

West Berkshire Local Plan Review (LPR) 2022-2039

Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (MM) - November 2024

This schedule contains all of the Proposed Main Modifications to the submitted [West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022 – 2039 \(LPR\)](#) which have been proposed in order to make the Plan sound. This version supersedes all earlier versions of Proposed Main Modifications schedules published on the examination website.

The Main Modifications below are expressed in the conventional form of ~~strike through~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text.

Please note that the page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the [Proposed Submission LPR dated 20 January 2023](#), as submitted.

A number of the Main Modifications require further corresponding changes to be made to the Policies Map. These changes are set out in a separate document.

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
Chapter 4 Development Strategy: Our Place Based Approach				
MM1	14	Paragraph 4.11	<i>Insert additional text to the end of paragraph 4.11 as follows:</i> <u>‘Future growth for Newbury and Thatcham has been set in the context of a long-term Vision developed for both towns, ensuring growth is sustainable in the longer term.’</u>	To reflect requirements of national policy. See Council response to PQ33 .
MM2	15	Paragraph 4.17	<i>Insert key diagram after paragraph 4.17 as set out in Annex A below</i>	To ensure compliance with national policy. See

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
				Council response to PQ17 .
MM3	16 - 17	Policy SP1	<p><i>Amendments to the following settlement boundaries as referenced in fourth paragraph:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chieveley – to ensure consistency with the Settlement Boundary Review Criteria (as shown in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map (PMC1)) • Newbury – to reflect amendment to allocated site boundary of Sandleford Park (as shown in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map (PMC2)) • Pangbourne - to reflect new site allocation at Land north of Pangbourne Hill (as shown in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map (PMC3)) • Thatcham – to reflect modifications to policy SP17, the inclusion of Colthrop Industrial Estate and the new site allocations at Henwick Park and Land east of Regency Park Hotel (as shown in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map (PMC4)) • Tilehurst – to reflect new site allocation at Pincents Lane and the inclusion of the Pincents Lane Retail Park. (as shown in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map (PMC5)) <p><i>Amend sixth paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p><i>'In making optimum use of land and achieving high quality design Ddensity on individual sites will vary according to their location and context, size of developable area and site specific issues such as shape and access:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Newbury, Thatcham, Tilehurst, Purley on Thames, and Calcot, 	<p>In response to the Inspector's Action Points: AP10 contained within IN14 AP27 contained within IN18 AP76 and AP77 contained within IN30 AP23 contained within IN18 AP47 contained within IN26</p> <p>In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP30) contained within IN26</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>developments are expected to secure a net density of at least 35 dwellings per hectare with densities of at least 70 dwellings per hectare in town centres and for flatted developments along main transport routes and close to transport nodes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within other defined settlements developments are expected to secure a net density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare with higher densities achievable in the centres of Hungerford, Pangbourne and Theale. • Developments on the edge of defined settlements are generally expected to secure a net density of 30 dwellings <u>per hectare outside of the AONB, and 20 dwellings per hectare within the AONB.</u> • However, lower density developments will be appropriate in certain areas of the District that are particularly sensitive to the impact of intensification and redevelopment. This may be because of the prevailing character of the area, the sensitive nature of the surrounding countryside or built form, and/or the relative remoteness from public transport.' <p><i>Amend the policy under 'Eastern Area' sub-heading as follows:</i></p> <p>'Eastern Area</p> <p><u>The Eastern Urban Area will continue to be a focus for housing development through existing commitments, allocated sites and regeneration and change in the existing built up area.</u></p> <p>The individual identities of the separate settlements within this area will be</p>	<p>In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP6) contained within IN14</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>maintained and the high quality landscape and environmental assets in this part of West Berkshire will be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Theale will be a focus for additional housing through existing commitments and <u>allocated sites</u> new allocations.</p> <p>The area will continue to be important for business development with the retention of DEAs.'</p>	
MM4	19	Policy SP2	<p><i>Amend the policy by adding a new second paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'Development in the setting of the AONB will be required to have regard to the interrelationship with the AONB and its landscape character and special qualities. Proposals will be required to be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise any adverse impacts on the AONB.'</u></p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP7) contained within IN14
MM5	19 - 20	Supporting text to policy SP2	<p><i>Amend the supporting text after paragraph 4.24 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'The setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape (AONB) and the protected landscape of the AONB itself add value to each other as the landscape and landforms link visually and functionally. The policy recognises this important interrelationship and seeks to ensure that development in its setting does not cause significant harm to the AONB by being poorly located or designed. This is especially the case where long views from or to the AONB are identified as important, or where the landscape character of land within and adjoining the AONB is complementary.'</u></p> <p><i>Insert two new paragraphs after paragraph 4.28 as follows:</i></p>	<p>In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP7) contained within IN14.</p> <p>To clarify position regarding the exceptional circumstances test for major development allocations within the AONB. See Council response to PQ30 and PQ31</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><u>‘As part of the development of the LPR the Council has demonstrated the exceptional circumstances which justify allocating the sites identified in the LPR within the AONB. Therefore, proposals that meet the requirements of the relevant site allocation policy, along with other relevant policies, will be deemed to be in accordance with the development plan and consistent with national policy.’</u></p> <p><u>The exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the allocation of any sites for major development within NDPs will be expected to be demonstrated through individual neighbourhood plans. Proposals that meet the requirements of the relevant site allocation policy in the neighbourhood plan, along with other relevant policies in the development plan, will be deemed to be in accordance with the development plan and consistent with national policy.’</u></p>	
MM6	21 - 22	Policy SP3	<p><i>Amend the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>‘Urban Areas: b) Strategic and non-strategic sites allocated for housing and economic development through other policies in the LPR <u>and/or</u> neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Rural Service Centres: f) Non-strategic sites allocated for housing and economic development through other policies in the LPR <u>and/or</u> neighbourhood plans</p> <p>Service Villages: i) Non-strategic sites allocated for housing and economic development through other policies in the LPR <u>and/or</u> neighbourhood plans’.</p> <p><i>Insert new paragraph at the end of the policy as follows:</i></p>	For clarity. The term ‘or’ could be interpreted as having development delivered through sites in the LPR <u>or</u> neighbourhood planning, rather than either or both. See WS3/1 Council response to Q3.4.

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<u>'Neighbourhood plans can allocate non-strategic sites for development. These must be located either within and/or adjoining the settlement boundaries of Urban Areas, Rural Service Centres and Service Villages. Strategic site allocations cannot be made within neighbourhood plans.'</u>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP8) contained within IN14
MM7	22	Supporting text to policy SP3	<i>Amend the supporting text by adding a new paragraph after paragraph 4.34 as follows:</i> <u>'Any non-strategic residential allocations within neighbourhood plans that are situated within defined settlement boundaries will not count towards meeting the housing requirement figure in policy SP12. This is because there is a presumption in favour of development within defined settlement boundaries and to do so would be inconsistent with the assumptions made in the LPR about the District's overall housing land supply.'</u>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP8) contained within IN14
MM8	23	Policy SP4	<i>Amend policy SP4 as follows:</i> 'Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) Aldermaston and Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) Burghfield <u>Within the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) land use planning consultation zones surrounding AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield development will be managed in the interests of public safety, and to ensure that any proposed developments do not adversely affect the defence related operation or capability of the AWE sites. pose an external</u>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP12) contained within IN14

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>hazard to the AWE sites, any new development of a type more particularly described in the table below¹ located in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ)² of AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield is likely to be refused planning permission by the Council, especially when the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and/or Ministry of Defence (MoD) have advised against that development and/or object.</p> <p><u>Development proposals within the land use planning consultation zones that pose an unacceptable risk to the operation of the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP) and/or adversely affect the defence related operation or capability of the AWE sites will be refused planning permission.</u></p> <p><u>In determining applications, the ONR and AWE/MOD will be consulted on development proposals applications for new development in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ)³, Outer Consultation Zone (OCZ)⁴ and any other 12km consultation zone as detailed on ONR website which meets the ONR consultation criteria as detailed on the ONR website⁵ described in the table below (as may be amended by the ONR from time to time).</u></p> <p><u>Development within the DEPZ is likely to be refused planning permission where the ONR, as regulator of the nuclear licensed sites, advise against the proposed development.</u></p>	

¹ This table reflects the ONR's consultation criteria as at 2022 – please note that these may change over time and the Policy SP4 reflects the Council's intention to follow the latest ONR guidance from time to time.

² Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) as defined by REPPiR and as detailed on the Council's website.

³ Current and future Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) as defined by REPPiR and as detailed on the Council's website. The extent of the DEPZs (at January 2023) shown in Appendix 3 and the Policies Map could change before the Local Plan is updated or superseded. Policy SP4 will be applied to the latest version of the DEPZ.

⁴ Outer Consultation Zone (OCZ) and 12km zones as defined on by ONR website along with relevant distances and centre points. The OCZ and 12km zones are depicted in Appendix 3 and on the Policies Map.

⁵ <https://www.onr.org.uk/our-work/what-we-regulate/other-regulationslegislations/land-use-planning/>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification																				
			<p>For development proposals in the DEPZ and OCZ for each of AWE's, consideration will be given as to how the proposed development would impact on the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan and supporting documents.</p> <p>Development within the Land Use Planning Consultation Zones: Office for Nuclear Regulation</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">AWE Aldermaston (AWE A)</th><th>AWE Burghfield (AWE B)</th></tr><tr><th>Zone</th><th colspan="2">Development Type</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">DEPZ</td><td colspan="2">Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could lead to an increase in residential or non-residential populations thus impacting on the off-site emergency plan.</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to the site.</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">OCZ</td><td colspan="2">Any new residential development of 200 dwellings or greater.</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Any re-use or re-classification of an existing development that will lead to a material increase in the size of an existing development (greater than 500 persons).</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Any new non-residential development that could introduce vulnerable groups to the OCZ.</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Any new development re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to</td></tr></table>	AWE Aldermaston (AWE A)		AWE Burghfield (AWE B)	Zone	Development Type		DEPZ	Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could lead to an increase in residential or non-residential populations thus impacting on the off-site emergency plan.		Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to the site.		OCZ	Any new residential development of 200 dwellings or greater.		Any re-use or re-classification of an existing development that will lead to a material increase in the size of an existing development (greater than 500 persons).		Any new non-residential development that could introduce vulnerable groups to the OCZ.		Any new development re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to		
AWE Aldermaston (AWE A)		AWE Burghfield (AWE B)																						
Zone	Development Type																							
DEPZ	Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could lead to an increase in residential or non-residential populations thus impacting on the off-site emergency plan.																							
	Any new development, re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to the site.																							
OCZ	Any new residential development of 200 dwellings or greater.																							
	Any re-use or re-classification of an existing development that will lead to a material increase in the size of an existing development (greater than 500 persons).																							
	Any new non-residential development that could introduce vulnerable groups to the OCZ.																							
	Any new development re-use or re-classification of an existing development that could pose an external hazard to																							

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification		Reason for modification
				the site.	
			12km zone	A circular zone of 12km radius around all nuclear sites, for certain types of significant development due to the potential for such developments to pose an external hazard to sites.	
			<p>ONR's website provides non-exhaustive examples of the types of developments that could pose an external hazard to a nuclear licensed site and the examples of the type of developments ONR would expect to be consulted on.</p> <p>The maps set out in Appendix 3 provide the mapping information, as at March 2020 in relation to the DEPZs, OCZs (5km) and the 12km consultation zones for each AWE site as per the ONR consultation criteria.⁶</p>		

⁶ It should be noted that the ONR 12km land use planning area should not be confused with the REPPiR Outer Planning Zones (OPZ) for the AWE sites. OPZs are for emergency planning use only. In 2022 they were AWE Aldermaston 15km and AWE Burghfield 12km.

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
MM9	23-25	Supporting text to policy SP4	<p><i>Amend supporting text to policy SP4 as follows:</i></p> <p>4.36 There are two nuclear licensed sites located in West Berkshire, the Atomic Weapons Establishment in Aldermaston (AWE A) and in Burghfield (AWE B). These are operated by AWE plc on behalf of the Ministry of Defence and regulated by the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) (as well as other regulators).</p> <p>4.37 Both AWE sites are core<u>critical</u> to sustaining the UK government's nuclear deterrent and support national defence and security.</p> <p>4.38 There are hazards associated with the authorised use of these sites including conventional chemicals, explosives and radiation sources. As a result of the quantities and types of material involved, the sites are also regulated under the following key legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019 (REPPIR)⁷. Both sites fall within the scope of REPPIR legislation. The regulator for these sites is the ONR. b. Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 2015 (COMAH)⁸. Under these regulations AWE A is a Lower Tier COMAH site. The joint regulators for this site are the ONR and the Environment Agency (EA). AWE B does not fall under the COMAH regulations at 	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP12) contained within IN14

⁷ Radiation - Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019 (REPPIR)

⁸ COMAH Guidance

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>the present time (2022).</p> <p>c. Explosive Regulations 2014⁹. Both AWE A and AWE B sites have explosives on site and AWE plc holds an explosives licence for both sites. The regulator is the ONR.</p> <p>d. Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (EPR). Both sites generate and dispose of radioactive wastes. The regulator is the EA.</p> <p>4.39 The NPPF outlines that states at paragraph 45: "Local planning authorities should consult the appropriate bodies when considering applications for the siting of, or changes to, major hazard sites, installations or pipelines, or for development around them."</p> <p>4.40 Furthermore, the NPPF at paragraph 95 states: <u>requires planning policy to</u></p> <p>"Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements. <u>It requires that operational defence sites are not affected adversely by the impact of other development proposed in the area, and that existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. by:</u></p> <p>i. anticipating and addressing possible malicious threats and natural hazards, especially in locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate. Policies for relevant areas (such as town centre and regeneration frameworks), and the layout and design of developments, should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the</p>	

⁹ Explosives Regulations 2014 -L150

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>police and other agencies about the nature of potential threats and their implications. This includes appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience and ensure public safety and security; and</p> <p>ii. recognising and supporting development required for operational defence and security purposes, and ensuring that operational sites are not affected adversely by the impact of other development proposed in the area.”</p> <p>4.41 Paragraph 97(b) (ensuring that operational defence and security sites are not adversely affected by the impact of other development in the area) is complemented by paragraph 187 of the NPPF which provides, amongst other things, that “planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses...” and that existing businesses “should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established”.</p> <p>4.42 These national policies should be read alongside other relevant policies relating to economic development within the LPR.</p> <p>4.43 The NPPF defines major hazard sites, installations and pipelines as: 'Sites and infrastructure, including licensed explosive sites and nuclear installations, around which Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (and Office for Nuclear Regulation) consultation distances to mitigate the consequences to public safety of major accidents may apply.'</p> <p>4.44 The preface to the guidance accompanying REPPiR 2019 states: "The provisions in REPPiR have been developed with consideration of provisions in the Control of Major Hazards Regulations 2015 (COMAH) [10] and the Pipelines Safety Regulations 1996 [11] to maximise emergency</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>preparedness consistency between Regulations for major hazards sectors."</p> <p>4.45 Nuclear installations which are regulated by REPPIR present a potential major hazard as a result of the quantities of radioactive materials on the site.</p> <p>4.46 Under the REPPIR 19 legislation a <u>Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ)</u> must be determined by the local authority where the relevant nuclear site is situated. For the AWE sites this is West Berkshire District Council. <u>This process was undertaken in 2019 and reviewed in 2023. Under legislation formal reviews of the DEPZ are required to be undertaken at least every three years or as a result of a material change in work with ionizing radiation. As such, the extent of the DEPZs shown in Appendix 3 and on the Policies Map could change before the Local Plan is updated or superseded. Policy SP4 will be applied to the latest version of the DEPZ.</u></p> <p>4.47 The DEPZ determination process, including the data behind the information provided in the Consequence Report prepared and issued by AWE, in 2019, was subject to an unsuccessful Judicial Review brought against the Council.</p> <p>4.48 The DEPZ for the AWE sites is the geographic area that in respect of which the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan (<u>OSEP</u>) covers. <u>The AWE OSEP must set out protective actions which would be implemented without delay to mitigate the likely consequences of a radiation emergency, must have detailed plans in place</u> and the Council, along with the other agencies involved in the AWE <u>OSEP</u> Off-Site Emergency Plan, must be able to respond effectively. The regulators therefore require assurances that the <u>AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan OSEP</u>, owned by the Council, is adequate and can be implemented effectively in order to protect the public.</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>4.49 The OCZ and 12km land use planning consultation zones for the AWE sites are determined by the ONR and extends from a geographical centre point on each AWE sites. <u>During the plan period there may be changes to the REPPIR legislation and/or in the inputs to the ONR's process which may result in consequential changes to the land use planning consultation zones or consultation criteria, which in turn could result in changes to ONRs advice on particular proposals. These will be kept under review and policy SP4 will be applied to the latest version of the ONR Guidance/Zones.</u></p> <p>4.50 The DEPZs and OCZs for the AWE sites cross over into the following neighbouring councils: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Reading Borough Council, and Wokingham Borough Council (see further below).</p> <p>4.51 In respect of both AWE sites, the ONR and AWE/MOD is <u>will be</u> consulted on any <u>planning applications for new development</u> within the DEPZ, the OCZ and the 12km zone (and any other consultation zone determined by the ONR from time to time) which meet the consultation criteria as set out within the policy on the ONR website¹⁰. These d <u>Developments within these zones may have an adverse impact on pose an unacceptable risk to the viability and operability of the AWE OSEP Off-Site Emergency Plan and/or pose an external hazard to, adversely affect the defence related operation or capability of the nuclear licensed sites, and advice will be provided to the Local Planning Authority accordingly.</u></p> <p>4.52 The ONR provides advice to the local planning authorities on planning applications for developments around the AWE nuclear licensed sites. This advice seeks to limit the radiological public health consequences to</p>	

¹⁰ <https://www.onr.org.uk/our-work/what-we-regulate/other-regulationslegislations/land-use-planning/>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>members of the public in the event of a radiation emergency and to ensure that the developments do not pose an external hazard to the sites.</p> <p>4.53 Given the potential cumulative effects of any population increase surrounding the AWE sites, it will be necessary to monitor committed and future approved but not built development in partnership with neighbouring councils. The councils will monitor planning completions and commitments as part of the Annual Monitoring Report and send this information directly to the Emergency Planning Services in each council and the ONR for them to make informed judgements when assessing future development proposals.</p> <p>4.54 The ONR's decision making process is detailed on its website.¹¹ The ONR will normally advise against a particular development should they not receive adequate assurance from the owner of the Off-Site Emergency Plan that the development can be accommodated within <u>the AWE OSEP that Plan</u>. As a result, the ONR will consider feedback provided by West Berkshire District Council Emergency Planning Service, as the <u>Plan AWE OSEP</u> owner under REPPIR. This feedback is often based on wider consultation with the <u>AWE Off-Site Planning Group</u> (a group of responding local, regional and national agencies). Should it be considered by the responding agencies that there would be an unacceptable risk to the <u>AWE OSEP, Off-Site Emergency Plan (the Plan)</u> would be adversely affected with no viable and sustainable mitigation options available, such that the <u>OSEP Plan</u> would not be able to accommodate the development and therefore protect public health, then <u>as the policy makes clear that planning permission will be refused</u>, normally West Berkshire District Council Emergency Planning Service would submit advice against the development to the local planning authority and inform the ONR. Consideration will be</p>	

¹¹ <https://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>given taking into account the Guidance currently under development.</p> <p><u>Applicants considering development proposals within the land use planning consultation zones are strongly encouraged to enter into discussions with the Council at an early stage to establish if there are likely to be any implications on the OSEP as a result of the proposals.</u></p> <p><u>The land use planning consultation zones for the AWE sites cross over into the following neighbouring councils: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Reading Borough Council, and Wokingham Borough Council. The Council will monitor committed and future development proposals in partnership with neighbouring councils, those agencies with duties under REPPiR, and the ONR to understand the impact on the OSEP and the operation of AWE.</u></p> <p>4.55 The ONR will provide advice for developments that potentially pose an external hazard to the AWE sites.</p> <p>4.56 Policy SP4 reflects the Council's intention to normally follow the ONR's advice in the ONR's consultation zones.</p> <p>4.57 During the plan period there may be changes in the inputs to the ONR's process which may result in consequential changes to the consultation zones or criteria. These will be kept under review.</p> <p>4.58 During the plan period there may also be changes to the DEPZ as a result of the requirement under REPPiR legislation to undertake formal reviews of the DEPZ at least on a 3 yearly basis or because of a material change in work with ionizing radiation. This may result in the DEPZ for either AWE site remaining the same, extending or reducing in size and</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			geography over time. These will be kept under review.'	
Chapter 5 Our Environment and Surroundings				
MM10	28-30	Policy SP6	<p><i>Amend second sentence of first paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>'...Within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (and also on sites of 1 hectare or more in size, and in other circumstances as set out in the NPPF)._.....</p> <p><i>Amend third sentence of first paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>'Development within areas of flood risk from any source of flooding, including areas with a history of fluvial, groundwater or surface water flooding, <u>or from areas suffering sewer flooding from overwhelmed sewers....'</u></p> <p><i>Amend sixth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>'In applying the Sequential Test, where development has to be located in flood risk areas, it should be demonstrated that <u>If the sequential test shows that it is not possible for an alternative site to be used and therefore development has to be located in a flood risk area, it should be demonstrated that:</u></p> <p><i>Criterion d):</i> 'The development will be safe <u>for its lifetime</u> and not increase flood risk elsewhere.' ...</p> <p><i>Amend eighth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>'Where an Exception Test is required, in accordance with national policy</p>	<p>For clarity and effectiveness. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EXAM24).</p> <p>In addition, to ensure consistency with national policy. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water.</p> <p>Some proposed modifications have also been in response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP72) contained with IN27.</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
MM12	34	Supporting text to policy SP7	<p><i>Amend paragraph 5.30 h) as follows:</i></p> <p>'h. Homes and buildings – New development should be designed to be functional, healthy and sustainable, and all residential development should comply with the nationally described space standards, as set out in the Technical Housing Standards (2015) or as superseded, in line with Policy DM30. New development ...'</p>	To reflect the removal of policy DM30.
MM13	37-38	Policy SP9	<p><i>Amend first paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>Positive action will be taken to ensure that opportunities for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment are maximised. <u>For example, this will include, but not be limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>producing conservation area appraisals and management plans;</u> • <u>maintaining a local list of non- designated heritage assets; and</u> • <u>maintaining a list of local heritage assets which are at risk, but which do not meet the criteria for inclusion on the national Heritage at Risk Register.</u> <p>The historic character, sense of place, environmental quality and local distinctiveness of West Berkshire will also be sustained and enhanced through new development, <u>including promoting heritage-led regeneration where appropriate and delivering public benefits from the District's archaeological resources.</u> Development.....</p> <p><i>Amend second paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>Development that has an impact upon a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, will be expected to maximise opportunities</p>	In recognition of the role CAAs play in the Council's strategic approach to the historic environment and to ensure consistency with national policy. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England . See Council response to PQ49 .

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>to preserve, enhance, or better reveal the asset's significance, <u>including the contribution to that significance made by and/or its setting</u>, and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness through high standards of design in accordance with Policy SP7.</p> <p><i>Amend third paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Weight will be given to the conservation of the District's heritage assets in a manner according to their importance. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. All proposals affecting</u></p> <p><i>Amend fourth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>Weight will be given to the conservation of the District's heritage assets in a manner according to their importance. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Proposals will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal: whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset.</p> <p><i>Amend fifth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>Development which would lead to substantial harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, <u>including the contribution to that significance made by</u> or its setting will not be permitted, unless – ...</p> <p>j. No viable use of the asset can be found in the medium term through</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and k. Conservation by grant funding or some other form of <u>not for profit</u>, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible, and</p> <p><i>Amend sixth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>Development which would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, <u>including the contribution to that significance made by or its setting will not be permitted, unless this harm is outweighed by be weighed against</u> the public benefits of the proposal, including, <u>where appropriate</u>, securing its optimum viable use.</p> <p><i>Delete eighth paragraph as follows:</i></p> <p>Development proposals for enabling development which would otherwise conflict with other policies in the Local Plan but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset will be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the proposals will not materially harm the heritage value of the asset or its setting; ii. it can be demonstrated that alternative solutions have failed; iii. the proposed development is the minimum necessary to protect the significance of the heritage asset; iv. it meets the tests and criteria set out in Historic England guidance GPA4: Enabling Development and Heritage Assets; v. it is subject to a legal agreement to secure the restoration of the asset prior to completion of the enabling development; and vi. it enables public appreciation of the saved heritage asset.' 	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
MM14	38 - 41	Supporting text to policy SP9	<p><i>Amend paragraph 5.45 as follows:</i></p> <p>5.45 'The policy gives great weight to conserving the significance of heritage assets and their settings in a manner according to their importance. Heritage assets include any valued component of the historic environment, be it a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape, identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified as by the Council, 'non-designated' heritage assets.</p> <p><i>Amend first sentence of paragraph 5.54 as follows:</i></p> <p>5.54 Development proposals likely to affect the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, <u>including the contribution to that significance made by</u> or its setting, are required to demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, the significance of the asset and any potential impacts on that significance through the preparation of a proportionate heritage statement.</p> <p><i>Delete paragraph 5.57 as follows:</i></p> <p>5.57 The long term conservation of a small minority of heritage assets can sometimes present particular problems. Enabling development is a planning mechanism which, in extreme cases, permits a departure from planning policies in order to enable the conservation of a relevant heritage asset in cases where the future of that asset would not otherwise be secured. Where planning applications propose enabling development, the Council will use the detailed and rigorous tests set out by Historic England in order to determine whether planning permission would be appropriate.</p>	In recognition of the role CAAs play in the Council's strategic approach to the historic environment and to ensure consistency with national policy. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England . See Council response to PQ49 .

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><i>Move paragraph 10.81 from the supporting text of policy DM9 to add to the supporting text of policy SP9 instead as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'The Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the District's 53 Conservation Areas. As part of this duty and as part of its strategy to maximise opportunities for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment the Council is undertaking a phased programme of Conservation Area Appraisals (CAAs), in partnership with the West Berkshire Heritage Forum. As well as helping to define what is special about a particular Conservation Area, the project will provide local communities with an understanding of how and why Conservation Area status is appraised, designated, and applied in future development and conservation management decisions. This will help communities better engage with the management of change in their area, allowing them to more effectively champion the significance and values of local heritage. The project has involved the setting up of a Conservation Area Working Group, which has developed a 'Toolkit', which contains a variety of guidance, list of resources, and an appraisal report template, to assist parish councils and volunteers in undertaking a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.'</u></p>	
MM15	42	Policy SP10	<p><i>Amend criterion o as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'Provide undeveloped buffer zones strips of vegetation along the banks of water courses in accordance with policy SP6.'</u></p>	For consistency and effectiveness. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EXAM24)

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
MM16	45 - 46	Policy SP11	<p><i>Amend the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>‘Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they conserve and enhance biodiversity and/or geodiversity including their long-term future management and <u>where required</u>, deliver a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gains....</p> <p><i>Amend criterion d as follows:</i></p> <p>‘d. Provides or retains <u>appropriate at least 10m</u> buffer zones between development proposals and designated sites.....’</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain All proposals should demonstrate a minimum biodiversity net gain of 10% via a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan using the most up to date biodiversity accounting metric developed by Natural England and provide details of the long term maintenance and management of the net gain. This should be delivered on site in the first instance, or through biodiversity off setting where appropriate. Major developments in particular must include measures to deliver biodiversity gains through opportunities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> u. Restore and enhance existing features on site; v. Create additional habitats and ecological networks on site which help support the District’s wider ecological network; and w. The linking of existing habitats within West Berkshire to create links between ecological networks and where possible, with adjoining features. 	<p>To comply with national policy. Whilst the LPR can highlight the statutory framework for BNG it should not duplicate the provisions of the statutory framework. (PPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 74-005-2023).</p> <p>Also in response to the Inspector’s Action Point (AP31) contained within IN26</p> <p>For effectiveness. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EXAM24)</p>
MM17	49	Supporting text to policy SP11	<p><i>Amend paragraph 5.86 of supporting text as follows:</i></p> <p>5.86 ‘Paragraph 174 of the NPPF highlights the need to provide net gains for biodiversity by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. The Council will deliver Biodiversity</p>	<p>To comply with national policy. Whilst the LPR can highlight the statutory framework for BNG it should not duplicate the</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><u>Net Gain in line with the latest national guidance and the Environment Act 2021. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) can be defined as “Development that leaves the environment in a measurably better state than beforehand” (DEFRA, 2018). In England, BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). BNG is part of the mitigation hierarchy and applicants for planning permission will be required to demonstrate that they have made all reasonable efforts to avoid losses of significant habitats and to mitigate any significant effects on biodiversity before demonstrating how the legally required BNG will be delivered. BNG will be achieved through a combination of retaining important features of the site and by making on site and off-site biodiversity enhancements to ensure an overall measurable minimum 10% net biodiversity gain is achieved, which contributes to restoring and enhancing the wider ecological networks and biodiversity of the District. To achieve net gain, a development must have a higher biodiversity unit score after development than before development (<u>except where exemptions apply</u>). The most up to date Natural England statutory Biodiversity Metric should be used to allow the assessment of assess biodiversity impact losses of a planning proposal given development, and where necessary appropriate the size of contribution required to offset the ecological impact of biodiversity loss from that development and deliver the additional 10% minimum net gain. The Council will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain in line with the latest national guidance and the Environment Act 2021. Applicants will need to submit a Biodiversity Gain Plan (including the completed Metric calculator) to demonstrate how the required net gain is to be delivered and to enable the local planning authority to discharge the statutory condition. Development cannot commence until the Biodiversity Net Gain plan has been approved and the condition discharged.</u></p> <p><u>The Environment Act 2021 requires that any on-site or off-site biodiversity</u></p>	<p>provisions of the statutory framework. (PPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 74-005-2023).</p> <p>Also in response to the Inspector’s Action Point (AP31) contained within IN26</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><u>net gain must be secured for a minimum of 30 years. Applicants will therefore need to demonstrate how the proposed BNG will be delivered and managed over that period of time. The Council will require periodic monitoring to assess whether the required BNG is being delivered and will seek appropriate remedial measures where monitoring demonstrates that it is not satisfactorily delivering and maintaining the required target condition. To secure the delivery of significant on-site and off-site BNG over the 30 years period, a legal agreement between the applicants/landowners and the local planning authority will be required. Where applicants propose to use off-site credits to deliver the required net gain in whole or in part, they will need to demonstrate that these credits are from a site registered to provide such credits.'</u></p>	
Chapter 6 Delivering Housing				
MM18	51	Policy SP12	<p><i>Amend the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>‘Approach to Housing Delivery</p> <p>Provision will be made for <u>at least 9,270</u> 8,721 to 9,146 net additional homes in West Berkshire for the period 1 April 20232022 to 31 March 20412039; 513 to 538 <u>a minimum of 515</u> dwellings per annum. The target figure of 538 dwellings per annum does not constitute a ceiling or cap to development.</p> <p>New homes will be located in accordance with Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy, Policy SP3: Settlement hierarchy and Policy DM1: Development in the Countryside.</p> <p>There should be no net losses from the existing stock of homes in West</p>	<p>As set out in the Council's response to the Inspector's Supplementary Question 7.1 with subsequent amendment to the end of paragraph 6.20. Also subsequent amendments in response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP8) contained within IN14 and the Inspector's Action Point AP32 which is contained within IN26.</p>

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<u>assessment as a minimum and field evaluation if required to assess the historic environment of the site.'</u>	Statement of Common Ground with Historic England .
MM71	144	Policy ESA4	<p><i>Amend criterion i of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>'i The site lies within a Mineral and Waste Safeguarding Area and so consideration of Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be required; and'</p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP69) contained within IN27 - factual amendment
MM72	146	Policy ESA5	<p><i>Amend policy to include additional criterion as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'Development will be informed by a desk based assessment (as a minimum) detailing the likelihood and extent of land contamination, followed by, where necessary, an intrusive investigation and undertaking of appropriate remediation measures. Further monitoring may be required depending on the nature of contamination and remediation.'</u></p>	For effectiveness. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EXAM24)
Chapter 9 Development Management Policies: Our Place Based Approach				
MM73	150	Policy DM1	<p><i>Amend the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>'Exceptionally, new residential development outside of adopted settlement boundaries will be permitted. These exceptions are solely limited to development which is appropriately designed and located and which satisfies one or more of the following criteria:</p> <p>a. Sites allocated as part of the development plan; b. Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (RSA24, RSA25 and DM20);</p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP54) contained within IN27

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>c. Rural exception housing and/or First Homes exception sites (<u>DM16 and DM17</u>);</p> <p>d. The conversion of redundant or disused buildings (<u>DM24</u>);</p> <p>e. Housing to accommodate rural workers (<u>DM23</u>);</p> <p>f. The extension to or replacement of existing residential dwellings (<u>DM25 and DM28</u>);</p> <p>g. The subdivision of existing residential dwellings (<u>DM27</u>);</p> <p><u>h. Student or staff accommodation necessary to meet the reasonable needs and operational requirements of existing educational and institutional sites in the countryside (Policy DM38) or</u></p> <p><u>i. h. Limited residential infill in settlements in the countryside with no defined settlement boundary where:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It is within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more existing dwellings adjacent to, or fronting an existing highway; and ii. The scale of development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot commensurate with the scale and character of existing dwellings within an otherwise built up frontage; and iii. It does not extend the existing frontage at either end; and iv. The proposed plot size and spacing between dwellings is similar to adjacent properties and respects the rural character and street scene of the locality. <p>Planning permission will not be granted where a proposal harms or undermines the existing relationship of a settlement within the open countryside, where it does not contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the rural area, including the special qualities and natural beauty of the landscape of the AONB or where development would have an adverse cumulative impact on the environment or highway safety.</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>communities with an understanding of how and why Conservation Area status is appraised, designated, and applied in future development and conservation management decisions. This will help communities better engage with the management of change in their area, allowing them to more effectively champion the significance and values of local heritage. The project has involved the setting up of a Conservation Area Working Group, which has developed a 'Toolkit', which contains a variety of guidance, list of resources, and an appraisal report template, to assist parish councils and volunteers in undertaking a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.</p> <p>10.82 The NPPF clarifies that not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Therefore, where a building (or other element) does not make a positive contribution to the heritage significance of the area, the loss of that building or feature should be treated as less than substantial harm or no harm. In these cases the level of harm should be weighed against the wider benefits of the proposal including the potential to enhance or reveal further the heritage significance of the area.'</p>	
MM82	172	Policy DM10	<p><i>Amend second paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building and/or the <u>contributions made by</u> its setting and any curtilage listed features.</p> <p><i>Amend third paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Unless justified otherwise,</u> Ddevelopment will not be permitted if it would:</p> <p>.....</p>	To ensure consistency with national policy as set out in EXAM35 .

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><i>Amend fourth paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>In particular, development <u>should avoid</u> will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to any of the following:</p> <p>xi. The removal of historic boundary treatments; unless justified to the satisfaction of the Council, that the proposed changes, loss or irreversible damage, and/or addition of new features to the Listed Building and its setting are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than substantial in terms of impact/harm on the character and significance of the Listed Building and its setting; and • Is off-set by the public benefit from making the changes, including enabling optimal viable use, and not enhancement to the Listed Building and its setting. Clear justification for this harm should be set out in full in the Statement of Heritage Significance accompanying the proposals. 	
MM83	174	Policy DM11	<p><i>Amend criterion c of policy as follows:</i></p> <p>c. Have particular regard to all of the following characteristics, depending on the type of asset affected:</p>	To ensure consistency with national policy as set out in EXAM35 .
MM84	182	Policy DM15	<p><i>Amend third paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>'The loss or deterioration of protected trees, groups of trees, woodland or important hedgerows will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and in accordance with the relevant legislation, policy and good practice recommendations. Development affecting trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) must be justified and the impact of the proposal</p>	To comply with national policy and in response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP41) contained within IN26

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<u>will be assessed on the amenity of the area. Where these and other protected trees are subject to felling, a replacement of an appropriate number, and size in an appropriate location will be required.</u>	
MM85	183	Supporting text to policy DM15	<p><i>Amend paragraph 10.132 of supporting text as follows:</i></p> <p>‘10.132 Protected trees includes trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order <u>(whether that be an individual tree, a group of individual trees or a woodland)</u> or those located within a Conservation Area. They also include those hedgerows meeting the criteria of “important hedgerow” in the Hedgerow Regulations <u>1997 (as amended).</u>’</p>	To comply with national policy and in response to the Inspector’s Action Point (AP41) contained within IN26
Chapter 11 Development Management Policies: Delivering Housing				
MM86	189	Policy DM19	<p><i>Amend first paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>‘....b) The location is appropriate in terms of design, layout and accessibility of facilities, services and public transport, <u>subject to other policies in the Plan being satisfied.</u>’</p> <p><i>Insert additional paragraph at end of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>‘<u>Affordable housing contribution will be required in accordance with the requirements of Policy SP19: Affordable Housing depending upon whether the accommodation falls within Use Class C2 (Residential Institutions) or C3 (dwelling house) of the Use Classes Order.</u>’</p>	To ensure consistency with national guidance and to provide further clarification by cross referencing to Policy SP19. In response to the Inspector’s Action Point (AP55) contained within IN27
MM87	189	Supporting text to policy DM19	<p><i>Amend paragraph 11.17 as follows:</i></p> <p>‘11.17 For the purposes of this policy, specialist housing will meet an</p>	To ensure consistency with national guidance and to provide further clarification

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>identified local need where it is regulated for both care and accommodation purposes. Development which provides unregulated on-site care and support, such as sheltered housing, will be considered in the same way as conventional housing. In terms of the latter, these typically comprise owner-occupied retirement living products. Pre-application advice should be sought if clarification is needed to whether a development is likely to constitute a specialist care housing provision. <u>Housing for older people covers a wide range of needs, from sheltered housing (where residents live mainly independent lives whilst sharing some communal facilities) through to extra care housing and care homes, where a level of personal health care is typically provided. Proposals for specialist housing will be considered on their own merits having regard to whether the proposal falls within Class C2 or Class C3 of the of the Use Classes Order. This will depend upon factors such as the level of personal care offered; the type of accommodation and level of communal space and facilities. Pre-application advice should be sought if clarification is needed as to whether a development is likely to constitute a specialist care housing provision.</u></p>	by cross referencing to Policy SP19. In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP55) contained within IN27
MM88	192-193	Supporting text to policy DM20	<p><i>Amend the supporting text as follows:</i></p> <p>'11.27 Need Gypsy and Traveller sites</p> <p>11.278 <u>Table 7</u> The following table sets out the need for <u>Gypsy and Traveller pitches up to 31 March 2038, correlating to the study period for the GTAA and for Travelling Showperson plots. For clarity, the cultural and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) need figures are two different representations of need. The PPTS need based on the PPTS definition of 'Gypsies and Travellers', and cultural need, which is defined as those Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who do not travel and identify themselves as part of the Traveller and Travelling Showpeople</u></p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Points (AP56, AP57 and AP59) contained within IN27

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification																																		
			<p>community.</p> <p>Table 7 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Identified Need 2021/22 to 2037/38 cultural need/PPTS need</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Cultural Need</td><td>Of which PPTS need</td></tr><tr><td>5 year Authorised Pitch Shortfall (2021/22 to 2025/26)</td><td>13</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Longer term need</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2026/27 to 2030/31</td><td>5</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>2031/32 to 2035/36</td><td>9</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>2036/37 to 2037/38</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Longer team need total to 2037/38</td><td>17</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>Net Shortfall 2021/22 to 2037/38</td><td>30</td><td>20</td></tr></table> <p>Table 8 Travelling Showperson plot requirements 2021/22 to 2037/38</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>2021/22 to 2025/26</td><td>2026/27 to 2037/38</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>Travelling Showperson plots</td><td>20</td><td>4</td><td>24</td></tr></table> <p><u>Table 7 Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation</u></p> <table><tr><td><u>Additional permanent pitches required 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2038</u></td><td><u>30</u></td></tr></table>		Cultural Need	Of which PPTS need	5 year Authorised Pitch Shortfall (2021/22 to 2025/26)	13	0	Longer term need			2026/27 to 2030/31	5	3	2031/32 to 2035/36	9	6	2036/37 to 2037/38	3	2	Longer team need total to 2037/38	17	11	Net Shortfall 2021/22 to 2037/38	30	20		2021/22 to 2025/26	2026/27 to 2037/38	Total	Travelling Showperson plots	20	4	24	<u>Additional permanent pitches required 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2038</u>	<u>30</u>	
	Cultural Need	Of which PPTS need																																				
5 year Authorised Pitch Shortfall (2021/22 to 2025/26)	13	0																																				
Longer term need																																						
2026/27 to 2030/31	5	3																																				
2031/32 to 2035/36	9	6																																				
2036/37 to 2037/38	3	2																																				
Longer team need total to 2037/38	17	11																																				
Net Shortfall 2021/22 to 2037/38	30	20																																				
	2021/22 to 2025/26	2026/27 to 2037/38	Total																																			
Travelling Showperson plots	20	4	24																																			
<u>Additional permanent pitches required 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2038</u>	<u>30</u>																																					

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification		Reason for modification														
			<table><tr><td><u>Additional permanent pitches planned for 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2023</u></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>• <u>New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston</u></td><td><u>8</u></td></tr><tr><td>• <u>Four Houses Corner, Padworth</u></td><td><u>1</u></td></tr><tr><td>• <u>Ermin Street, Lambourn Woodlands</u></td><td><u>1</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>Total pitches planned for 2021-2023</u></td><td><u>10</u></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td><u>Permanent pitches required 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2038</u></td><td><u>20</u></td></tr></table>	<u>Additional permanent pitches planned for 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2023</u>		• <u>New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston</u>	<u>8</u>	• <u>Four Houses Corner, Padworth</u>	<u>1</u>	• <u>Ermin Street, Lambourn Woodlands</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Total pitches planned for 2021-2023</u>	<u>10</u>			<u>Permanent pitches required 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2038</u>	<u>20</u>		
<u>Additional permanent pitches planned for 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2023</u>																			
• <u>New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston</u>	<u>8</u>																		
• <u>Four Houses Corner, Padworth</u>	<u>1</u>																		
• <u>Ermin Street, Lambourn Woodlands</u>	<u>1</u>																		
<u>Total pitches planned for 2021-2023</u>	<u>10</u>																		
<u>Permanent pitches required 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2038</u>	<u>20</u>																		
			<p><u>11.28 The GTAA 2021, in updating the 2019 study, identifies that there is a residual overall need for 30 permanent pitches between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2038, considering existing supply on established sites, and accounting for household formation and net in-migration. Taking into account the 10 pitches already planned this leaves a residual need of 20 pitches which are required between 1 April 2023 and 31 March 2038.</u></p> <p><u>11.29 Table 7 sets out the total need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Of the 30 pitches needed to 2038, 13 are required in the short term up to 31 March 2026. 10 pitches have been planned for in the period 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2023. The site at New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston has been allocated in RSA24 to replace 8 transit pitches with 8 permanent pitches. This takes forward the existing allocation in the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the recommendations of the GTAA to create permanent pitches. Planning permission (reference 22/00120/FUL) was granted in September 2022 for this use and is yet to be implemented. Since the GTAA was updated Four Houses Corner, a Council operated site in Padworth, had planning permission approved for 17 permanent pitches (reference 23/01552/REG3</u></p>																

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><u>approved in April 2024). This represents an increase of 1 pitch above the 16 pitches counted in the GTAA. The permission is yet to be implemented. Also since the GTAA was updated 1 pitch has been provided on land at Ermin Street, Lambourn Woodlands (reference 21/02045/FUL approved in August 2022).</u></p> <p><u>11.30 Table 7 outlines that 20 permanent pitches are required between 1 April 2023 and 31 March 2038. To meet this need the Council is preparing a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Development Plan Document. Site allocations will be made in the context of a further update to the GTAA which would follow the repopulation of Four Houses Corner, Padworth. In contributing to meeting the need planning applications will be assessed in accordance with the criteria set out in this policy.</u></p> <p><u>11.31 There is no requirement to identify a site for transit pitches. However, the GTAA 2021 recommends that tolerated stopping places or negotiated stopping places should be provided. The Council will explore this further through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation DPD and/or through developing a Council policy to govern this.</u></p> <p>11.29 The GTAA identifies a need for four transit pitches, which would accommodate eight caravans.</p> <p>11.30-11.32The GTAA does not identify a need for houseboat dwellers and thus the LPR does not provide for any permanent houseboats.</p> <p>Supply</p> <p>11.31 There is an existing private site at New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston. There are 24 permanent pitches, with 15 transit sites. Policy</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>RSA32 seeks to allocate 8 permanent pitches at Paices Hill, which uses the land used as transit sites. This results in the reduction of 8 transit pitches.</p> <p>11.32 There is an existing Council operated site at Four Houses Corner, Reading Road, Upton Nervet, which is due to be refurbished. When it reopens there will be 17 pitches. The updated GTAA is clear that when the site reopens a survey of households is required to determine the long term needs from children and young people living on the site.</p> <p>11.33 There are other authorised small private traveller sites in the District.</p> <p><u>Travelling Showperson sites</u></p> <p>11.34 <u>11.32</u> There is currently one Showperson's Yard in the District which is located at Long Copse Farm, Enborne. 24 plots are allocated for use by Travelling Showpeople, as defined in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, under policy RSA25. The eastern part of the site has an authorised use for Circus headquarters and agricultural holding as a dual use. The allocation would enable a residential and operational base for staff and families associated with the Circus.</p> <p>The 2019 GTAA concludes that there is no additional need for Travelling Showpersons yards and any need that does arise can be addressed on the Long Copse yard.</p> <p>11.35 To address the longer term need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and for transit sites/short term stopping places a Development Plan Document will be prepared. The Local Development Scheme outlines the timetable, with evidence being prepared between February 2023 and December 2025, leading up to adoption by September 2027.'</p>	

Ref	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Main Modification	Reason for modification
MM106	238	Policy DM45	<p><i>Amend last paragraph of the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>'Where developments are required to develop travel planning measures, it is expected that necessary targets will be set to restrict single occupancy vehicle journeys and to increase sustainable travel, and undertake regular monitoring and reporting in line with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.'</p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP46b) contained within IN26 .
MM107	238	Supporting text to policy DM45	<p><i>Amend supporting text to include a new paragraph after 12.112 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>'Commonly Travel Plans should be monitored for a period of five years, which should allow for travel patterns to become established. However, for large multi-occupancy developments which may be built over an extended period, the monitoring period may cover a period encompassing the construction and final occupation of the development and include a period of up to five years beyond final occupation. In these incidences, the monitoring period will be agreed between the Council and the developer.'</u></p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP46b) contained within IN26 .
Appendices				
MM108	251-253	Appendix 3	<p><i>Amend text in Appendix 3 as follows:</i></p> <p>3.1 The maps set out below provide the mapping information, as at March 2020 <u>January 2023</u>, in relation to the DEPZs, OCZs (5km) and the 12km planning consultation zones for each AWE site as per the ONR consultation criteria.</p> <p><u>3.2 The extent of the DEPZs shown in Appendix 3 and the Policies Map could change before the Plan is updated or superseded and policy SP4 will be applied to the latest version of the DEPZ.</u></p>	In response to the Inspector's Action Point (AP12) contained within IN14

Ref:	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Additional (minor) Modification	Reason for modification
			<p><i>Add new definitions to Appendix 9: Glossary as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – a nationally important landscape protected by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) to conserve and enhance its natural beauty. On 22 November 2023 AONBs across England and Wales became known as National Landscapes, but the formal designation, and the legal protections, remain the same. In West Berkshire, the North Wessex Downs National Landscape is designated as an AONB.</u></p> <p><u>Energy Hierarchy – generally accepted best practice across the building design sector. This seeks to 1) reduce energy demand (be lean) 2) supply energy efficiently (be clean) and 3) supply renewable energy (be green)</u></p> <p><u>National Landscape (NL) - see Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u></p>	
AMA9.2		Appendix 9	<p><i>Amend the definition of Gypsies and Travellers in accordance with the ‘Planning Policy for Traveller sites’ published in December 2023 as follows:</i></p> <p>Annex 1 of the government’s ‘Planning Policy for Traveller sites’ (PPTS, August 2015 <u>December 2023</u>) defines, Gypsies and Travellers for the purposes of planning policy as:</p> <p>Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily <u>or permanently</u>, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.”</p> <p>In determining whether persons are “gypsies and travellers” for the</p>	To reflect the amendment to the definition of Gypsies and Travellers to accord with the ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, and for consistency with the definitions in the NPPF Annex 2. See Council response to PQ45

Ref:	Page of submitted LPR	Policy/ Paragraph of submitted LPR	Proposed Additional (minor) Modification	Reason for modification
			<p>purposes of this planning policy, consideration should be given to the following <u>issues amongst other relevant matters</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whether they previously led a nomadic life b) The reasons for ceasing their nomadic life c) Whether there is an intention of living a nomadic habit of life in the future, and if so, how soon and in what circumstances. <p>Travelling Showpeople are defined in the PPTS for the purposes of planning policy as:</p> <p>“Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family’s or dependants’ more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily <u>or permanently</u>, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.</p>	
Policies Map				
PMC19	168	Policy DM8	<i>Amendment to remove the two revoked AQMAs in Newbury and Thatcham</i>	Factual update