</p>	<p>Agree  Agreed, but beyond scope of NP</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
Resident 56	AH Comments		

	AH2 – Affordable for young and elderly AH3 – Local needs	Agree, that is the point! Agree	AH2 amended AH3 amended
Resident 57	IRS Comments IRS 1 and 2 – These issues are fast becoming a problem – too many small developments taking up spaces. Take the development on Bearwood Road  TC Comments TC2 – A priority as RBH cannot cope with the additional load.  TC3 – Safety and policing has to be increased AH Comments AH2 – Housing still too expensive GA Comments All roads need improvement i.e. road surfaces ruined by construction traffic.	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment  Agreed, medical centre is required though decision rests with CCG Beyond scope of NP  Noted  Beyond scope of NP	Refer IRS policies as amended  TC2 e) as amended refers  No action  No action  No action
Resident 58	IRS Comments IRS3 – So Important  TC Comments TC2 – Definitely and a shop  AH Comments AH2 – Must be affordable	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment Agree  Agree	See IRS policies as amended
Resident 59	IRS Comments Barkham is being swallowed up by too many houses  TC Policies Where are the small purpose-built homes for the elderly population?  AH Comments Smaller properties to allow people to downsize and stay in the area	Revisions to IRS policies intended to strengthen protection of rural environment  Noted  Noted	Refer IRS policies as amended  See AH3  See AH3
Resident 60	IRS Comments Make Swan a listed building	Noted Swan is already listed grade II	

	<p>TC Comments Especially Arborfield Village Hall, New water supply and sewerage</p> <p>AH Comments How expensive is 'Affordable'? One never sees a quantities figure Very Strict AH3</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is beyond scope of NP to resolve</p>	
Resident 61	<p>AH Comments Fill in housing rather than using new areas Need to increase sewage plant</p>	<p>Noted Noted</p>	<p>No action Refer AH5 as amended</p>
Resident 62	<p>1) The retention of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land could be incorporated into the plan as a specific policy.</p> <p>2) The BVDS and the ANVDS could be attached as appendices to the plan</p> <p>3) Although policy IRS3 addresses the issue of protecting the natural environment by way of its general application, the narrative within the body of the plan about the Coombes could be expanded and a specific policy developed for it</p> <p>4) Policy AH4(f) seems problematic because, as drafted, it could be inferred that development adjacent to a listed building, building of historic interest and/or open space is either presumed acceptable and/or supported.</p> <p>5) The relevance of the landscape map (no.7) to the plan seems somewhat unclear, as the latter's relevant policies IRSI-4 are not articulated in a manner which relate specifically to each of the various landscape characteristics it identifies</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed these should be integral part of the Plan.</p> <p>The importance of The Coombes is well recognised and the strongest possible protection is intended through the Plan.</p> <p>Policy re setting of listed buildings was removed on recommendation of WBC as it did not add to national/local policies.</p> <p>The Landscape references have been changed (see IRS1) and are supported by a revised supporting paper (Annex V Landscape and Important Views).</p>	<p>Mentioned. Refer Policy TC3 as amended</p> <p>BVDS and BNVDs are included as Annexes of the Plan.</p> <p>Refer IRS3 as amended.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Refer IRS2 and supporting text as amended and also the revised Annex V</p>

	<p>6) The ultimate sentence of Policy IRS3 should make explicit under what limited circumstances development would be permitted on a designated LGS, for the avoidance of doubt by applicants and planners alike.</p> <p>7) Policy GA3 reads more as a statement of intent rather than a policy</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed this is in effect a statement of intent, but it is difficult to make specific proposals re road schemes within the context of the NP.</p>	<p>Refer updated IRS3 para 2 which excludes such development.</p> <p>GA Policies have been rewritten and this specific point is now included in the Project List</p>
Wokingham Borough Council	Concern about the use of emotive language in the plan – some examples highlighted in the attached.	This refers to quotes from feedback to” Shaping Our Future event”	Replaced by comments from latest consultation
WBC (cont’d)	Misuse of ‘Green Belt’ at times – important to amend in the Plan.	This refers to quotes from feedback to” Shaping Our Future event”	Replaced by comments from latest consultation
WBC (cont’d)	It would be prudent to reduce the inclusion of data/policy from WBC that is likely to change – such as the reproduction of the open space requirements.	Noted	Reference is now dated to refer to current policy
WBC (cont’d)	There’s a lot of preamble. May be best placed in a background document as it’s half the document currently. The vision and objectives aren’t mentioned until page 38 of 46 – this means the document when complete will not be as concise as it could be	Noted	The whole document has been restructured with less background info
WBC (cont’d)	1.9a Revised wording “demonstrating near unanimous support for this principle.”	Noted	Reworded – see 1.13 a)
WBC (cont’d)	<p>3.9a Development was a hot topic, particularly following the recent announcement that Barkham Square is being assessed by the planners when the building of Arborfield Green is only in the early stages. “Why is Barkham being targeted again?” asked one resident while another said he had “moved here to be in the country and soon it will be part of Reading”.</p> <p>Comment This is slightly misleading. The site has been promoted to the council amongst around 280 others and all of them are being assessed ‘by the planners’. Barkham Square is one of the sites that is being masterplanned along with other sites as it is a more complex site but this does not necessarily mean it will be found suitable for development.</p>	This refers to quotes from feedback to” Shaping Our Future event”	Replaced by comments from latest consultation
WBC (cont’d)	4.6 Shoddy solutions may provide short term fixes (and profit to the developer) but they will only create problems that will have to be resolved by future generations	Noted	

	Comment Maybe less negative to say something like “development proposals which don’t adequately consider all the elements of sustainability can lead to future issues that will need to be resolved by future generations”		
WBC (cont’d)	4.7d Bearwood Lakes Golf Club, judged to be the 4th best course in the Country by the website Comment I was just too intrigued not to check this out and the website actually says 4th best in Berkshire and 51st best in the country. Still impressive but needs to be factually correct	Noted	Revised wording 5.14f
WBC (cont’d)	4.9 Planning for growth has become problematic with some approved sites remaining vacant, while unlawful development is a challenge. Comment Does this mean not built or built and unoccupied? I suspect the former and if so any examples of these? If it’s sites within the SDL then it is widely accepted delivery will be phased.	Yes, refers to unbuilt. Phasing has been recognised from the start but it is nevertheless a challenge.	Amended - refer to 3.9 e)
WBC (cont’d)	4.9g Many of these became residential roads during the 1950s and 1960s Comment This fact isn’t really reflected in the historical narrative. Currently the intro sections read as though there were once historic villages and these have seen recent development with no acknowledgement of the development that has clearly occurred in between	This is factually correct. (The historical narrative has been reduced)	Amended - refer to 3.9 g)
WBC (cont’d)	4.13 In the past few years it is apparent that flood events are being experienced more frequently than used to be the case. Comment Any evidence to highlight or reference to?	This reference now at 6.29. Specific local problems are described in 6.30	Refer 6.30
WBC (cont’d)	4.18 What residents want Comment These are a lot wider ranging than the sustainability feedback comments above which mainly concern flooding. Are there any more comments that can be referenced in the above sub-section	The point is that sustainability creeps into every corner	This feedback not now included
WBC (cont’d)	5.25c Comment There is no Green Belt in Arborfield or Barkham so this should just say ‘countryside’ or ‘green space’	True, but this refers to quotes from feedback to” Shaping Our Future event”	Replaced by comments from latest consultation
WBC (cont’d)	5.25h Strongly oppose further major housing development at Hall Farm and Barkham Square. If these are built rural identity will be lost. Comment Outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan	Agree, but this refers to quotes from feedback to” Shaping Our Future event”	Replaced by comments from latest consultation
WBC (cont’d)	6.10 There are a number of successful businesses within Arborfield and Barkham, mostly based on horticulture and animal husbandry or of a relatively small scale, including home working. The rural nature of local business should be encouraged in the following ways:	This is intended to describe businesses in the Plan Area.	Reworded, refer 5.14

	<p>a) Support current businesses. In particular consider how new technology can be utilised to enable more people to work from home.</p> <p>b) Encourage expansion and development of new businesses that do not detract from the environment by utilising heritage buildings and integrating shared “start up” facilities.</p> <p>c) Maintain and protect existing farming activity. In particular encourage communities to consume fresh produce grown locally through access to allotments, community farms and local farmers markets.</p> <p>Comment This doesn't really follow the format of previous sections, are these comments/themes that have emerged from engagement?</p>		
WBC (cont'd)	<p>7.9 This will more than double the population in the Parish as of 2011 and therefore significantly alter the above demographic data once fully developed.</p> <p>Comment But as you've said above a large portion of these houses will be in Finchampstead so this isn't factually correct.</p>	Roughly half will be in Barkham (1800). Using factor of 2.6, this would increase population by 4680, which compares with 2011 census of 3603.	Revised wording refer 6.8
WBC (cont'd)	<p>7.12 The 80+ age group is a remarkably small proportion in Arborfield and Barkham. This would seem to reflection of there having been a large influx of family groups during the 1980s and 1990s who have not yet reached to most senior age group.</p> <p>Comment This is the first time this has been picked out. Again, the narrative of the parishes' histories doesn't reflect this growth or trend – just seems to be all about SDL.</p>	The chart now in 6.9 refers to 2011 census and has nothing to do with the SDL.	No action
WBC (cont'd)	<p>7.24 MOD Housing The number of vacant properties was assessed by comparing the electoral rolls with the Royal Mail database.)</p> <p>Comment Is this not skewed by people who aren't registered to vote but nevertheless do live in a property?</p>	When delivering leaflets, it has been obvious that many houses have been vacant for a considerable amount of time.	No action
WBC (cont'd)	<p>7.30 The order of preference was as follows: extension of garrison, new community, infill development, small sites in country then extension of villages.</p> <p>Comment What were the percentages of these?</p>	37%, 34%, 33%, 26%, 23% respectively. Closer examination of postcodes suggested that residents preferred anywhere not likely to be near them!	No action
WBC (cont'd)	<p>7.40 Housing Feedback Comments</p> <p>Comment Are there any specific comments which suggest where 'new communities' could go?</p>	No	No action
WBC (cont'd)	<p>8.11 It is disappointing that there is little sign of a shift away from car use with only small numbers of residents walking, cycling or going by bus to work or education.</p>	There is little evidence to suggest that the improved bus	No action

	Comment What about the 'recently improved' bus services mentioned at 8.9	services impact on commuting. Both 2012 and 2016 surveys show only 3% commuting by bus. Chart shown in 7.6 explains why	
WBC (cont'd)	8.25 Survey results Comment Much of this repeats info from elsewhere so stick to presenting the facts in one place in a consistent manner to other sections of the plan.	Noted	Revised document eliminates a lot of the repetition
WBC (cont'd)	10. Policies Comment It is generally helpful to put the policy wording in boxes with any supporting text outside the box	Noted	Actioned
WBC (cont'd)	IRS2 The Settlement Separation Area is shown on Map 3 Comment Don't think this would comply with our policies as it goes beyond the countryside policies in the development plan. A similar policy was rejected by the Inspector of the Core Strategy. This will likely need to be replaced with just a settlement policy	Noted, we should rely on Policy CP11	Map no longer included
WBC (cont'd)	IRS3c Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of street lighting and mitigating the impact of domestic external lighting Comment May have to check with Highways what their approach is to street light from a safety perspective	Noted	Now renumbered IRS3 d)
WBC (cont'd)	IRS3e include at least 50% open space, Comment What's the evidence for seeking this? And why type of open space? Would this be better located in a policy more specifically linked to development proposals rather than the natural environment?	Noted. This reflects current open space requirements and Garden Village principles used in SDL. Refer paras 6.23, 6.24 and 6.25	Policy now included in AH3
	POLICY IRS4: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES The areas shown on the Local Green Space maps are designated as areas of Local Green Space. Development on designated Local Green Space will be permitted only in very special circumstances Comment Need to make sure these satisfy the criteria at paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Maybe some supporting text to reference this and justify the inclusion would be useful after the policy wording – doesn't need to be overly wordy. As a comment SANGs are supposed to be in perpetuity anyway and are less likely to satisfy the requirement that local green spaces should not be extensive tracts of land.	Noted. A revised map specifies the areas concerned, which are fairly limited.	Refer Appendix 1 Map 4
WBC (cont'd)	POLICY TC1: LOCAL COMMUNITY-VALUED ASSETS AND FACILITIES	Noted	Refer TC1 as amended

	Comment Consider listing the various points rather than one long sentence as below.		
WBC (cont'd)	TC2 Proposals should be accompanied by a business plan showing how the development relates to existing and future needs, and how the facility is to become financially self-sufficient Comment This could seek information on future management and maintenance arrangements.	Policy amended to focus on viability.	Refer TC2 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	TC3d there will be minimal adverse impact resulting from increased traffic, noise, smell, lighting, vibration, or other emissions or activities generated by the proposed development; Comment replace "smell" with "odour"	Policy amended to focus on potential impact on immediate neighbours.	Refer TC3 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	AH1 All proposals for development should be the subject of consultation with the local community prior to an application for planning consent being submitted. Comment Needs to be consistent with our SCI – appears to be too onerous as worded	This is something where the Sustainability Focus group had strong views	No action
WBC (cont'd)	AH5a Betterment is embedded into all new development proposals. Comment replace "proposals" with "plans"	This policy has been largely rewritten	Refer AH5 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	AH5f Sufficient time is allowed during consultation to enable to local community to work with the planning authority to understand local flooding and flood risk and for this knowledge to be fed back into the planning process. Comment What does this mean? Application consultation will be based on statutory procedures and our SCI. Also not a land use policy	This policy has been largely rewritten. This statement has been removed.	Refer AH5 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	AH5 Development will not be permitted in and around areas prone to flooding and in particular in and around flood plains. Comments This needs to be based specifically on floodzones and national guidance. Development may be acceptable 'around' the floodplain if the site itself is not at risk of flooding so this is too vague and onerous.	Flood zones are re assessed in the light of changing circumstances. The text instead focuses on local issues (para 6.30).	Refer AH5 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	GA2 Development proposals will not be supported if they would have an adverse impact on road safety at known traffic hazards identified that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, or if they would result in increased traffic on unsuitable routes. Comment Set out in some supporting text what known hazards and unsuitable routes are and base this on evidence.	GA1 and GA2 have been amalgamated. The revised text focuses on roads not suited for additional traffic. Supporting text lists roads and their respective constraints (para 7.11, 7.12, 7.13)	Refer GA1 as amended
WBC (cont'd)	GA3 The Parish Councils will work with the Highway Authority to bring forward traffic management measures for Arborfield village centre, to be implemented as part of the Arborfield Cross Relief Road Scheme; and to progress to completion the widening of Barkham Bridge and the Nine Mile Ride Extension.	Agree	Statement moved to Project List.

	<p>Comment This isn't a policy as worded. It would be fine as supporting text for a policy which said something like:  "development proposals for transport improvements which support x, y, z scheme will be supported. Development proposals which are likely to compromise the delivery or effective operation of x, y, z scheme will be unacceptable</p>		
Historic England	<p>IRS1: The plan builds on the achievement of the Village Design Statements and we are pleased to see that these are identified as a document that provides important information in the supporting note to this policy. To give the VDS greater weight in decision making we recommend requiring their use within the policy itself, which has the greatest weight in decision making. A form of words would be to state: "Applications should demonstrate how the design of new development has complied with the guidance set out in the relevant Village Design Statement".</p>	Agree	Suggested wording included in Policy IRS1
Historic England (cont'd)	<p>IRS4: We commend the steering group for taking a positive approach to the conservation of the historic environment by including this policy in the plan and identifying a list of potential non-designated heritage assets in the supporting note, which should be considered by the local planning authority. We feel that a, at present bullet e) in the policy lacks clarity as it requires (as we read it) development proposals to designate new heritage assets. We recommend amending the text to read more clearly</p> <p>"e) non-designated areas of historic or archaeological interest identified within the plan or by the local planning authority or special character, including those identified as being of local importance".</p> <p>We recommend including the list of sites to be targeted for designation within the policy to ensure they are clearly identified and will receive a measure of protection as a result of this policy. This would require removing the reference to targeted sites in the note and inserting text in the policy after bullet e) to read: "These will include areas of historic interest and special character at:</p> <p>“. the historic chestnut avenue leading to the remains of the old church at Arborfield (which is designated separately as a scheduled monument);</p> <p>“. the lime grove at Nashgrove Ride in Barkham; and</p> <p>“. an area at Carters Hill and at Hall Farm including Hall Farm House, the Old Rectory (listed) and neighbouring buildings."</p>	Agree	Policy IRS4 amended

	<p>It would be necessary to illustrate the intended area that each of these refer to on a map as part of the plan.</p> <p>We recognise that the pre-submission draft states that it is not presently the intention to designate these sites through the plan but there is nothing to prevent these areas being identified clearly as non-designated heritage assets through the plan and it is doubtful whether the Local Planning Authority will have resources to do so separately. Identification through the plan provides clarity for decision makers and certainty that those values the community appreciate about these areas will be given appropriate consideration decisions.</p>		
Historic England (cont'd)	<p>AH1: 'In principle' has a very specific meaning in town and country planning practice that means permission is given to development of a site, with only technical details reserved for further consideration. The use in this policy might suggest permission is given for development of sites within the settlement boundary even where it may not be truly suitable for development (for example where one of the exceptions set out in footnote 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework), which can make refusing permission for development on technical grounds only very difficult. Blanket 'in principle' support for development set out in this policy could unintentionally result in a conflict between this and other policies in the plan or the Local Planning Authority's strategic planning policies. As such we recommend the simple remedy of removing the term 'in principle', which does not detract from the meaning of the policy as a whole.</p>	Agree	AH1 amended
Thames Water	<p>New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2018, states: "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater..."</p> <p>Paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF goes on to state: "Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary..."</p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this</p>	Noted	Reflected in AH5 a)



National Grid	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Noted	No action required
Barton Wilmore	<b>The following comments were provided by Barton Wilmore on behalf of Linden Homes, Reading University and Reading Football Club</b>		
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Draft Policy IRS1 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Identity and Rural Setting of Settlements) Development proposals must show how they would preserve, conserve or enhance the identity and rural setting of settlements, with regards to: a) The scale and form of the development; b) The density of the development; c) The materials used in the development; d) The distinctive character of the open landscape of the area; e) The Important Landscape Views identified by the public; and f) The tree and hedgerow planting that reinforces and reflects local biodiversity in the Parishes.	Noted, restatement of Policy IRS1	
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Criteria a), b) and c) relating to scale and form, density and materials. It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to paragraph 117 of the NPPF (effective use of land) within this section and highlight that there are many ways to create a sustainable community, and this should be demonstrated accordingly whilst being in accordance with the NPPF and the Local Development Plan. Neighbourhood Plan does not need to repeat what is already adopted policy in the Local Development Plan or national policy, rather the draft policies must be compatible with existing policies. Section 15 of the NPPF (July 2018) relates to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 170 of the Framework states that valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value soils should be protected and enhanced. Therefore, in the context of this Draft Neighbourhood Plan and given the character of the Parishes, to preserve, conserve and enhance identity is not supported by national policy or in accordance with the Framework. There are varying Landscape Character Areas within the Parishes and as such, the Neighbourhood Plan should make not only a clear distinction between the varying characters but also reflect varying importance and significance. That said, given adopted policy CC03 of the MDDL (Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping), it is not considered that this policy from a landscape perspective adds value in addition to the NPPF and the Development Plan.	The policy has been amended to reflect NPPF paras 170 and 185. Rather than to repeat national policy, the thrust has been to interpret the policies in terms of specific local conditions.	Refer IRS1 as amended

Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Criteria d) requires that development proposals should have regard to "the distinctive character of the open landscapes of the area". The Parishes is set within a number of Landscape Character Areas of differing Landscape Character Types. The key characteristics of these areas are not all identified to be 'open'. As such, development should not be designed to preserve characteristics that are not relevant to their setting. We therefore consider Criteria d) of Policy IRS1 should be re-phased as follows:</p> <p><i>d) the character of the receiving landscape as set out within the relevant Character Area as described within the Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment.</i></p>	<p>Agreed the expression "open landscapes" is not entirely appropriate. The policy has been revised in terms of "the distinctive character of the varied landscape of the area". This is further explained in supporting text.</p>	<p>Refer Policy IRS1 e) as amended and para 4.8</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Criteria e) requires that development proposals should have regard to "the Important Landscape Views identified by the public". The key landscape views identified within the Landscapes and Important Views Report (2018) do not represent the key or defining characteristics of the Landscape Character Areas identified within the document and described in the Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>As such, the document does not identify how the protection of these views would preserve, conserve or enhance the identity and rural setting of any settlements. We therefore consider that Criteria e) should be omitted from this draft policy unless further justification can be provided on how the protection of these important views would preserve, conserve or enhance the identity and rural setting of settlements.</p> <p>We note that the adopted Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan contains a policy (Policy 1: Location of Development) regarding the location of development which states:</p> <p><i>"In Shinfield Parish, development within the Development limits, will be supported, development adjacent to the Development Limits will only be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh its adverse impacts. "</i></p> <p>We consider the wording of this adopted policy provides a balance between controlling development beyond Development Limits whilst allowing for the opportunity for appropriate development adjacent to Development Limits where benefits can be demonstrated. We would therefore recommend that the Pre-Submission Draft A&amp;BNP should include a similar policy which will also ensure consistency in the wording of policies between Neighbourhood Plans within the borough.</p>	<p>The Important Landscape Views are examined in the context of the 2004 Landscape Character Assessment (para 4.8).</p> <p>The Shinfield policy is not considered appropriate for Arborfield and Barkham</p>	<p>Refer Policy IRS1 f) and para 4.8 as amended. Also Annex 10.</p> <p>No action taken</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>In summary, it is considered that the draft policy should be re-worded as detailed below:</p> <p>Draft Policy IRS1 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Identity and Rural Setting of Settlements)</p> <p>Development proposals <del>must show how they would preserve conserve or enhance</del> should contribute to the identity and rural setting of settlements, with regards to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The scale and form of the development;</li> <li>b) The density of the development;</li> <li>c) The materials used in the development;</li> </ol>	<p>See comments above</p>	<p>Refer IRS1 as amended</p>

	<p>d) <del>The Distinctive character of the open landscape of the area</del> the character of the receiving landscape as set out within the relevant Character Area as described within the Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment; and</p> <p>e) <del>The Important Landscape Views identified by the public;</del>and</p> <p>f) The tree and hedgerow planting that reinforces and reflects Local biodiversity in the Parishes</p>		
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy IRS2 (Preservation of the Separation Areas between Arborfield, Barkham and Arborfield Green)</p> <p>We consider that reference to 'Separation Areas' should be removed from the Pre-Submission Draft A&amp;BNP. National policy, in principle, does not support the use of 'gaps', settlement separation is adequately conserved by settlement or Development Limits boundaries, and we consider that development proposals that lie outside of Development Limits should be assessed on their own merits through the decision-making process. In any event, there is no evidence base or criteria-based assessment to support this policy; it is overly restrictive; and would inhibit with the purpose of Neighbourhood Plans to shape, direct and help deliver sustainable development, as required by the NPPF. In summary, it is considered that the draft policy should be re-worded as detailed below:</p> <p><del>Development proposals will not be supported where they encroach upon the Settlement Separation Area unless they:</del></p> <p>a) <del>Involve only brownfield or previously developed land that is not of heritage or landscape value</del></p> <p>b) <del>Enhance the separation between settlements by replacing an inappropriate land use with a form of development more sympathetic to preserving the separate identities of the settlements.</del></p> <p><b>Development within the Development limits will be supported; development adjacent to the Development Limits will only be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh its adverse impacts.</b></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Core strategy (2010) does refer to separation areas (see Core Strategy para A7.5 and Key Map Diagram on page 128.</p> <p>The NPPF makes no reference to gaps.</p> <p>IRS2 has been amended and does not make reference to specifically delineated separation zones though the principle of separation remains.</p>	Refer IRS2 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy IRS3 (Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment and Green Spaces)</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected, where appropriate, to conserve and enhance the natural environment and will be supported only if they:</p> <p>a) Protect and enhance wildlife areas, including local wildlife sites and SANGs, and incorporate measures to provide net gains in biodiversity. Where there is a residual loss compensatory measures will be required</p>	Noted, restatement of Policy IRS3	

	<p>b) Take the opportunity to protect, enhance and extend the network of landscape and wildlife corridors between existing open spaces and habitats as a means of mitigating the impacts of development on biodiversity</p> <p>c) Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of street lighting and mitigating the impact of domestic external Lighting</p> <p>d) Contain measures that will help to mitigate the impacts of, and adapt to, climate change</p> <p>e) include at least 50% on-site open space, excluding the area occupied by highway infrastructure</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to ensure that there is minimum loss of biodiversity and where possible to provide a net gain. Where there is Likely to be a loss of biodiversity, measures to mitigate should be put in place to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity, through the creation of like-for-like habitats wherever possible.</p> <p>The areas shown on the Local Green Space maps are designated as areas of Local Green Space. Development on designated Local Green Space will be permitted only in very special circumstances.</p>		
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Section 15 of the NPPF (July 2018) relates to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 170 of the Framework states that impacts should be minimised on biodiversity and that net gains for biodiversity should be provided that are coherent and more resilient.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority are required to assess planning applications in terms of the NPPF and the Development Plan. The policy test as detailed in paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that when Local Planning Authorities are determining planning applications that applications which seek opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements should be encouraged. It is considered that the policy should reflect national policy and state that where appropriate, contribute to and enhance biodiversity.</p>	The policy has been amended to reflect NPPF paras 170 and 185. Rather than to repeat national policy, the thrust has been to interpret the policies in terms of specific local conditions.	Refer IRS3 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Criteria b) should be omitted as this is a repeat of policy CC03 of the MDDLDP.	This is a general statement as a lead in to the policy. Noted there is no conflict with CC03	No action
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Criteria c) requires that new development should "Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of street lighting and mitigating the impact of domestic external lighting! Although we understand the ecological motives beyond this criterion, however we do consider this needs to be balanced against ensuring safe and accessible places. We therefore consider that Criteria c) should be re-phased as follows:</p> <p>c) Consider the environment for nocturnal species through the design to cause minimum lightspill, where practical' Criteria</p>	This seems a very fine distinction	No action

Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>e) requires that development proposals will be expected to "include at least 50% on-site open space, excluding the area occupied by highway infrastructure' We understand this requirement seems to have stemmed from paragraph 5.24 of the Pre-Submission Draft A&amp;BNP that cites Arborfield Green using 'Garden Village' principles with around 50% of the land remaining as open space. Whilst this Strategic Development Location may comprise approximately 50% open space, not least because of the substantial existing retained landscape of water bodies and woodland, the extrapolation of this quantum for future development is arbitrary.</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) website provides a distillation of the key elements of the successful Garden City model of development, for a 21<sup>st</sup> century context. The 7<sup>th</sup> of nine principles identified references the provision of a 'comprehensive green infrastructure network', but notably does not specify a minimum open space requirement needed to achieve this. This recognises that each site is different, with a different context and a different set of opportunities and constraints. The same 'garden village' objectives can be achieved in different locations without adhering to an arbitrary minimum 50% open space threshold.</p>	<p>Para 6.23 demonstrates that the 50% will occur in most situations, so long as there is a SANG involved. As all the NP area is within the Thames Basin Heaths 7km zone, this should apply.</p> <p>In the view of the Steering Group, it is necessary to have a large proportion of open space to provide a 'comprehensive green infrastructure network'. The SDL provides an appropriate model for the Plan Area.</p>	<p>This particular requirement has been moved from IRS3 and is now included in AH3 and supporting text.</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>In addition, requiring a minimum of 50% of the site to be open space is contrary to Local Plan policy and is not based upon a robust assessment of the needs of the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is not always compatible with making efficient use of land. Indeed, the policy could result in a poorer quality development. Large areas of open space may not all be used, provide an increased maintenance burden and may divert investment away from other desirable objectives such as provision or contributions to other community facilities or affordable housing. The Core Strategy and Policy TB08 of the Managing Development Delivery DPD provide the required open space standard so we therefore recommend deleting Criteria e).</p>	<p>The policy allows a wide variety of land uses, some of which would be low maintenance. As an example, local SANGs at Hazebrouck Meadows and Rooks Nest comprise woodland and rough grassland, requiring minimal maintenance</p>	<p>Refer AH3 as amended and supporting text.</p>
)	<p>In summary, it is considered that the draft policy should be re-worded as detailed below:  Draft Policy IRS3 (<del>Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment and Green Spaces</del>)  Development proposals will be expected, where appropriate, <b>should</b> to conserve and enhance the natural environment and will be supported <del>only</del> if they</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Where appropriate, contribute to</b> <del>Protect</del> and enhance wildlife areas, including Local wildlife sites and SANGs, and <b>where possible</b> incorporate measures to provide net gains in biodiversity. <del>Where there is a residual loss compensatory measures will be required.</del></li> <li>b) <del>Take the opportunity to protect, enhance and extend the network of landscape and wildlife corridors between existing open spaces and habitats as a means of mitigating the impacts of development on biodiversity</del></li> </ul>	<p>See comments above</p>	<p>Refer IRS3 as amended</p>

	<p>e) <del>Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of steel lighting and mitigating the impact of domestic external lighting</del></p> <p>d) Consider the environment for nocturnal species through the design to cause minimum light spill, where practical"</p> <p>e) Contain measures that will help to mitigate the impacts of, and adapt to, climate change</p> <p>f) <del>Include at least 50% on site open space, excluding the area occupied by highway infrastructure</del></p> <p>Development proposals <del>will be expected to</del> should ensure that there is minimum loss of biodiversity and where possible to provide a net gain. Where there is likely to be a loss of biodiversity, measures to mitigate should be put in place to ensure there is no net Loss of biodiversity, through the creation of like for-like habitats wherever possible.</p> <p><del>The areas shown on the Local Green Space maps are designated as areas of Local Green Space. Development on designated Local Green Space will be permitted only in very special circumstances.</del></p>		
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>This draft policy refers to Local Green Spaces however until the Local Green Space Map is made available, we are unable to comment on this element of the policy however, in accordance with paragraph 100 of the NPPF (July 2018), we would like to emphasise that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In reasonable close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li>b) Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li>c) Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</li> </ul>	Noted that Map has not been available. If it is any reassurance, the areas specified are fairly limited in extent.	Refer Appendix 1 Map 4
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Policy IRS4: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE SPECIAL AND HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE AREA</p> <p>Development proposals will need to demonstrate how they would protect or enhance the special and historic character of the area, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Arborfield Cross Conservation Area</li> <li>b) Chamberlain's Farm Area of Special Character</li> <li>c) The Barkham Street Area of Special Character</li> <li>d) The local historic environment, including the setting of Listed and other historically significant buildings</li> <li>e) The designation of additional areas of historic or special character, including those identified as being of local importance</li> </ul> <p>Where heritage assets would be affected by new development, proposals should incorporate measures to improve future viability.</p>	Noted, restatement of Policy IRS4	

Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>The NPPF and the Act both expect that intervention (or impact) that affects a designated or non-designated asset is proportionate to the degree of significance that can be identified (or is already recognised) for individual heritage assets. Those elements which hold less heritage significance are therefore more tolerant of change.</p> <p>The concept of proportionality should be reflected in the policy which seeks to control the non-designated and undefined 'special and historic character' of the area (Items B &amp; C). All other heritage assets (designated and non-designated) would be picked up in the development plan and are therefore redundant here.</p> <p>It remains the mandate of the local authority to identify heritage assets of local significance which are compiled into a local list.</p>	<p>There is strong local concern about the areas identified. These proposals are considered proportionate.</p> <p>The Project List included the ambition to include additional designation by the LPA and that these should ultimately be included in the local plan.</p>	Refer IRS4 as amended and Project List
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	As it is currently written, item E is irrelevant to this policy, which requires the applicant to identify non-designated heritage assets within a criteria which remains undefined ('special and historic character'). The neighbourhood plan needs to identify assets or supply criteria by which assets can be understood to make the neighbourhood distinctive or special.	IRS4 e) has been amended as suggested so that specific locations are identified.	Refer IRS4 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Policy IRS4: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE SPECIAL AND HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE AREA HISTORIC ENVIROMENT</p> <p>Development—proposals will need to demonstrate how they would protect or enhance the special and historic character of the area, specifically: <b>Where the character of non-designated heritage assets has been identified and would be affected by new development, proposals should demonstrate proportionate consideration of the following non-designated heritage assets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <del>Arborfield Cross Conservation Area</del></li> <li>b) Chamberlain’s Farm Area of Special Character</li> <li>c) The Barkham Street Area of Special Character</li> <li>d) <del>The local historic environment, including the setting of Listed and other historically significant buildings</del></li> <li>e) The designation of additional areas of historic or special character, including those identified as being of local importance</li> </ul> <p><del>Where heritage assets would be affected by new development, proposals should incorporate measures to improve future viability</del></p>	See comments above	Refer IRS4 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate Housing</li> </ul> <p>Draft Policy AH1 (New Housing within Settlement Boundaries or on Brownfield Sites)</p>		

	<p>The policy seeks to require that all developments are subject to public consultation before submission. This is contrary to national policy and planning legislation which does not require applicants to consult prior to the submission of an application. A policy which encourages consultation (where appropriate, for example when the scale of development or its circumstances would generate significant public interest) as a matter of good practice would be appropriate but procedurally a Development Plan policy cannot be used to require consultation when there is no legal obligation to do so.</p> <p>Moreover, the wording of AH1 requires that for sites of 0.4ha and greater 'consultation on a development brief prior to the initial proposals being drawn up' should be undertaken. This applies an unnecessary level of bureaucracy associated with bringing forward much needed new development that will slow delivery and not necessarily improve outcomes which is counter to the general thrust of national planning policy and guidance. This policy also raises logistical issues in who would be responsible for funding and preparing the development brief, who controls and approves the brief and what status it would hold in guiding future applications. The requirement for consultation on a development brief should be removed from this policy.</p>	<p>This is something where the Sustainability Focus group had strong views. This should be considered as best practice as a matter of course, recognising that the local community are also stakeholders</p>	
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Policy AH2: Support for housing to meet local needs, e.g. affordable and key worker homes All proposals for new housing development must demonstrate how the types of homes provided will contribute to a balanced mix of housing and meet the needs identified in the Arborfield and Barkham Housing Needs Analysis, including provision for key workers. In all new housing development providing affordable housing, the occupancy of all affordable homes will be prioritised for households with a local connection with the Parishes of Arborfield and Newland, and Barkham.</p> <p>Paragraph 59 of the NPPF states the importance of delivering a variety of new homes. Policies within the Development Plan seek to significantly boost the supply of housing informed by a local needs assessment. Policy TB05: Housing Mix in the MDDL P provides policy guidance on appropriate housing mix and affordability. In addition to this, there is an Affordable Housing SPD (July 2013) which details type, tenure, design, distribution and delivery. It is not considered that draft policy AH2 contribute in addition to the Development Plan, and as such can be omitted as a draft policy.</p>	<p>The Arborfield and Barkham Housing Needs Analysis is intended to identify the local need within the Plan Area. This seems eminently reasonable and surely is a primary purpose of producing a neighbourhood plan</p>	<p>Refer AH2 as amended. A definition of local connection has been included.</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy AH3 (Very Strict Exception Policies for New Development Outside Settlements) Please see our comments to Draft Policy IRS2 above. On this basis we do not see the necessity to include this draft policy.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>AH3 has been amended to include the requirement for 50% open space.</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy AH4 (Any Development to be of High Quality, with Generous Open Space and Properly Landscaped)</p>	<p>Noted, restatement of Policy AH4</p>	

	<p>All new developments must reflect the rural character and historic context of existing dwellings within the parish. New development must deliver good quality design. In order to achieve this, all new development must wherever possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Consider the density of any new development which must be in character with the surrounding area, respect the rural nature of the area and be designed to give an impression of spaciousness and variety with uniform houses and plots being avoided;</li> <li>b) Provide sufficient internal space as defined in the Technical Housing Standards - national space standard</li> <li>c) For homes of three or more bedrooms, be designed to meet current Lifetime Home standards</li> <li>d) Where enclosure of plots is planned, hedges of indigenous plants or post and rail fences are preferred giving a sense of open space from plot to plot</li> <li>e) Enhance developments by landscaping and planting and preserving existing trees and hedges wherever possible that reflect local biodiversity</li> <li>f) Where any new development is adjacent to a Listed Building or building of historic interest and/or open space be sensitively designed to conserve and enhance the setting, form and character of the building and/or space</li> <li>g) Recognise, in the design of developments, the distinctive local character of the area and contribute sensitively in order to create dwellings of a high architectural and rural quality, referring to the published Village Design Statements</li> <li>h) Design all new buildings and/or developments with the security of the building and its occupants at the forefront in terms of personal safety, crime prevention and environmental efficiency</li> <li>i) Be laid out so as to encourage travel by means other than the car, for shorter journeys</li> <li>j) Provide streets which encourage low vehicle speeds, and which can function as safe, social spaces</li> <li>k) Provide sufficient car parking and integrate it within landscaping so that it does not dominate or cause congestion in the streets</li> <li>l) Incorporate charging points for electric vehicles, and measures to minimise the use of energy and water resources</li> <li>m) Avoid the use of tandem parking on drives as part of the means of meeting the current parking standards.</li> </ul>		
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>We consider the use of the words 'Generous' and 'Properly' within the title of this Draft Policy are undefined terms and therefore we advise that this policy title is re-worded. The requirement for new developments to be of high quality is supported. In most instances, requiring all new developments to 'reflect the rural character and historic context of existing dwellings' within the Parish is appropriate and is consistent with the principles set out in the Borough Design Guide. However, with existing built up areas and</p>	<p>The requirements are specified in the various points a) to m) However the intro sentence does include reference to "the rural character and historic context</p>	<p>Refer AH4 as amended</p>

	<p>Strategic Development Locations adjacent to and within the Parish boundary, future development opportunities may arise that may not be appropriate to reflect the rural character of the wider Parish. We therefore consider that this draft should be amended to avoid an overly prescriptive design approach.</p> <p>We have the following comments regarding the criterion of this draft policy:</p>	of existing dwellings within the Plan Area@.	
We have the following comments regarding the criterion of this draft policy:	<p>In respect to Criteria a), we consider that the density of new development must consider the character of the surrounding area, rather than only rural nature of the villages as part of integrating with the immediate character of the surrounding area and making efficient use of land in a sustainable location. We consider that the requirement for development to be 'designed to give an impression of spaciousness' is too vague and unmeasurable. Section 11 of the NPPF relates to 'making the effective use of land'. Paragraph 117 states that policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. It is not considered that the draft policy (as currently worded) is encouraging multiple benefits on land. This can be achieved through (but not limited to) scheme providing a net biodiversity gain, developments creating new habitats or the creation and/or improvement of public access to the countryside.</p> <p>With regards to density, paragraph 122 of the NPPF states that the need for different types of housing and other forms of development, local conditions and viability, capacity of infrastructure, and services, improvement scope, desirability of the area and the prevailing character and setting and good urban design should all be taken into account when a decision is being made. Therefore, it is imperative for the draft policy to not be unduly restrictive and contrary to national and local policy.</p>	<p>The thrust of this policy is to encourage good design, something towards which all developers should anyway aspire.</p> <p>The comment re biodiversity indeed is part of the argument for the 50% open space requirement</p> <p>The policy is in the spirit of para 122 of the NPPF, taking account that this is a rural, not an urban, location.</p>	
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	In terms of Criteria b), the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (Para. 002 Ref ID:56-001-20150327) describes DCLG's Technical Housing Standards (March 2015) as 'optional' technical housing standards. We therefore consider that such Technical Housing Standards should be considered as a guide to allow for flexibility on the basis that they are not statutory standards and will be subject to review.	The expectation is that developers should aspire to the highest standards.	No action
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	With regard to Criteria c), we consider that this draft policy should be deleted as Lifetime Homes Standards is no longer supported by national policy.	Given the ageing population in the Plan Area, Lifetime Homes Standards are considered a high priority and should not be expensive to provide.	No action
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	We consider that Criteria d) would benefit from clarifying that it applies to the enclosure of front gardens rather than side of rear gardens, which will require different treatments to ensure privacy and security.	Given the key word is "preferred", the distinction	No action

		front/side/rear is not considered necessary.	
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	We note that Criteria e) requires new developments to <i>"Enhance developments by landscaping and planting and preserving existing trees and hedges wherever possible that reflect local biodiversity!"</i> We consider that this text should also state that development should take reference from the Key Issues and Guidelines set out within the relevant Character Areas as described within the Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment	Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment is referenced in IRS2 f) important landscape views.	Refer para 4.8.
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	In respect to Criteria m), we consider that tandem parking should not be precluded on new developments. It is an appropriate parking typology as part of a balanced mix of parking solutions across a site, including an appropriate level of on-street parking opportunities, integrated as part of the overall design approach to avoid indiscriminate parking and parking that is overly dominant in the street scene.	The policy is worded to avoid tandem parking which does not preclude it where there is no reasonable alternative.	No action
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	In summary, it is considered that the draft policy should be re-worded as detailed below: Draft Policy AH4 (Built form Any Development to be of High Quality, with Generous Open Space and Properly Landscaped) Development should take account of the character of its context. <del>All new developments must reflect the rural character and historic context of existing dwellings within the parish. New development must deliver good quality design.</del> In order to achieve this, all new development must wherever possible: a) <del>Consider the density of any new development which must be in character with the surrounding area, respect the rural nature of the area and be designed to give an impression of spaciousness and variety with uniform houses and plots being avoided;</del> b) <del>Provide sufficient internal space as defined in the Technical housing standards—national space standard;</del> c) <del>For homes of 3 or more bedrooms, be designed to meet current Lifetime Home standards</del> d) <del>Where enclosure of plots is planned, hedges of indigenous plants or post and rail fences are preferred giving a sense of open space from plot to plot;</del> e) Enhance developments by landscaping and planting and preserving existing trees and hedges wherever possible that reflect local biodiversity; f) here any new development is adjacent to a Listed Building or building of historic interest and/or open space be sensitively designed to conserve and enhance the setting, form and character of the building and/or space	See comments above	No action

	<p>g) Recognise, in the design of developments, the distinctive local character of the area and contribute sensitively in order to create dwellings of a high architectural standard and rural quality, referring to the published Village Design Statements</p> <p><del>h) Design all new buildings and/or developments with the security of the building and its occupants at the forefront in terms of personal safety, crime prevention and environmental efficiency;</del></p> <p><del>i) Be laid out so as to encourage travel by means other than the car, for shorter journeys</del></p> <p><del>j) Provide streets which encourage low vehicle speeds and which can function as safe, social spaces;</del></p> <p><del>k) Provide sufficient car parking and integrate it within landscaping so that it does not dominate or cause congestion in the streets.</del></p> <p><del>l) Incorporate charging points for electric vehicles, and measures to minimise the use of energy and water resources.</del></p> <p><del>m) Avoid the use of tandem parking on drives as part of the means of meeting the current parking standards</del></p>		
<p>Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)</p>	<p>POLICY AH5: NO ADVERSE DRAINAGE AND SEWAGE IMPACTS AND NO DEVELOPMENT IN FLOOD AREAS</p> <p>Planning applications for development must ensure that:</p> <p>a) Betterment is embedded into all new development plans</p> <p>b) All elements of flood risk management, including SuDs are fully addressed at the outline planning stage and, ideally, in pre-application discussions. This includes SuDs maintenance plans and funding for the lifetime of the development including adoption by Wokingham Borough Council.</p> <p>c) Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) are utilised for water quality and flood risk management purposes</p> <p>d) Sewage and drainage are designed from the wider catchment view</p> <p>e) The Local environment and Local water courses are protected from adverse impact through increased water consumption, foul water discharge, waste water treatment and other sources of pollution discharged both during and after construction</p> <p>f) Sufficient time is allowed during consultation to enable to local community to work with the planning authority to understand Local flooding and flood risk and for this knowledge to be fed back into the planning process</p> <p>Development will not be permitted in and around areas prone to flooding and in particular in and around flood plains.</p>	<p>Noted, restatement of Policy AH5</p>	

Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Item (a) requires Betterment to be embedded in all new development plans. It is understood the policy should try to achieve betterment but the wording is too wide ranging and not measurable. NPPF requires all developments to not increase flood risk and take into account climate change which is in itself betterment. In addition, National and Local flood risk and drainage policies provide betterment by, for example, restricting off site flow and/or assessing downstream receptors. By their very nature SuDS can provide ecological and biodiversity betterment not linked to flood risk. It is considered that criteria (a) should be omitted.	The reference to betterment has been removed, to rely instead on wording in AH5 b), which is now AH5 a). .	Refer Policy AH5 a) as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Item (b) requires all elements of flood risk management, including SuDS, to be fully addressed at the outline planning stage. Outline planning permission seeks to establish whether the scale and nature of a proposed development would be acceptable to the approving authority, before a fully detailed proposal is put forward. Following award of outline planning approval developers will request approval of the details (reserved matters) before work can start. It is acknowledged the principles of the flood risk management, including SuDS, should be addressed at an early stage, but it is unreasonable to request all elements to be fully addressed when the scheme, and the details influencing the flooding and drainage, will not be fully detailed. Suggested revised wording as follows: <del>b) All elements</del> <b>The principles</b> of flood risk management, including SuDs are fully addressed at the outline planning stage and, ideally, in pre-application discussions. This includes SuDs maintenance plans and funding for the lifetime of the development including adoption by Wokingham Borough Council.	The policy has been amended, taking note of the advice of Thames Water  It is not unreasonable at all – the impacts should be fully addressed at the planning stage, not retrospectively.  Distinction between elements and principles seems a fine point!	Refer Policy AH5 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Item (c) seek to use SuDS for water quality and flood risk management. It is acknowledged that SuDS should be used wherever possible. However, this does not reflect DEFRA's current best practice guidelines for Sustainable Drainage, nor the Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk. For example, there may be instances which prevent SuDS feature being incorporated within developments, such as inappropriate ground conditions, site location, nature and quantum of development etc. suggested revised wording as follows: c) Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) are utilised. <b>Where appropriate</b> , for water quality and flood risk management purposes	See earlier comment re Thames Water	Refer Policy AH5 as amended
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	Item (f) seeks sufficient time to be allowed for discussions between the Local Planning Authority and the Parish to be undertaken to understand local flood risk. This is not consistent with national policy and should be omitted. It is acknowledged that restricting development in flood plains generally provides benefit and this is covered under National Policy with respect to NPPF and the allocation of sites.	See earlier comment re Thames Water	Refer Policy AH5 as amended

	<p>However, to restrict development in, and around, areas prone to flooding and flood plains does not accord with national policy and "around" is too subjective and ambiguous. NPPF provides for a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change. Furthermore, these tests enable safeguarding land that is required for current and future flood management.</p> <p>However, there may be instances where the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, or, where siting development can be located in, or near, areas of flood risk, there may be legitimate instances where it would be advantageous to alter the drainage regime within sites, in order to achieve an appropriate and enhanced drainage strategy solution, which in some instances could also accrue wider benefits.</p> <p>Within NPPF if, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible or consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test can be applied if appropriate.</p>		
<p>Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)</p>	<p>Draft Policy GA1 (New development must not increase traffic on unsuitable roads) Linden Homes objects to draft Policy GA1 in its current form. The draft policy is overly restrictive and there is no justification to support such a policy. It is also not in accordance with Policy CP6 in Wokingham Borough Council's Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Transport Test for new development is set out in paragraph 109 of the NPPF as follows: "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." This test purposely sets a high bar - development can only be refused for transport reasons if it would have a 'severe' impact. Marginal or de minimis impacts, i.e. modest increases in traffic, should therefore be acceptable. The draft policy indicates that any intensification on certain routes is unacceptable. If any increase at all is unacceptable then it must follow therefore the existing situation is so bad that one extra car or pedestrian should not be allowed to use these routes. If that were the case then Linden Homes would expect WBC to be doing something to resolve the existing severe issues. We are not aware of any plans to undertake such works. The personal injury accident statistics also do not suggest there is an existing highway safety issue in the Arborfield Cross area which would necessitate application of such a policy. The 83349 School Road, the A327 Eversley Road, and Langley Common Road all have good highway safety records over the last five-year period.</p>	<p>GA1 does not conflict with CP6. Indeed, Para g) appears to support the approach of GA1, i.e. "Do not cause highway problems or lead to traffic related environmental problems."</p> <p>The definition of "severe" in NPPF 109 is open to debate. For example, it is worth recalling that a Planning Inspector as long ago as 1974 considered that Barkham Road had inadequate capacity for further development: since then the road has suffered from incremental development in the area.</p>	<p>Refer Policy GA1 as amended.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, there is no definition of what qualifies as an 'unsuitable road'. Without some clear criteria, Linden Homes is concerned that this is open to significant interpretation and objectors may seek to argue roads are unsuitable (without providing any evidence to justify the claims) which are in fact capable of safely accommodating modest amounts of additional traffic.</p> <p>Finally, it is not clear how this policy takes into account the beneficial impact the Arborfield Relief Road (ARR), once open, will have on local roads in Arborfield Cross, including along School Road. The ARR is forecast to remove traffic from some local roads and it should follow that, as a minimum, an increase in traffic up to the existing levels as a result of new development in the area should be acceptable due to the headroom created by the implementation of the ARR, i.e. as set out above, the operation of the existing highway network is considered to be acceptable at present.</p>	<p>It is not just a matter of the capacity of the roads but issues such as air quality and the environmental impact on residents have to be taken into account. Refer to circular published in 2013 by the Department of Transport (Circular 01/2013) which recognises the practical difficulties of vulnerable users and other environmental issues.</p> <p>It is highly questionable that the ARR will have any beneficial impact on School Road.</p>	<p>GA1 amended indicates the types of road unsuited to additional traffic, with further justification described in para 7.10 to 7.13</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy GA2 (Implement Local Network or Green Routes for Non-Motorised Users)</p> <p>Whilst the overall aims of the policy are agreed in principle, the requirements should not be applied so rigidly that the viability of development is comprised. Any improvements need to be proportional in scale and kind to the impact of the development and need to take into account what is deliverable with the applicant's control or the highway. The policy should also make clear that the provision of safe crossings of major routes does not necessarily mean a signalised pedestrian should be provided and it is considered that safe crossing facilities can be adequately accommodated through enhanced uncontrolled facilities.</p>	<p>Developing the greenway network is in many respects opportunistic. It is seen as a priority in terms of sustainable transport and amenity. It is not stated that safe crossings have to be signalised, though with respect to Mole Road where there is a strong and unfulfilled requirement for a Pegasus crossing.</p>	<p>No action</p>
Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)	<p>Draft Policy GA3 (Arborfield Cross Relief Road, Barkham Bridge Widening, and Nine Mile Ride Extension to be Supported)</p> <p>Linden Homes supports the policy for the Arborfield and Barkham Parish Councils to work with Wokingham Borough Council and developers to ensure committed highway improvements in the area are implemented in accordance with the agreed strategy</p>	<p>It was considered that this is not a land use policy per se so the comment has been moved to the Project List</p>	<p>Refer Project List item i)</p>

<p>Barton Wilmore (Cont'd)</p>	<p>Draft Policy GA4 (Bus Routes in New Development Must have Adequate Road Width and Junctions)  This policy does not prove effective for smaller development sites, which are likely to comprise the majority of future developments in the area, as only sites of a significant scale will need to accommodate a bus route within the site. Furthermore, in Linden Homes view it is better for bus services to operate along direct routes and are intuitively logical rather than circulating through a development which can add extra journey time and additional mileage and result in them becoming less attractive as an alternative to the car. The existing Leopard 3/3B service provides an hourly service between Arborfield Cross to Reading and Bracknell and two services per hour towards Wokingham. Combined these make up over 50% of the workplace destinations for existing residents in the area, using data from the 2011 Census, as well as comprising the main centres for shopping, leisure and personal business trips. Therefore, in Linden Homes, the existing bus services do provide an attractive alternative to the car for residents of Arborfield Cross. It is important to note that an enhanced 15-minute service between the Arborfield SDL and Reading as part of the public transport improvements to be funded by the Arborfield Garrison SDL will also benefit residents of Arborfield Cross.</p>	<p>The policy was not intended for small developments. The policy (now GA3) has been amended to refer specifically to the SDL.</p>	<p>Refer GA3 as amended</p>
--------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------