Tandridge District Local Plan Examination

Matter 6 – South Godstone Garden Community and housing allocations

Examination Statement by Nexus Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey
1. This statement has been prepared by Nexus Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (“TW”).

2. TW controls some 122ha of land to the west of the A22 adjacent to Blindley Heath, which is available for a housing led development. TW has also actively promoted a Garden Community at Blindley Heath for 4,000 dwellings, the majority of which is available for development now.

3. TW is a member of the Tandridge Developer Forum (“TDF”) and therefore also relies upon separate representations made by the TDF.

**SCG01: South Godstone Garden Community**

**Issue: Is the policy for the allocation of a broad location for a Garden Community at South Godstone justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

6.1 Is the approach that the specific details of the proposed Garden Community would be determined through an Area Action Plan (APP) effective and is it clearly justified to address these matters in an additional development plan document?

4. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF provides for the identification of ‘broad locations’ for growth for years 6-10 and onwards of a plan period. The PPG outlines that additional local plans such as a site allocations document or an AAP can be produced, providing clear justification for doing so exists (ID:12-012). It is therefore clear that national policy and guidance allows for the specifics of a broad location to be determined at a later date through an AAP.

5. AAPs have a strong focus on delivery and implementation, and of course form a statutory component of the development plan, enabling them to review Green Belt boundaries. They are also well placed to deal with situations where a complicated array of infrastructure delivery arises due to the focused remit of the documents and therefore an ideal tool to help facilitate the delivery of a Garden Community.

6. Notwithstanding the above, Policy SCG01 establishes the principle of a new settlement to be located within a relatively confined area of search. Therefore to find the TLP sound, it must be demonstrated that a new settlement within the identified broad location is the most appropriate growth strategy to meet long-term needs, when considered against reasonable alternatives.

7. TW consider that the principle of a Garden Community in the central / southern part of the District is based upon compelling evidence – much produced by TW through early discussions / submissions to the Council as part of the Regulation 18 process.

8. However, TW, having reviewed the evidence relating to, inter alia, heritage, landscape, Green Belt impact and landownership, consider that the board location should comprise a much larger area within which various sites / development options can be considered as part of the AAP process.
Without this change, the AAP approach is neither justified nor effective. The Council's approach has, it appears, been led by assessing ‘stand-alone’ development options which mirror developer submissions and an arbitrarily formulated aim not to release more than 1% of the District's Green Belt in order to deliver the Garden Community. As such, it is limiting its opportunity in identifying the most appropriate development solution within this general geographical area having regard to both national and local constraints and opportunities.

9. TW suggest that a sound approach would involve extending the broad location to include Blindley Heath; identifying a ‘Strategic Development Location’ for the establishment of a ‘Garden Community’ or ‘linked Garden Communities’. Support for this approach can be found through the Strategic Development Location to the South of the M4 in Wokingham District. In this instance a wide area of transformational change was identified and a mechanism, through Part 2 Local Plan and SPD production, put in place to identify development parcels, open space and infrastructure to support the area’s development aspirations. This was secured through a clear and transparent Infrastructure Delivery Plan where each developer contributed equally to the overall infrastructure.

10. It is clear when reviewing the evidence and the Council's SA that there is little differentiation between South Godstone and Blindley Heath with both demonstrating strengths and weaknesses. Combining the areas to provide a much wider broad location would significantly strengthen the potential to deliver the most sustainable and appropriate development solution for the long term growth of the District in the most environmentally sensitive and deliverable way and thus ensure that the AAP route is justified and effective.

6.2 Was the broad location for the proposed Garden Community selected on a robust basis?

11. No.

12. Our concerns with the conclusions made within the SA are set out within our Matter 1 Statement and Regulation 19 representations in respect of the SA. Overall, it cannot be concluded that the proposed Garden Community represents the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, until such time that these deficiencies have been addressed.

13. Furthermore, our Regulation 19 representations to Policy SCG01 identify a number of shortcomings in the Council’s wider evidence base associated with the Garden Community, namely in respect of the Garden Community Matrix which can be found in Appendix 1 of the Council’s Housing Topic Paper (HNS2).

14. Paragraph 363 of HNS2 states that this represents a “comprehensive list of the factors and criteria that led to South Godstone’s designation as the most appropriate location for the Garden Community”. We do however have fundamental concerns with the conclusions of this matrix, which like the SA, include factual errors and fails to represent an objective assessment of the options.
A number of the issues highlighted with the SA scoring overlap with the matrix, for example in respect of ‘landscape’ and ‘heritage’ considerations, all of which are outlined in full within our Regulation 19 representations. A summary is therefore provided below:

- **land availability** – the Council has failed to consider land ownership positions in an objective manner and fundamentally underestimated the complexity of compulsory purchasing 40ha of land at South Godstone, which is owned by 348 individual owners across the world;
- **landscape** – the Council appears to have ignored the conclusions of its Landscape Capacity Assessment within the matrix and failed to offer any weight to the landscape sensitivities of land to the north and south of South Godstone;
- **heritage** – the Council’s evidence base fails to include any assessment of heritage impacts, most notably in respect of the potential impacts of the South Godstone Garden Community upon the setting of a Scheduled Monument, an asset of the highest significance. The only evidence it appears to rely upon is fundamentally flawed.
- **public transport / rail services** – the Council’s approach to considering sustainable travel modes double counts rail service benefits (which only benefit the selected Garden Community option) and gives weight to purported future improvement to services serving Godstone railway station, for which there is no evidence;
- **impact on existing communities (including community benefit)** – there is insufficient evidence to justify South Godstone delivering additional benefits over Blindley Heath against this consideration when the Garden Community is expected to deliver the same facilities wherever it is located and given these two options are in the same geographic part of the District (southern / central);
- **employment** – the Council fails to acknowledge that two Strategic Employment sites are in close proximity of Blindley Heath; and
- **Green Belt** – the Assessment Matrix fails to consider impact upon the Green Belt in any form. The Council’s Green Belt evidence base has significant shortcomings and impact upon the Green Belt has not be given proper due consideration or weight.

Given the above, it is considered that insufficient evidence exists to support the identification of the South Godstone Garden Community as the most appropriate broad location.

Furthermore, even if additional evidence was prepared in respect of land around South Godstone, TW does not consider that it would be capable either in land ownership or environmental terms of accommodating the requirements of Policy SGC01 in full, as support by the conclusions of the TDF.

However, to assist the Council (and in the context of significantly boosting the supply of new homes in a constrained District) TW consider that a robust and sound approach would be to expand the area of search such that it forms a true broad location (as anticipated by paragraph 47 of the Framework), covering both South Godstone and Blindley Heath. Doing so would involve identifying significantly more land than is required to deliver the policy objectives, but importantly would present an opportunity for the Council to consider a range of options for allocating growth
as part of the Garden Community, including greater scope to minimise impacts across a range of considerations.

19. At outlined in our response to question 6.1, this approach is not dissimilar to that adopted by Wokingham Borough Council in its Core Strategy in respect of a series of Strategic Development Locations, in particular to the south of the M4 motorway where a significantly larger area of search was identified than was required to deliver the policy requirements, covering a number of villages. The policy included, for example, requirements to maintain separate between existing settlements which could be required in respect of South Godstone and Blindley Heath. The policy was also supported by more detailed requirements as an appendix to the plan (see Appendix 1) to inform a future SPD / DPD.

20. Importantly, we consider that this modification can be achieved without significant delay to the adoption of the TLP.

6.3 Is the proposed broad location in a suitable location for housing development?

21. As detailed within our Regulation 19 representations to Policy TLP01 and Policy SCG01, as well as our Matter 3 and Matter 4 Statements, it is clear that a Garden Community or Garden Communities in the southern / central part of the District would have far and wide reaching benefits for almost half of the entire District, enhancing the vitality of rural communities and provide supporting services to local villages. These benefits could not be achieved through a wholly dispersed approach to housing, or a Garden Community in another part of the District, for example Redhill Aerodrome which is located on the periphery of the District with stronger functional relationships to adjacent towns outside of the District.

22. Accordingly, TW support the identification of a new Garden Community or Garden Communities within the Plan and agree that it should be located in the central / southern part of the District. However, for the reasons set out in response to question 6.2, we do not consider that the identification of South Godstone in isolation as the Garden Community is sound and consider that Blindley Heath should be included in the broad location in order to provide a more robust, deliverable, and environmentally sustainable long term development option for the District.

6.4 How was the proposed broad location defined and is the defined extent justified?

23. Page 245 of the TLP offers a very specific and limited broad location, effectively following developer promotions. It is noted that at paragraph 33.22 of the TLP that this does not represent a formal boundary for allocation but it is demonstrable that this boundary is very detailed, largely following ownership boundaries from a multitude of landowners / promoters. TW does not consider that this represents the type of broad location envisaged at paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

24. Furthermore, the Council’s evidence identifies that within this already small area of search, certain parts are more preferable. For example, the Council’s SA identifies the area south of the railway line to be the most sustainable location with the far northern area more sensitive in landscape terms.
The Housing Topic Paper (HNS2) also states that “land to the north is open and exposed, and forms the setting to the community, as such it is considered sensitive.”

25. Given the above, it would appear that the Council only consider approximately half of what is already a limited broad location is likely to be appropriate for development (to the south of South Godstone). Through this demonstrable failure to identify a true broad location for long term growth, the Council will have little scope to minimise impacts through absence of alternative locations for specific development parcels. This approach is likely to result in greater impacts than might arise through a consideration of a larger broad location such as ‘the central / southern part of the District’.

26. Accordingly, TW do not consider the extent of the broad location to be justified and to resolve this issue of soundness, the broad location should be extended to include Blindley Heath.

6.5 How has the identification of the proposed broad location taken into account the significance of designated and non-designated historic heritage assets. Where is the evidence that the Council has identified and assessed the particular significance of heritage assets within or outwith the defined area of search where their significance may be harmed through development within their settings?

27. The Council’s evidence base to support the TLP exhibits a distinct lack of any heritage based analysis. Indeed, in the context of the Garden Community, this appears to be confined to a single brief description of heritage assets within the Garden Community Matrix at Appendix 1 of HNS2. This is despite the broad location including a Scheduled Monument (an asset of the highest significance having regard to paragraph 132 of the NPPF), as well as Grade II and II* listed buildings and Park Pale – an historic deer park. Importantly, the Scheduled Monument and Grade II* listed building are located directly to the south of South Godstone (strangely an area the Council consider to be most appropriate for development).

28. This approach is contrary to paragraph 169 of the NPPF, which requires local planning authorities to have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment and “use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment.” Furthermore, it fails to demonstrate how future regard has been given to the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, in terms of paying “special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

29. As set out within our Matter 1 Statement, this scenario is very similar to proposals for an area of search for a new settlement which was proposed in the emerging Hart Local Plan. This was subsequently found unsound by the Local Plan Inspector, in part due to a lack of heritage evidence, and the Inspector ultimately recommended that the broad location should be deleted.

30. TW has commissioned its own Heritage Assessment of the Garden Community (see Appendix 2 of our Regulation 19 representations to Policy TLP01). This concludes that even with a significant
buffer, development would have a significant effect such that “any sense of a historic park associated with the medieval moated site would be urbanised and all but obliterated” (paragraph 153). It then concludes that the Garden Community would “cause considerable harm to the setting of this designated heritage asset of the highest significance” (para 164).

31. The NPPF is clear at paragraph 132 that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated assets and that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. It then sets out that substantial harm to assets of the highest significance (such as scheduled monuments and grade II* listed buildings) should be “wholly exceptional”.

32. The potential harm that would arise to a scheduled monument and grade II* listed building as a result of the Garden Community is, alone, a significant factor which should significantly weigh against this option and a factor that has been fundamentally overlooked by the Council. The importance of this matter is further elevated by the Council’s evidence base suggesting that land south of South Godstone is most appropriate for development in the context of the broad location, increasing the likelihood of negative impacts upon this asset of the highest significance.

33. Whilst TW consider that this could in itself result in the option being discounted entirely, we do consider that there is potential to substantially mitigate potential impacts to an acceptable level through a significantly increased broad location that includes Blindley Heath.

6.6 Is there evidence that land within the proposed broad location would not be available for development?

34. Yes, please refer to the TDF statements in response to this question and our Regulation 19 representations to Policy SGC01.

35. In summary, some 40ha of land to the south of South Godstone has been subject to a plot land scam. As a result, there are 348 individual landowners across this area alone, many located across the world. Whilst the Council consider compulsory purchase to be a ‘last resort’ in the context of Blindley Heath (see Appendix 1 of HNS2), it appears to be a viable option for this Council in the context of South Godstone, without any negative criticism - a clear inconsistency in approach.

36. Furthermore, the Council fundamentally underestimate the complexity of this issue and the timescale compulsory purchase could take with so many landowners. This is a substantial risk to the deliverability of a new community at South Godstone, indeed the TDF consider that the Garden Community could, at best, deliver 600 dwellings within the plan period (a shortfall of 800 dwellings against the Council’s trajectory). This reinforces TW’s assertion that the broad location needs to be significantly increased such that land that is available earlier in the plan period can come forward initially, with land requiring CPO to come forward, if required, beyond the plan period. This would ensure the plan is effective.
6.7 Is there sufficient evidence in regard to possible infrastructure requirements to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect that homes could be built at the proposed Garden Community in the Plan period as set out in the Plan’s trajectory? Points to consider include:

- Any necessary improvements to Junction 6 of the M25;
- Any necessary improvements to the A22;
- Any necessary improvements to South Godstone Railway Station;
- Whether the infrastructure requirements have been sufficiently considered and costed so as to inform the high-level viability of the proposal?
- Whether there are any infrastructure requirements which would mean that the site could not be viably developed at the point envisaged?

37. TW’s consider that sufficient evidence exists to demonstrate that homes could viably be delivered through a Garden Community in the central / southern part of the District during the plan period, albeit not through the current broad location.

38. TW submitted a comprehensive array of evidence in support of its Garden Community proposal at Blindley Heath, most recently in response to the Council’s Garden Villages Consultation in October 2017 and a request by the Council to provide further information in January 2018. Appendix 3 of our Regulation 19 representations to Policy TLP01 include the latter, which in particular addresses infrastructure requirements (which in general terms equally apply to South Godstone).

39. TW’s own Infrastructure Delivery Plan (“IDP”) relating to the above identifies a realistic, achievable and viable infrastructure package that its development proposals could sustain. We note that overall costs outlined in the Council’s IDP (INF1) for the Garden Community do not significantly differ.

40. However, having regard to the substantial constraints within the current broad location and the significant land ownership issues, there is no confidence that sufficient housing could come forward in a timely manner to support the necessary improvements in the plan period. Increasing the broad location to include, inter alia, 122ha of land controlled by a national housebuilder, would help address this.

6.8 When would the proposed Garden Community realistically deliver the first homes? What is the realistic rate of delivery which should be assumed?

41. Based upon the current broad location, we agree with the TDF that first completions are unlikely to occur until 2029/30 and in broad terms agree with the delivery rates advocated.
42. However, TW consider that first completions could be significantly earlier if the broad location is expanded to include Blindley Heath and in particular land controlled by TW. Given that this land is significant in scale (122ha), is available now for development and controlled by national housing builder (none of which applies land within the current broad location), first completions could occur in 2025/26, initially at 50-75 dwellings, but rapidly increasing to 200 dwellings per annum. This would significantly boost housing delivery relative to the TDF’s assessment and offer a reasonable prospect of delivering 1,400 dwellings from the Garden Community within the plan period.

6.10 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

43. We do not comment upon the specific modifications proposed by the Council in MD16 but do consider that modifications are required for soundness, as outlined in response to the above questions.
4.83 Without proper consideration of long term planning of the area around the Garrison, there is a risk that unsustainable travel patterns will arise once the MoD vacate the site in 2012. To address this and take account of the opportunities for redeveloping an existing site, the Council has identified the Garrison as an SDL. The authority will negotiate with the landowners a phased programme for the delivery of service and facility improvements, especially education, together with enhanced accessible public transport associated with development.

4.84 The Council’s Employment Land Study (July 2006) indicates that there is scope to increase floorspace within the existing boundaries of the Hogwood Farm Industrial Estate by around 30,800m². If this is impractical to provide on site, other land within the SDL may need to be identified to accommodate this uplift in employment. At present Arborfield Garrison is a major employment location and it will be necessary to consider any impacts of its closure in the context of the employment situation in the borough as a whole (see policy CP15). Work undertaken by Children’s Services indicates that a long term development of 3,500 dwellings will require at least 2 two form entry primary schools. A secondary school of 1,500 places will be necessary at an early stage in the development. It is important to ensure that improved public transport services are provided to link Arborfield Garrison to Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell as well as adequate highway capacity. The delivery of the site may need to await adequate capacity in the sewage network as highlighted in the SFRA. Further guidance is set out in the concept plan (in appendix 7), which will be amplified in the Development Brief SPD (incorporating a masterplan). The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects the Core Strategy’s Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.68) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5). The Study of Gaps and Green Wedges found that it is essential to maintain them and this reflects the Community Strategy and Audit Report.

**CP19 – South of the M4 Strategic Development Location**
Within the areas identified South of the M4 motorway, a sustainable, well designed mixed use development will be delivered by 2026 including:
1) Phased delivery of around 2,500 dwellings including affordable homes in accordance with policy CP5;
2) Appropriate employment;
3) Appropriate retail facilities;
4) Social and physical infrastructure (including provision for up to 2 new primary schools and the likely expansion of existing primary provision together with existing children’s centre and youth facilities);
5) Measures to maintain separation of these settlements from each other and from Green Park Business Park (Reading), settlements within the administrative Borough of Reading, Shinfield (North of M4) and Swallowfield;
6) Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England’s latest standards. This will include sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (subject to monitoring of the quality and quantity standards).;
7) Improvements to highway capacity along the A327 (on routes to Reading and the M3, including Shinfield eastern relief road) and the A33 (route to Reading);
8) measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes along the A327 and A33 corridors and routes to the stations at Green Park and Winnersh Triangle; and
9) Provision of a Park and Ride in line with CP10.

The development will be guided by a Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document produced with the involvement of stakeholders including all interested landowners in the area covered by the Strategic Development Location as defined on the Proposals Map.

A co-ordinated approach to the development of the Strategic Development Location will be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the expanded community.

4.85 The Council recognises that development at these settlements will have the opportunity to access Reading through improved public transport along the A33 and A327 corridors. It is necessary to ensure that the distinct identity and separation of these settlements is retained to ensure compliance with the Community Strategy and Audit Report. As part of development in this SDL, it is important that space for adequate services should be found within the area for development together with appropriate safeguarding for high quality public transport services to link the area with facilities and services in Reading. The Council will work with the infrastructure and service providers and Reading Borough to ensure the integration of improvements with those along the A33 and A327 corridors.

4.86 Enhanced facilities and services should ideally be concentrated around either existing local centres in Shinfield and Spencers Wood or at a district centre to serve all the communities in the parish. The Borough Retail Study (August 2007) (paragraph 5.2) indicates that the 2,000m² of additional convenience expenditure likely to be required for Earley could alternatively be provided as part of the new centre for this SDL. As part of development at this location, additional primary education facilities will be required. The additional primary education requirements will include:
   a) Expansion of some of the existing primary education facilities; and
   b) Two further two form entry primary schools, with the potential to expand to three form entry.

Appendix 7 includes the concept plan for the SDL, which will be amplified in a Development Brief SPD (incorporating a masterplan).

4.87 As paragraph 2.78 recognises, there is an unimplemented permission for around 19,000m² of employment floorspace in Shinfield. The Employment Land Study indicates that there is potential to increase the floorspace at Wellington Industrial Estate, Spencers Wood by almost 1,900m². The implementation of this unimplemented permission or the Science Park under policy CP17 would meet the employment needs for this SDL. The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects the Core Strategy’s Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.68) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5). The Study of Gaps and Green Wedges found that it is essential to maintain them and this reflects the Community Strategy and Audit Report.
South of the M4 (Junction 11)

A7.14 Core Strategy Policy CP19 identifies the area around Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross for a sustainable mixed use development to provide around 2,500 dwellings alongside a range of supporting employment and retail uses, open space and social infrastructure.

A7.15 Furthermore, it requires that the separation between settlements be maintained, a park and ride and other transport improvements be provided for and that any impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area are mitigated against.

A7.16 The allocation of 2,500 dwellings includes existing WDLP allocations.

Concept Rationale

A7.17 The area to the south of the M4 is characterised by existing small settlements set within a rural context, which has thus far been retained through the former allocation of green gaps. This sets it apart from the area to the north of the M4, which is perceived as being more closely aligned to Greater Reading. The character of the area is considered worthy of retention as it forms part of the identity of the Borough. New development must therefore seek to balance the demand for new housing with the prevailing settlement configuration and setting. To achieve this:

a) New growth should be focused around the existing settlements of Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross. In pursuing a strategy based on village expansion, additional support for existing services can be provided, whilst simultaneously retaining the separation between distinctive settlements.

b) Development in a series of locations around the periphery of the three villages is required. This approach should consider the relationship between the current built areas and the open countryside. Opportunities to form new edges to the existing villages exist, allowing a managed transition between urban and rural.

c) Shinfield could be extended to the west, east and north west and should include new and enhanced local services and facilities, including a primary school.

d) A new connection should be provided to the east of Shinfield to accommodate demand for travel on the A327 resulting from the SDLs at South of M4 and Arborfield Garrison. This should include a crossing of the M4, and should include measures for bus priority.

e) Spencers Wood could be extended to the north-east and to the east with a new primary school provided in the latter location.

f) Three Mile Cross could be extended to the west and east.

g) To accommodate this development, a review of the local highway network will be required, leading to a package of measures to promote and achieve non-car travel, in order to help reduce congestion within and around the villages and beyond.

Concept Statement

A7.18 This concept statement provides further details in support of Core Strategy policy CP19 and should be used to guide future master plans and development proposals for the Shinfield / Spencers Wood / Three Mile Cross.

A7.19 Strategic objectives for the site
a) To accommodate new housing (up to 2500 units) through the expansion of the three existing settlements, and to provide local services including two new primary schools, and public open space;
b) To ensure the maintenance of meaningful open countryside between Shinfield and Spencers Wood, and the former gap between Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross, in order to retain a sense of separation between settlements;
c) To provide high quality, convenient public transport connections within the area and to Arborfield Garrison, Bracknell, Reading, Twyford, Winnersh and Wokingham.

A7.20 Landscape Structure
a) The existing floodplain should be retained as part of an open space network.
b) Open countryside between villages should have minimal intervention to ensure its existing character is retained. However, improvements to rights of way and public footpaths may be carried out to improve pedestrian access.
c) Existing woodland areas and hedgerows should be retained, enhanced and where possible extended.
d) The landscape strategy for the development should incorporate proposals to help manage the transition between the new development and the open countryside.
e) A network of green spaces should be created including:
   i) Formal playing fields and children’s play facilities to Wokingham Borough Council’s Standards
   ii) Informal parks and recreational areas
   iii) Community gardens, orchards, allotments and cemetery

Sustainability
A7.21 A strategy to deliver sustainable development, demonstrating current best practice, must be provided and implemented in accordance with the Council’s SPD on sustainable development. It must address at least the following:
a) the Code for Sustainable Homes 
b) BREEAM standards for non-residential buildings 
c) energy efficiency 
d) energy generation 
e) water efficiency 
f) bio-diversity and habitat protection 
g) waste reduction and management 
h) flood risk 
i) infrastructure provision to support sustainable travel

Infrastructure Requirements
A7.22 Access and Movement
a) A park and ride facility will be required in the vicinity of Junction 11 of the M4. This will provide direct and efficient public transport links to Reading, with future capacity for the proposed Reading Mass Rapid Transit scheme. A landscape strategy should be integral to the proposals to help reduce the visual impact of this facility.
b) Provision for public transport interchange should be made within the district centre to cater for direct services to Arborfield Garrison, Bracknell, Twyford, Reading, Winnersh and Wokingham. This should include secure cycle parking, high quality real time passenger information portals and covered, heated and secure passenger waiting facilities.
c) A strategy for prioritising public transport services and facilities within and beyond the SDL is required, including improvements to the A327 and A33.

d) A strategy for prioritising walking and cycling within and between settlements should be provided. Improvements to transport capacity along the A327 and A33 could include a variety of measures such as an eastern relief road to Shinfield together with a new link between these highways through the SDL. Any measures will need to be modelled to ensure it is an effective solution and should be capable of delivery at an appropriate time in the delivery of the development.

A7.23 Physical
a) Improvements should be made to the Sewage Network Capacity.
b) Any development scheme should accommodate sufficient SANG in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England’s adopted standards. SANG can be delivered in phases provided each one meets the requirements of c below.
c) The provision of SANGS within any proposed development scheme for Shinfield / Spencers Wood / Three Mile Cross will need to reflect Natural England’s quality standards regarding size, access, character, availability and function.

A7.24 Community and social
a) At least 35% of homes must be affordable in accordance with Policy CP5.
b) Improved neighbourhood and local centres facilities should include a range of community uses including expansion of existing primary health care, children’s and youth facilities, two new primary schools and other community buildings.

Housing Land, Mix and Density
A7.25 Approximately 77 hectares of land should be allocated for residential use within the master plan. Average development density will be between 30 - 35 dwellings per hectare (calculated in accordance with PPS3 annex B). Variation on site could occur through the concentration of above average densities near to local facilities and bus routes.

A7.26 A predominance of houses with private gardens should prevail throughout the development. In addition consideration should be given to life time homes, elderly person housing and live-work units.

Key Design Principles
A7.27 A master plan for the SDL should demonstrate adherence to current best practice in urban design, to include:
a) A layout which respects the existing settlement form, includes a high degree of connectivity between old and new areas of housing, and provides a legible hierarchy of streets which distinguishes through routes from quieter residential streets.
b) A positive response to the topography of the site and existing tree planting, which should be incorporated into the layout.
c) New primary schools at Shinfield and Spencers Wood, at a location accessible by public transport.
d) A new local centre at a location at Shinfield which is easily accessible on foot to new and existing homes. This could accommodate a store of around 2,500m² primarily selling convenience goods.
e) Development which is inclusive and accessible for all in accordance with Policy CP2.
f) Good access to public transport, and provision for a high level of amenity, information and safety for passengers.
g) Architectural design that is high quality and distinctive. New buildings should reflect the character of existing high quality architecture in the Borough as well as current best practice. Regard must be given to the Borough's Residential Design Guide.
h) A well designed approach to the urban edge, which relates development at the periphery to its rural setting and affords good access to the countryside.
i) Public art which is integrated within the design of the development.
j) Careful attention to the composition of the street frontage and street corners to ensure a continuous building line and help define the street. Long featureless blank frontages should be avoided.
k) All vehicle parking is integral to the plan, to ensure limited impact on visual amenity and residential amenity. Larger surface level car parks should make provision for generous planting to aid visual containment.
l) A phasing strategy which prioritises the provision of non-vehicle links, landscape planting and education within the early years of the scheme.

Planning Obligations

A7.28 In accordance with Circular 5/05, and Council SPD relating to Infrastructure Delivery for the SDL, developers will be expected to enter into a legal agreement to ensure the provision of necessary infrastructure and facilitates detailed in this Statement in order to make the development acceptable. These will include:

a) Transport
   i) Measures to maintain the operation of the network in times of flooding
   ii) Contribute towards Park and Ride in the vicinity of M4 junction 11
   iii) Measures to improve accessibility by non car transport modes along the A327 and A33 corridors
   iv) High quality express bus services between Green Park and Twyford stations via the Park and Rides in the vicinity of M4 junction 11 and Loddon Bridge and Winnersh Triangle railway stations
   v) Improvements to the quality and frequency of public transport services along any part of the network
   vi) Improvements to increase the use of bicycles including cycle paths
   vii) Enhancements to footpath and cycle networks to improve access to services and facilities

b) Education
   i) Up to 2 new primary schools (each of up to three form entry)
   ii) Expansion of existing primary provision (Shinfield Infant and Junior) from two form entry to three form entry
   iii) Contributions towards new Secondary School to serve the development

c) Affordable housing
   i) 35% affordable housing (common to all schemes in line with CP5)

d) Community facilities
   i) Expansion of existing local centres in Shinfield and Spencers Wood or at a district centre
   ii) Appropriate retail facilities
   iii) Expansion of children’s centre and youth facilities
   iv) Leisure/recreational facilities
   v) Expanded GP surgery
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Add Comments?
vi) Faith facilities
vii) Other communities buildings e.g. community centres
viii) Appropriate requirements of the emergency services
ix) Appropriate requirements for utilities

e) Thames Basin Heaths Mitigation
   i) Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

f) Water/drainage/sewerage
   i) Any necessary flood mitigation measures