



## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 4-7 and 11-14 February 2020

Accompanied site visits made on 4, 13 February 2020

Unaccompanied site visit made on 14 February 2020

**by Christina Downes BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 9 April 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/19/3238048**

**Land north of Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Berkshire**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 181685, dated 11 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is the erection of up to 118 dwellings and associated parking landscaping and open space (outline) and change of use of part of the land to form a suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG), incorporating an outdoor education area (full)
- 

### DECISION

1. For the reasons given below, the appeal is dismissed.

### PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2. The appeal concerns a hybrid application. The residential development relates to the southern part of the site and was made in outline form with access to be considered at this stage. A further plan was submitted with the appeal to show the internal road layout in accordance with the provisions of the *Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015*. The SANG relates to the northern section of the site and this part of the application was made in full.
3. At appeal stage the Appellant requested that the red line boundary be changed to omit the gypsy site on the southern part of the site and also a small area of land adjacent to the southern boundary. Minor revisions were also requested to the northern boundary of the SANG. As a consequence, the maximum number of dwellings would be 117. In addition, an uplift of affordable housing from 40% to 50% was proposed, along with the incorporation of 5% Self-Build and Custom-Build serviced plots into the scheme. The Council had no objections to these changes, and I am satisfied that they would not be prejudicial to any third-party interests. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
4. During the inquiry the Appellant submitted a "proving layout". This sought to introduce a layout that provided a better relationship of houses to protected trees, especially on the south-western part of the site. The layout of houses

on this drawing is illustrative of how the site could be developed. Amended SANG Landscape Proposals and Indicative Masterplan drawings have been submitted that include the proving layout and the various boundary changes referred to in the preceding paragraph. For the avoidance of doubt, they are drawing numbers P16-1187\_20 Rev F and P16-1187\_01 Rev N respectively and I shall take them into account.

5. The proposal is supported by a Planning Obligation by Agreement (S106 Agreement) and a Planning Obligation by Unilateral Undertaking (UU). Due to the large number of signatories it was not possible to complete the Deeds before the close of the inquiry. I therefore allowed a short amount of extra time accordingly. However, due to the illness of one of the freehold owners, 3 of the land parcels could not be included. Both Deeds therefore include a covenant that development will not be commenced until a Confirmatory Deed with these owners has been entered into. I understand that the Council has no objection to this arrangement, and I am satisfied that it would ensure that the covenants would be enforceable.
6. During the inquiry the Appellant also put forward various measures to improve accessibility. These included the widening of the footway between the California Crossroads and Park Lane; the provision of shelters at the two nearest bus stops; and a new pedestrian crossing to Nine Mile Ride. The provisions are included in the UU and were discussed at the inquiry. The Council objected to them and the Appellant did not consider them necessary to make the scheme acceptable. The provisions are considered further below.
7. The application was refused for 10 reasons. 5 of these were not pursued by the Council at the inquiry. These concerned ecology and biodiversity; the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; archaeology; and the absence of a legal agreement relating to local employment skills and affordable housing.
8. Following the close of the inquiry I asked the main parties whether they wished to comment on any implications that the Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic may have in terms of their evidence on housing delivery. I have taken the responses into account accordingly. The Appellant also submitted a further recent appeal decision by the Secretary of State, which was also copied to the Council, relating to residential development at Long Melford Suffolk. I have had regard to its contents, but I am satisfied that it does not necessitate further comment by either party.

## **REASONS**

### **Planning policy context**

9. The development plan includes the *Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Development Plan Document* (the CS), adopted in 2010 and the *Managing Development Delivery Local Plan* (the MDD LP) adopted in 2014. Whilst the 2009 South East Plan has been revoked, policy NMR6 relating to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area was saved and is also relevant to this proposal. The Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan, but this is at a very early stage and has not yet been submitted for examination. It therefore has little weight at the present time.

10. There is no dispute that the appeal site is not within or adjacent to any designated settlement, including Finchampstead North. For policy purposes it is within the countryside.
11. At the inquiry there was a great deal of debate as to whether the most important policies for determining the application are out-of-date. Paragraph 11d) of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) is precise in its language. Its reference to "application" rather than "appeal" means that it is those policies relating to the consideration of the whole scheme rather than those matters in dispute at the appeal that should be included. However, "most important" policies do not mean "all relevant" policies and it is a matter of judgement for the decision-maker to decide what these may be. Case law has determined that it is the basket of most important policies as a whole that is the relevant consideration.

*The most important policies*

12. There was no agreement between the main parties as to what constituted the most important policies in this case. Most of the policies in the reasons for refusal fall within this category although I consider that policy CP4 in the CS relating to infrastructure requirements and policy TB25 in the MDD LP relating to archaeology are relevant but not most important.
13. There is no dispute that the following policies should be considered most important:
  - CS: policies CP1, CP3, CP6, CP9, CP11
  - MDD LP: policies CC01, CC03, TB21, TB 23
  - South-East Plan: policy NRM6
14. There is dispute about the following policies:
  - CS: policies CP2, CP4, CP5, CP7, CP8, CP17, CP18
  - MDD LP: policies CC02, CC10, TB05, TB08, TB12, TB25
15. Although the following policies are relevant, I do not consider that they fall within the category of most important for the following reasons:
  - Policy CP2 has a number of social objectives that would be applicable to the development. However, the gypsy site is now outwith the application boundary.
  - Policy CP4 relates to infrastructure requirements, which would be addressed through the legal Deeds.
  - Policy CP18 is specific to the Arborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location (SDL), albeit that its future development would impact on the proposal particularly in respect of accessibility.
  - Policy CC10 relates to sustainable drainage, which could be addressed through a planning condition.
  - Policy TB12 requires an employment and skills plan. Although it was a reason for refusal it would be addressed through the S106 Agreement.

- Policy TB25 relates to archaeology but the appeal site is not in an area shown to be of high potential and the reason for refusal could be addressed through a planning condition.
16. Policy CP17 relates to housing delivery and sets out the CS housing requirement and how it will be addressed through the supply of sites from various sources. This is clearly relevant to a consideration of any housing proposal. However, I agree with the Inspector in a recent appeal decision relating to a residential scheme in Hurst<sup>1</sup> that it is not a development management policy that plays a significant role in determining planning applications. It is therefore not a most important policy in this case.
17. The most important policies to this application proposal are thus as follows:
- CS: policies CP1, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP7, CP8, CP9 and CP11
  - MDD LP: policies CC01, CC02, CC03, TB05, TB08, TB21, TB23
  - South East Plan: policy NRM6

*Whether the most important policies are out-of-date*

18. Whether development plan policies are considered out-of-date in terms of paragraph 11d) of the Framework will depend on their degree of consistency with its policies. There is no dispute that policies CP1, CP8, CC03, TB21, TB23, and NRM6 do not fall within this category. Policy TB08 is questioned by the Appellant but I am not satisfied that there is evidence that the open space standards on which it is based are other than relevant.
19. In the CS, policy CP3 has 10 general development control criteria against which proposals should be assessed. The provision setting out open space requirements is not based on a current assessment in accordance with paragraph 96 of the Framework. On the other hand, this is rectified by the more recent MDD LP policy TB08. The provision requiring no detrimental impact on important ecological and heritage features does not follow the wording or approach in paragraphs 175 and 194 of the Framework. However, this is a general policy and all but 2 provisions are agreed to be consistent with the Framework. I consider that it is important to take a sensible and proportionate approach and I conclude that policy CP3 is not out-of-date.
20. Policy CP5 includes a provision that residential proposals of at least 5 dwellings will provide 50% affordable housing where viable. Whilst this part of the policy does not apply to the appeal proposal due its size, it is not in accordance with paragraph 63 of the Framework and therefore is out-of-date.
21. Policy CP6 is a permissive criteria-based policy. It indicates that permission will be granted if road safety is enhanced, adverse effects on the network are mitigated and highway problems are not caused. It does not say that permission will necessarily be refused if these provisions are not met. I appreciate that the wording is different from paragraph 109 of the Framework but the way that it is worded does not make it inconsistent.
22. Policy CP7 relates to biodiversity and seems to me to generally follow the

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal decision relating to the erection of 5 dwellings at Lodge Road, Hurst, dated 31 January 2020 (APP/X0360/W/18/3194044).

principles in paragraph 175 of the Framework relating to development management. Reference is also made to enhancement, but this is dealt with in accordance with paragraph 174 by policy TB23, which is also agreed by the main parties to be a most important policy and not out-of-date.

23. In the MDD LP, policy CC01 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Unsurprisingly it does not set out the wording changes introduced in the 2019 version of the Framework, perhaps most importantly referring to the consideration of relevant rather than most important policies. It is not therefore consistent with paragraph 11 of the Framework.
24. Policy TB05 relates to housing mix. It refers to the *Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document* within this context and not in relation to the trigger for affordable housing provision, which is dealt with in CS policy CP5 and referred to above. Policy TB05 is therefore not out-of-date.
25. For the reasons given above I do not consider that policy CP17 in the CS is a most important policy, but I do consider it to have relevance to the consideration of whether policies CP9 and CP11 in the CS and policy CC02 in the MDD LP are out-of-date. The housing requirement in policy CP17 was based on the now revoked South-East Plan and is clearly no longer fit for purpose. In any event, the Framework makes clear that as the strategic policies in the CS were adopted more than 5 years ago and have not been updated, local housing need should be calculated using the standard method set out in national planning guidance. There is no dispute that when applying the relevant 5% buffer the requirement is 844.4 dwellings per annum (dpa). This is significantly more than the 723 dpa in policy CP17.
26. The scale and location of housing and the associated development limits were established to accommodate this lower housing requirement. However, as the Hurst Inspector observed, policy CP17 does not cap housing numbers and includes flexibility to bring land forward in identifying future land supply. Housing land supply is considered later in the decision, but the evidence is clear that this depends on some sites that are outside the development limits. The delivery of a sufficient supply of homes is a fundamental objective of the Framework but cannot be achieved through adherence to policies CP9, CP11 and CC02, which are all dependent on the development limits. These policies are therefore out-of-date. In this respect I disagree with the Hurst Inspector, but I note that there was no dispute about housing land supply in that case and therefore the evidence on which his conclusions were based was materially different.

### *Conclusions*

27. From the above, I have found that 5 of the 16 most important policies are out of date. However, a consideration of whether the basket itself is out-of-date and therefore whether the appeal scheme complies with the development plan as a whole is a matter to which I will return in my final conclusions.

### **The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance the area, the landscape and trees**

28. The appeal site comprises 17.6 hectares (ha) of land on the northern side of Nine Mile Ride, close to its junction with Park Lane. The residential element of

the proposal would occupy the southern part of the site, immediately adjacent to the existing built-up area. At this point there are detached residential properties along the main road frontage but also driveways leading to individual dwellings to the rear and more substantial private accesses serving small residential clusters at depth.

29. Policy CP11 in the CS seeks to restrict proposals outside development limits other than in limited circumstances. The nearest settlement to the appeal site is Finchampstead North and the appeal scheme does not fall within one of those provisions where development would be permitted under the terms of the policy. The policy purpose is to maintain the quality of the environment and protect the separate identity of settlements.

#### *Separation of settlements*

30. The appeal site is within the area between Finchampstead North and the Arborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location (SDL). On the Key Diagram to the CS there is a zigzag line and the key makes reference to policy CP19, which relates specifically to this SDL. It requires, amongst other things, measures to maintain separation from Finchampstead North. The wording clearly indicates that it is the development proposals for the SDL that must provide the appropriate measures. The map of development limits in the MDD shows the two developed areas but does not include any specific gap notation in between. Indeed, the Examining Inspector specifically addressed this matter and considered that additional policy protection over and above that in policy CP11 would be unsound.
31. Gaps are a spatial tool to prevent coalescence between built-up areas and have little to do with landscape character. None of the criteria in policy CP11 are specifically directed towards ensuring that the 2 settlements do not get closer together. To my mind it is a policy that is aimed towards countryside protection and, as the supporting text makes clear, seeks to protect the character and setting of settlements and direct development to them for reasons of accessibility. I do not therefore agree that any development within the space between the Arborfield Garrison SDL and Finchampstead North would be harmful to spatial separation as a matter of policy.
32. In any event, in this case the new houses would not extend further westwards than the Robinson Crusoe park homes or further north than existing development served by the western access. In such circumstances the appeal scheme would not have any adverse effect on the separate identity of the settlements.

#### *Effect on the landscape and trees*

33. The proposed housing area mainly comprises grassland and trees. It would be divided into two main sections that would be linked by a pathway for pedestrians and cyclists. The western part is about 1.5 ha in extent and the eastern part is about 3.7 ha. To the north of the latter is a large swathe of woodland with grassland on its eastern side and western edges, which is proposed to form the SANG. The north-eastern portion of this land comprises part of the Longmoor Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and this adjoins a similarly designated area in the southern part of California Country Park.

34. The *Wokingham District Landscape Character Assessment* (2004) (WDLCA) places the appeal site within the Forested and Settled Sands landscape type, which covers the south-eastern corner of the Borough. In particular it is part of the Finchampstead Forested and Settled Sands landscape character area (LCA). This was originally part of the Royal Forest and its long straight roads follow the line of the historic rides that provided access to the royal hunting grounds. There is a strong linear pattern of mainly post-war detached housing within a woodland setting along with more recent estate infill.
35. The appeal site is representative of many of the key characteristics of the LCA. In particular, the influence of the adjacent built-up area is evident especially in the southern section of the site. The proposed access points link into the long, straight green corridor of Nine Mile Ride and woodland covers large parts of the site itself. The enclosure provided by the dense stands of trees creates a sense of remoteness and isolation. The SSSI is former heathland although it has been invaded with undergrowth and bracken.
36. The WDLCA records that this landscape is of high quality and generally good condition. The overall strategy is to conserve and actively manage the woodland, important wildlife habitats and recreational use. The LCA is considered to have moderate sensitivity to change overall. However, there are some aspects of higher sensitivity, including the influence of the long, straight historic rides, the forest, the ecological habitats and the perceptual qualities.
37. The proposed development would result in a substantial loss of trees. In total more than 1,000 protected trees would be removed. This would amount to about 8% of the total tree cover if the Appellant's assessment is correct<sup>2</sup>. On the face of it this would seem to be a significant loss of one of the key characteristic features of this LCA. However, a numerical assessment is insufficient in itself for several reasons.
38. I observed at my site visits that the quality of some parts of the woodland on the northern part of the site was in poor condition. Some areas were overcrowded with young saplings competing for space. There were also many fallen, windblown or damaged trees. I noted a sense of neglect and this has arisen from a lack of proper management. This is private woodland and there is no reason why judicious stewardship should not take place independently of the development proposals. However, there is no evidence that such an eventuality is likely to happen. In the circumstances, the removal of trees in the interests improving the structure, condition and resilience of the woodland would have qualitative benefits to the LCA. I consider that the tree loss that is proposed for management purposes should not be seen to impact negatively in landscape terms.
39. The proposal would also include restoration of the SSSI, which it currently in unfavourable condition. The heathland habitat has been seriously diminished by the encroachment of undergrowth, in particular bracken, following a wildfire in 2011. The proposal is to clear the area of the invasive species in order for heather and other heathland habitats to re-establish. It emerged

---

<sup>2</sup> The Appellant's assessment was that the site contains about 12,000 trees. This did not include the stand of pine trees within the SSSI. It was agreed that the ecological evidence indicated these would be removed. However, the assessment that they amount to 350 trees was not agreed by the Appellant.

during the inquiry that a relatively dense stand of pine trees on the northern part of the SSSI would be felled in order to undertake this work. In terms of the landscape effects, the harm resulting from the removal of the trees has to be balanced against the ecological benefits to the SSSI. Heathland is a characteristic of the LCA along with the rich wildlife habitats, lakes and bogs. Restoration of these areas is part of the overall strategy in the WDLCA. For this reason, I do not consider that the loss of the pine trees would result in overall landscape harm.

40. However, a significant amount of tree loss would be necessary to enable the housebuilding and also to create the eastern access. The proving layout shows how 117 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. Whilst this is illustrative, it indicates that wherever possible housing would occupy the open grassland areas that immediately adjoin the existing built-up area. However, the Appellant's Tree Survey indicates that there would be significant tree clearance. Although there could be tweaks here and there, it is very clear that the residential development could not be accommodated unless a large number of trees were felled. Whilst it is appreciated that the 117 dwellings is expressed in the application as a maximum, there is no evidential basis for assuming a lower number would be built if planning permission were granted.
41. It is appreciated that the Appellant's objective has been to focus on removing the lower quality trees. However, it is relevant that they are all protected by a Tree Preservation Order and there is no evidence that the areas in question would need to be cleared for purposes of woodland management. Indeed, I saw no such indication at my site visit. Some of the trees are assessed in the Tree Survey to be of relatively low value. Nevertheless, they form part of the woodland edge that make an important contribution within the landscape between existing housing and the wider countryside.
42. Furthermore, a significant number of individual trees and tree groups within the area to be cleared are shown in the Tree Survey to be category B2, which BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* (BS 5837) indicates have moderate quality with a remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years and collective landscape value. Furthermore, there are also some individual trees classified as category A2, which BS 5837 indicates have higher quality with a life expectancy of over 40 years and landscape importance even though this may be as part of a group.
43. Whilst post-war development and modern estate housing is a characteristic element within the LCA this is typically of a linear nature along the rides. Modern infill between the rides is prevalent in Finchampstead North. However, in the vicinity of the appeal site development has been of an ad hoc nature with low density housing extending behind the frontage housing in an irregular and unplanned way. It seems to me that this creeping urbanisation is one of the key issues that the WDLCA is seeking to rectify.
44. I appreciate that the Appellant considers that this would be a unique development with pockets of housing within a treed setting. Whilst I do not doubt that it would be a high-quality scheme, in my opinion it would essentially be a suburban estate of considerably higher density than its surroundings. New tree planting is proposed along the streets, in amenity spaces and in gardens, but the size and species would be likely to be dictated

by their residential context and the limited availability of space. The built development would not, in my opinion, be reflective of the LCA of which it would form a part and the significant net loss of trees to accommodate it would lead to unacceptable landscape harm.

45. A sense of remoteness and solitude is evident, especially in the woodland on the northern parts of the site. Whilst this cannot be publicly experienced due to the private ownership of the land it nevertheless is reflective of one of the key characteristics of the LCA. Whilst this is said to be a landscape of good public accessibility its very provision through the proposed woodland walks and the like, would undoubtedly diminish the qualities of isolation that are attributable to this particular landscape.
46. BS 5837 indicates that care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention or attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees. None of the protected trees would be in private garden areas and the proving layout demonstrates that it should be possible to avoid undue pressure from future occupiers to seek permission to fell or severely prune remaining trees. There would be some overhang of tree canopies on the parking bays shown on the southern side of the access road on the western section of the site. However, methods could be employed to avoid significant root disturbance. Some gardens would be overhung with tree canopies, but I am satisfied that there would be no excessive overshadowing. The Council highlighted instances where development in close proximity to protected trees had made requests to fell unavoidable. In this case I consider that the scale of tree removal would avoid a situation that could not be reasonably controlled.

#### *Effect on the Green Route*

47. Nine Mile Ride follows the route of one of the historic linear rides through the Royal Forest. This section has a typically green character being lined with trees and understorey planting, garden boundary hedges and soft verges. Frontage housing, which at this point is mainly on the northern side of the road, is set back behind generous sized front gardens. The frontage is punctuated by private driveways or narrow roads that serve the houses to the rear. Nine Mile Ride is shown as a Green Route in the MDD LP. This is defined as a road lined with trees and vegetation that makes a significant contribution to the character and environment of an area. Amongst other things, policy CC03 in the MDD LP requires proposals affecting such routes to protect and retain existing trees, hedges and landscape features.
48. The eastern access would be a 6 metre (m) wide roadway with a 2 m footway on the eastern side, a bell mouth and grass verges. The existing unmade driveway would therefore be replaced by a substantial engineered feature, which would lead into the site through a straight corridor some 12 m wide. A significant number of individual trees would be lost, including an English Oak and a Beech close to the road frontage. These are category B2 in the Tree Survey and of good quality with landscape value. The other trees to be felled along the new line of the road include English Oak, Sweet Chestnut and Silver Birch. Although these are category C and less visible, they do make a contribution to the green infrastructure that characterises the Green Route. It is appreciated that there would be a group of Scots Pine, Rhododendron and English Oak behind the felled trees. However, these would be in the garden of

the adjoining property and would not compensate for the significant loss of greenery described above.

49. Even though the new roadway would be flanked by new grass verges, I consider that it would be an incongruous urban element that would be very different in character to most other modest private roads and driveways. Whilst the corridor is not devoid of engineered features, including the existing hard surfaced frontage to Oak Tree Nursery, these are not typical of this stretch of Nine Mile Ride. Reference was made to the larger entrances to California Country Park and Nine Mile Ride Industry. However, these are a long established recreational and commercial facility respectively and neither is within the linear residential frontage.
50. At the inquiry proposals were put forward to enhance accessibility and they are discussed in the following section. However, of particular relevance to the Green Route is the potential widening of the footway to 2 m along the 2 kilometre stretch on the northern side of Nine Mile Ride between California Crossroads and Park Lane. There are mature trees close to the back edge of the footway and it is clear that the proposal would retain a narrower width in places so as to protect tree roots. Nevertheless, the work would remove the soft verges that currently exist between the edge of the footway and individual property boundaries in many places. Whilst these vary in quality, they do provide a soft and in places green edge to the footway. The footway widening would therefore be harmful to the character of the Green Route.

#### *Visual effects*

51. Public views into the site are relatively limited due to its location to the rear of established development and the intervening tree cover. It is doubtful whether pedestrians or drivers would see the new houses from viewpoints along Nine Mile Ride. The exception would be along the eastern access where I consider it likely that those walking along the footway would be aware of the houses at the southern end of the site. However, such a view would be at a distance and localised and the adverse effect would be of minor significance.
52. The trees would be retained along the side boundary of the western section of the site. When in leaf they are likely to provide an effective screen from viewpoints in Park Lane. In the winter months there would be greater visibility and the upper parts and roofs of the new houses would be seen. However, this would be at a distance and within the context of the Robinson Crusoe park homes and the lake in the foreground. Pedestrians using the footway, including those walking to Bohunt School or the new District Centre would be sensitive to the changes but overall, I consider the adverse impact would be of minor significance.
53. There is a pedestrian walkway within the southern part of California Country Park from where there are views into the site. At present these are restricted by the dense stand of pine trees at the northern end of the SSSI but as referred to above these are proposed to be removed as part of the ecological restoration work. Viewers within this area would be highly sensitive to change and would be able to see the northern edges of the development parcel on the eastern side of the site. Whilst there would be some remaining intervening trees and the view would be at a distance of some 300 m, it was agreed that the adverse impact would be of moderate-major significance. The landscape

proposals would include new tree planting within the open area of the SANG to the north of the houses. After 15 years when this becomes established the adverse impact would be likely to reduce to moderate.

#### *Overall conclusion*

54. Drawing together the above points, the proposed housing development would not adversely affect the separation of Arborfield Garrison SDL and Finchampstead North. Whilst the visual impact would be limited, the views of new housing development from California Country Park would result in an unwelcome intrusion to those enjoying that recreational facility. Just because something would not be widely seen does not necessarily mean that it would be acceptable. For the reasons given above, there would be an adverse effect on the character of the area, the Green Route and the landscape.
55. A large amount of woodland on the overall site would remain and in terms of the LCA as a whole the loss of trees to accommodate the housing would be relatively small. However, the trees in question are protected and have value as part of the woodland edge and also individually and in groups. Whilst housing is a key characteristic of the LCA, outside of Finchampstead North that is particularly attributable to the linear development along Nine Mile Ride. The housing to the rear is ad hoc in nature and relatively low in density. The appeal scheme would further push development northwards into the countryside and would introduce an estate of houses that would fail to integrate successfully with its surroundings. Indeed, such creeping urbanisation is a key issue that is referred to in the WDLCA.
56. There would be benefits, including woodland management, restoration of the SSSI to favourable status and public recreational access to the SANG. These matters will be further considered in the planning balance below. However, for the reasons I have given, I conclude that the proposed development would cause very substantial harm and would conflict with policies CP3, CP11 in the CS, policies CC02, CC03 and TB21 in the MDD LP and the Framework, in particular paragraph 170b.

#### **Whether the site is within an accessible location, which would allow new occupiers a real choice about how they travel**

57. The CS indicates that the Borough has one of the highest rates of car ownership in the country. The 2011 Census shows that only about 5% of households in the two wards local to the appeal site do not have access to a car. Policy CP1 in the CS includes a provision that development should demonstrate how it would reduce the need to travel, particularly by car. Policy CP3 includes general principles including that proposals should be accessible, safe, secure and adaptable. Policy CP6 requires development to be located where there are, or will be, available modal choices to minimise the distance people need to travel.
58. Section 9 of the Framework promotes sustainable transport and opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport. It also points out that sustainable travel solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, which should be taken into account. In this case the appeal site is within the countryside for planning policy purposes. However, it is not within an isolated

rural area and it is reasonable to bear this in mind when considering what opportunities are available to maximise sustainable travel solutions.

### *Walking*

59. There was much debate at the inquiry about how a reasonable walking distance could be determined. *Manual for Streets* indicates that walking offers the greatest potential to replace short car journeys, particularly those under 2 kilometres (km). Whilst not an upper limit, it indicates that walkable neighbourhoods are typically those where there are a range of facilities within a 10 minute (800 m) walk from home. Similar guidance is provided in the *Borough Design Guide* and *National Design Guide*. *The Institute of Highways & Transportation Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot* (the IHTC guidelines) suggest that an acceptable walking distance is 800 m with a preferred maximum of 1.2 km.
60. It should of course be borne in mind that these distances are advisory and there are many examples of housing developments that are further away from local facilities than 800 m. Furthermore, the IHTC guidelines make clear that what is acceptable will depend on a number of factors, including the mobility and fitness of the individual, the purpose of the journey and the convenience of alternative options. The nature, attractiveness and safety of the route are also relevant matters to be taken into account.
61. The Appellant's evidence indicated that apart from the bus stops, Oak Tree Nursery and the Nine Mile Ride Industry, all existing facilities would be between about 1.2-2.2 km from the centre of each section of the site. The nearest existing local shops and facilities are at California Crossroads, which is about 2 km away. The pedestrian journey would be along the north side of Nine Mile Ride where the footway varies between about 1.2-2 m in width. The section between the western access and California Country Park has relatively poor surveillance due to the set-back of the houses and sporadic street lighting. *Manual for Streets* indicates that for lightly used residential streets the footway should have a minimum unobstructed width of 2 m.
62. Nine Mile Ride is not lightly trafficked and the footway between the site and California Crossroads is not ideal for comfortable pedestrian movement. This would not be a walk that I would judge to be pleasurable to undertake, particularly at peak periods when the road is busy, during inclement weather or in the dark. Whilst some would travel on foot, I suspect that most people who have the choice would use the convenience of their car, especially as there is available parking outside the shops.
63. The evidence suggests that existing students do walk in a westerly direction along Nine Mile Ride to Bohunt School. This is on the Arborfield Garrison SDL and a crossing has been provided over Park Lane to make this a safer journey. There is no reason to suppose that children from the new development would also not walk the 1.5 km distance to the secondary school, notwithstanding the limitations of the footway along the Nine Mile Ride section. There are primary schools at Gorse Ride and Avery Corner, which are 1.9-2.1 km away respectively. Both involve walking eastwards and children would therefore encounter the same issues as people walking to the shops. I appreciate that the CS indicates that primary school children should have access to a school within safe walking or cycling distance of 3-4km of their

home. However, in my experience this is a challenging distance to expect young children to walk and, in any event, this takes no account of the shortcomings of the walking route described above.

64. The Appellant is willing to widen the footway between California Crossroads and Park Lane to 2km where possible. This would be implemented by a financial contribution in the UU, which has been costed accordingly. However, it is recognised that it would not be possible to achieve the desirable width along the whole route without an unacceptable loss of trees. It would therefore be necessary to maintain existing narrower sections in places where trees are close to the footway edge. Whilst no detailed survey has been undertaken the Appellant considered that this would affect about 160 m of the 2 km route. This improvement would be the best that could be done but for the reasons given above, it would result in harmful environmental effects to the Green Route. In any event, apart from school journeys to Bohunt School, I am not convinced that the walking environment would be sufficiently improved to encourage a significant increase in walking trips especially in the direction of California Crossroads. Other issues including the length of the journey, poor street lighting and absence of surveillance would still act as a deterrent.
65. New facilities are planned at Arborfield Garrison SDL. This includes a new District Centre, and the approved Development Brief indicates that this will contain an anchor foodstore as well as other shops, facilities and services. The walking route once within the site is presently unclear but it seems likely that the District Centre would be about 1.5 km from the site. The legal agreement attached to the outline planning permission for the northern section of the SDL requires that reserved matters for the District Centre should be approved and 25% of it completed by the occupation of 1,000 dwellings. To date some 287 dwellings have been delivered. For the reasons given below, I consider it unlikely that the trigger point will be met in the next 5 years. However, even if it is, that would only require part of the District Centre to be built. It is thus unclear when the shops and facilities would become available. In any event it seems to me that many would not choose to walk from the site, especially if it entailed carrying heavy shopping.
66. Other proposed facilities at the Arborfield Garrison SDL include an extension to the Hogwood Lane employment area, a new primary school and a Local Centre. Reserved matters approval has been given for the Local Centre, which would be about 1.3 km away from the site. The information suggests that it would include two small shops but there is no clarity as to when these facilities would be provided.

### *Cycling*

67. There are many facilities within a 5 km cycle distance of the appeal site. These include employment opportunities, schools, leisure facilities and shops. Crowthorne Station would also be accessible by cycle and it offers secure cycle parking facilities. However, the Council's Cycling Map indicates that the routes in question contain no dedicated cycling infrastructure, although parts of some journeys could be undertaken on what are termed "quiet routes". There is also a recently introduced route for cyclists between Finchampstead and Arborfield Garrison. Nevertheless, Nine Mile Ride and indeed much of the

local road network carries significant amounts of traffic. I observed on my journeys to and from the inquiry that at peak periods there is considerable congestion, especially along the roads that lead in and out of Wokingham. In the circumstances I consider that cycling would not be for the faint hearted, especially during peak periods.

### *Bus*

68. The site benefits from bus stops close to the western access. The Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation document *Buses in Urban Developments* provides relatively recent guidance that 300 m is now normally considered to be an acceptable walking distance to bus stops. However, it advises that this will depend on the characteristics of the route, the fitness and mobility of the traveller and the purpose of the trip. In this case the bus stop would be less than 300 m for those living on the western section of the site and 400 m or more for those living on the eastern section. Although the walk would be relatively level and quiet, the distance from the larger eastern residential area is likely to deter some from walking to the bus stops.
69. The CS refers to a "good" public transport service as one at 30 minute intervals during peak times, hourly intervals during off-peak hours and a service on Sundays. The site would be served by Route 3, which runs between Wokingham and Reading and currently provides an hourly service but no buses on Sundays. There are also buses between Shinfield and The Forest School and Bohunt School to convey pupils on Mondays to Fridays during term times. As things stand this is not a "good" level of service that would encourage many people to use it in preference to the convenience of the private car.
70. Improvements to bus services are planned through the *Arborfield SDL Public Transport Strategy*. This will provide an enhanced 30 minute service between Reading and Wokingham and a new hourly service between Reading and Bracknell. The evidence suggests that the improved services will be phased and dependant on the accumulation of sufficient financial contributions as development proceeds. However, the Council emphasised many times during the inquiry that good infrastructure provision was the main strength of focusing development at the strategic locations. In such circumstances it is reasonable to suppose that public transport delivery will be expedient.
71. The appeal proposal includes a financial contribution towards bus improvements, which I was told would be sufficient to fund 5 return journeys between Reading and Wokingham on Sundays for about a year. In such circumstances the future improvements to bus travel is a matter to be taken into account when considering the matter of accessibility.
72. At the present time the nearest bus stops are denoted by pole signs close to the western access to the appeal site. On the south side there is no footway and the bus stop is on the grass verge. The appeal scheme proposes to install a hard-surfaced area leading up to the south side bus stop and bus shelters on both sides. The north side stop would be relocated nearer to the western access to take account of the alterations to the entrance to Oak Tree Nursery. It seems to me that the bus shelters would help encourage new residents to use the enhanced bus service by making their waiting time more comfortable, especially in inclement weather. A similar style of shelter is provided outside

California Country Park. This seems to me to blend satisfactorily into the green environment along Nine Mile Ride. Whilst the Council has raised a number of concerns including the impact on tree roots, available width of verge and interference with sight lines, I am satisfied that a scheme could be designed to adequately address these matters.

73. The Appellant has also proposed a new crossing to allow pedestrians to safely access the southern bus stop. At present there are no other facilities that would require people to cross Nine Mile Ride at this point, not least because there is no footway along this side of the road. Although the plan appended to the UU shows a signal-controlled crossing, this is indicative and the Appellant made clear that a zebra crossing, for example, would be a possible alternative. The implications for interrupting traffic flow have not been assessed and no formal consultation has been undertaken. However, the evidence indicates that a formal crossing would be unlikely to be justified. Even if the modal shifts anticipated in the Framework Travel Plan were to be achieved, the Appellant estimated that only about 6 new residents would use the crossing to reach the southern bus stop in the morning peak and 4 in the afternoon peak. The bus stops outside the entrance to California Country Park provide a dropped kerb and tactile paving rather than a formal crossing and to my mind this would be sufficient in this case.

#### *Train*

74. There are direct rail services to Reading and London, Waterloo from Wokingham railway station, which is about 6 km from the appeal site. Crowthorne Station is about 4.5 km away and there is also a service to Reading where trains also run to London, Waterloo. Whilst there are secure cycle parking facilities at both stations, for the reasons given above, the routes are not particularly attractive, especially during peak periods. The bus stops at Wokingham station but although it is a relatively short trip the route is congested at peak times. Car travel would suffer from the same issue but would be more flexible in terms of times of travel and connections and could take advantage of the parking facilities at the station.

#### *Travel Plan*

75. The appeal proposal includes a Framework Travel Plan and a planning condition could be imposed to require a full Travel Plan to be agreed prior to first occupation of the development. The anticipated modal share targets would be challenging with a drop of 14% in car travel relying on a significant rise in pedestrian, cycle and bus travel. For the reasons given I do not anticipate that walking or cycling would be particularly popular and therefore such optimism seems unrealistic. However, I appreciate that final targets would be determined when the site became operational and that measures to encourage occupiers to use sustainable modes could include travel packs and free bus passes, for example.
76. The Council operate a Borough-wide travel plan initiative called MyJourney. This aims for a more co-ordinated approach through a dedicated team of officers and provides an alternative to travel plans by individual developers. It has the advantage of being able to apply economies of scale in terms of monitoring, promotions and marketing for each individual site. A cost of £450 per dwelling is charged and this was originally calculated for the SDLs where

the scheme originated. MyJourney is optional and the Appellant is content to provide the requisite contribution as well as fund a Travel Plan. However, there would be considerable overlap between the 2 approaches and requiring both would not pass the test of necessity.

### Conclusions

77. The enhanced bus service that will be provided by the Arborfield Garrison SDL, the bus contribution from the appeal scheme, the proposed new bus shelters and the Travel Plan or MyJourney contribution would provide some opportunities for modal shift. However, for the reasons given I consider that this is a site where modal choice is and will remain relatively compromised. Those living on the development would therefore remain largely dependent on the convenience, flexibility and security of the private car for most of their journeys. The appeal scheme would thus conflict with policies CP1, CP3 and CP6 in the CS and with section 9 of the Framework.
78. A great deal of the Appellant's evidence was directed towards comparing the appeal site with others in terms of proximity to services and facilities. However, such an exercise needs to be treated with caution. Most of the sites referred to in the evidence are shown to be close to some facilities than the appeal site and further away from others. In most of the locations chosen it is to be expected that people will meet at least some of their needs through the use of a car. The important point is whether alternative choices are available for as many local journeys as possible.
79. In looking at different sites it is also important to compare like with like. Context is very important and in the grant of planning permission there are likely to be a number of considerations to balance. Also, accessibility is a relative term and depends on context rather than distance alone. For example, the quality of the walk, cycle route or bus journey will be an important factor and its convenience when compared with other modal alternatives. This means that in many cases the judgement will be site-specific. I have considered all of the examples that the Appellant has given but the comparison undertaken does not lead me to alter my conclusions on this issue.

### Five-year housing land supply

80. The housing requirement in policy C17 of the CS was based on the now revoked *South East Plan* and is clearly no longer fit for purpose. In any event, the Framework makes clear that as the strategic policies in the CS were adopted more than 5 years ago and have not been updated, local housing need should be calculated using the standard method set out in national planning guidance.
81. There is no dispute that the relevant 5-year period is 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2024. The local housing need based on the standard methodology is 4,022 dwellings. Over the previous 3 years the 2019 Housing Delivery Test shows 175% completions against requirement meaning that the test is passed and that a 5% buffer is applied. This gives an overall figure of 4,223 dwellings. In its latest *Five-Year Housing Land Statement* (July 2019) (HLSS) the Council indicates that its deliverable supply is 5,398 dwellings and that it can demonstrate a 6.39-year supply. The Appellant disputes this and believes that

it is only 4.75 years. This is generally on the basis that delivery rates are overly optimistic, although in some cases the deliverability of the site is questioned.

82. The 2019 Framework includes a much more rigorous approach to the issue of deliverability. It makes clear that the site must be available and in a suitable location for development to take place now and that there should be a realistic prospect that housing will come forward on the site within 5 years. There are 2 closed categories, but the main dispute in this case relates to the second one. These are mainly the large strategic sites with outline planning permission, and it is the Appellant's case that the Council is overly optimistic as to the quantum of housing that will be delivered over the 5 year period.
83. The evidence clearly indicates that historically the Council's record of delivery has not been very good. In the 13 years between 2006/7 and 2018/19 the CS requirement has only been met in 4 years. However, it is relevant that this has improved recently and in the last 3 years the requirement has been exceeded by a significant amount<sup>3</sup>. This supports the Council's point that a large amount of the supply relies on the SDLs. Housebuilding here has often depended on the early delivery of significant infrastructure and this has meant that it was slower to come forward in the early years. The Council contends that developers are now keen to build at pace and it was pointed out that there are some 2,000 homes currently under construction in the Borough.
84. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that the Council has often been overly optimistic with its forecasting and that performance has consistently lagged behind prediction. Even in the latest HLSS it is shown that only 35% of the predicted number of residential units were actually built. It is not unreasonable to surmise that in order to successfully function in a very competitive industry housebuilders may be tempted to talk-up delivery. In addition, it is understandable that they would wish to present a favourable picture to investors, shareholders and indeed the Council. However, the market can only absorb a certain amount of new housing and developers are unlikely to build houses if they think they will be standing empty for a long period of time. This is clearly an issue that is very dependent on the buoyancy of the local housing market but also the number of outlets competing for the same slice of the market. Those developers who offer a range of housing products or focus on a particular niche are likely to be able to sustain a higher output.
85. On the other hand, the Council has recently been putting more rigorous processes in place to ensure improved accuracy with assessing future delivery rates on individual sites. There is a specialist team of officers that now deals with SDL delivery with a dedicated officer for each one. Regular contact is maintained between the relevant developers and landowners and the information received is carefully scrutinised using empirical evidence, knowledge of the developer and specific site information. I was also told that the Council is adopting a more cautious approach to build-out rates, including moving sites further on in the trajectory or else removing some altogether if delivery seems to be in doubt.

---

<sup>3</sup> 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19.

86. The onus is on the Council to justify its forecast delivery for sites with outline planning permission. I acknowledge that in a number of recent appeals the housing land supply was not challenged. However, this may have been for a variety of reasons and not just because the appellants accepted that the supply was robust. Whatever the reason, the Appellant has challenged the supply in this case with detailed evidence. Whilst reference has been made to appeal decisions where housing supply was examined, any assessment will be a snapshot in time and depend on the evidence that has been presented. In the circumstances, I have reached my own conclusions on the evidence that I have been given.
87. Since the inquiry the world has been afflicted with the Coronavirus pandemic and this is likely to result in economic repercussions at least in the short term. Bearing all of this in mind I now turn to the disputed sites and my conclusions regarding their delivery.

### *The Strategic Development Locations*

#### Arborfield Garrison SDL

88. In this SDL the delivery of homes has undoubtedly been much slower to get off the ground than anticipated. However, the development relies on the early provision of infrastructure and this is now well underway with the Nine Mile Ride Extension (north) completed and opened in 2017. Outline planning permission has been granted for 3,500 dwellings and the District Centre. A number of developers are involved, and reserved matters approval has been given on some of the parcels.
89. On the Hogwood Farm part of the SDL, the trajectory indicates that 240 dwellings will be delivered. There is reserved matters approval for 178 and the dispute is with the remaining 62 dwellings. The developer, Legal and General, has just obtained reserved matters approval for the southern extension to Nine Mile Ride and it is understandable that it is keen to deliver the rest of the houses. The Council's information is that a reserved matters application will be made in 2020 and I was told that this developer uses a modular system of housebuilding, which should allow faster delivery. The range of different housing products being proposed would also support the build out rates anticipated. Delivery would not be until the end of the 5-year period (2023/24) and from the evidence I am satisfied that the trajectory is robust.
90. On the northern part of the SDL there is reserved matters approval for all but 652 dwellings and of these 308 are included in the 5-year supply. There is a recent full planning permission for 70 dwellings leaving a disputed 238 dwellings. There are several developers operating on this site and the Council indicated that it has reduced their anticipated supply and so the 308 dwellings in the trajectory was cautious. However, there are no reserved matters applications and the evidence from Savills the marketing agent shows no developer interest in 14 of the 15 parcels. The one where there is a developer involved indicates that 44 dwellings are anticipated. However, Savills cautioned the forecasting as being subject to market conditions and not definite or fixed. There is insufficient evidence to be confident that any of these units will be delivered and the trajectory should be reduced by 238 dwellings.

91. The Appellant considers that the anticipated rate of delivery from Crest Regeneration, who are building out several parcels, is too high. Overall the trajectory shows 357 dwellings over the 5 year period, which averages at 71 dwellings per annum (dpa). This is considerably higher than the 50 dpa that the Council has adopted in its assumptions for larger sites with 2 or more developers. The Appellant considers that 107 of the dwellings should therefore be removed from the supply. However, the 50 dpa is an average rate across the Borough and I note that in 2018/19 Crest Nicholson delivered 63 dwellings from one parcel. Having considered all of the evidence, including the better communication initiated with individual developers and the different products on offer, I do not consider that the rate of delivery here is necessarily unrealistic.
92. The Appellant is also critical of the delivery rate from those parcels with reserved matters approval. This involves 1,059 dwellings and would result in an average delivery of 212 dpa. Whilst this is much faster than has happened in the past, housebuilding only commenced in 2016 and the expectation is that it will ramp up as a result of the completion of infrastructure. There are a number of different developers offering a range of housing products, including affordable housing and private rented accommodation. In the circumstances, there is insufficient evidence to justify the reduction in build-out rates suggested by the Appellant.
93. A condition on the outline planning permission for the northern part of the SDL only permits 1,000 dwellings to be delivered until 25% of the commercial floorspace in the District Centre has been completed. Progress is being made but there is no reserved matters application and the Development Brief does not give specific timescales. It is very difficult to be confident about when the District Centre will go ahead, especially with the present fluctuating retail market. The Council indicates that it could vary the condition. However, on the assumption that it was considered necessary when imposed it is far from certain that such steps would be acceptable. At present the northern part of the site is anticipated to deliver 1,119 dwellings in the 5 year period and only 713 remain to be built before the condition would be breached. Taking account of my conclusions in paragraph 90 above, this would leave 406 dwellings where delivery in the 5 year period is subject to doubt.
94. Drawing together all of the above points, 406 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory.

#### *South of the M4 Motorway SDL*

95. This SDL is one of the longer established strategic sites where delivery started in 2012/13. However, it was not until 2017/18 that it reached (and exceeded) the 250 dpa anticipated. This continued the following year and a total of 1,280 homes is forecast over the 5 year period. The Council's own evidence of delivery on 2 parcels<sup>4</sup>, where there were 5 housebuilders involved, was about 39 dpa. The number of active parcels is set to decrease from 10 to 4 by 2021/2022.
96. The land west of Shinfield is being delivered by 3 developers. Linden Homes

---

<sup>4</sup> Land south of Croft Road (completed in 2018/19) and Land West of Shinfield (Phase 1) (275 of the 517 completed 2018/19).

have specifically indicated that it will be slowing delivery rates. Each parcel is indicated to deliver 75 dpa in the first 3 years of the trajectory but to significantly increase delivery on phase 2 in the last 2 years once phase 1 is completed. Although both sites are adjacent, the assumption that construction teams will be moved across to ramp up delivery on the phase 2 site does not seem to be based on evidence. In such circumstances I consider that the rates should remain consistent and that 73 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory.

97. Taylor Wimpey are active on 3 parcels and the trajectory shows a total of 346 dwellings being delivered over the 5 years. This indicates a rate of just short of 70 dwellings a year. The evidence on past rates for this developer on the south of Croft Road parcel show a delivery rate nearer the 50 dpa referred to in the HLSS. Overall, I consider that this is more realistic and that 96 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory.
98. I note that the Appellant considers that overall past delivery rates should be applied to this SDL going forward. Whilst as noted above Linden Homes have indicated a slowdown that does not necessarily apply to other housebuilders. It is not considered robust to adopt this approach, particularly when the evidence indicates that delivery has significantly improved since 2017/18.
99. Drawing together all of the above points, 169 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory.

#### *North Wokingham SDL*

100. This SDL has made slow progress and consistently failed to deliver in accordance with the trajectory until 2018/19. However, the evidence shows that matters are improving and that in 2019, 438 of the 827 dwellings anticipated over the 5 year period were under construction. The Council indicates that there is a likelihood that the 252 dwellings shown in the trajectory for 2019/20 will be delivered. There is evidence that delivery on the SDL is improving and that the increase shown in 2018/19 is likely not to have been due to a "spike" caused by pent up demand.
101. The trajectory shows that the number of outlets will decrease, but 3 developers remain active over the whole 5 year period. The Appellant's contention that a generic build-out rate of 100 dpa should be applied is based on historic rates and the evidence seems to me to be demonstrating that this SDL is now delivering, albeit after a slow start. In the circumstances I consider that no changes should be made to the trajectory.

#### *Other sites*

102. At Auto Trader House, Danehill it is understood that there was prior approval for 26 flats in March 2019 and this can be taken into account as part of the forward supply. On the other hand, there is no evidence that a development of 76 dwellings was being contemplated and indeed the Council refused permission for the scheme. Although this larger development was granted permission on appeal in June 2019 this was well after the base date of 31 March. In the circumstances the trajectory should be reduced by 50 dwellings.
103. At Stanbury House, Spencers Wood outline planning permission for 57 dwellings was granted on appeal in September 2018. It is appreciated that

part of the developer's case was that the site would assist the 5 year supply. However, from the evidence there has been no reserved matters application. The Council indicated it had sought an update from the developer but had received no response. Indeed, an application has now been submitted for 120 units on a larger site. The developer's intentions are thus far from clear. Even though delivery is shown to be in the last 2 years of the trajectory, the evidence does not show that housing completions will begin within the 5 year period. In the circumstances the trajectory should be reduced by 57 dwellings.

104. At Sonning Golf Club an outline planning permission was granted for 13 dwellings in July 2018. Apart from a reserved matters application relating solely to the access, no further approvals have been granted. Whilst this is a greenfield site, there are a number of pre-commencement conditions relating to such matters as contamination and archaeology that have not been discharged. It is understood that a pre-application meeting has been held with the housebuilder, Alfred Homes, but there is insufficient evidence that delivery will take place in the 5 year period. In the circumstances the trajectory should be reduced by 13 dwellings.
105. Outline planning permission was granted for 20 dwellings at Trowes Lane, Wokingham in February 2018. It is understood that a conditions application was approved in August 2018 but since then no further progress has been made. Cove Construction Ltd is the developer and the Council has indicated that the site is flagged on its website as "coming soon". However, the developer has not responded to the Council's enquiries and no reserved matters application has been forthcoming. Although this is a small site and has been placed in the final year of the trajectory, there is insufficient evidence that delivery will take place in the 5 year period. In the circumstances the trajectory should be reduced by 20 dwellings.

#### *Windfalls*

106. The small sites windfall allowance is not disputed. However, the Appellant contended that a large sites windfall allowance of 32 dpa from year 3 is not justified. The evidence of windfalls of 10 or more completions on previously developed land between 1999 and 2019 indicates an average of 44 dpa although there is considerable annual variation. The Council therefore consider that its rate is very conservative.
107. However, prior approvals would fall into the category of windfalls but there is no evidence that those identified specifically would all deliver in years 1 and 2. Similarly, there is no evidence that windfall sites with planning permission at the base date would deliver as quickly as the Council contends. In such circumstances I consider it likely that there is the potential for significant double counting. In the absence of any better evidence, the 96 dwellings comprising the large windfall allowance should be removed from the trajectory.

#### *Conclusions*

108. Drawing the above points together, I conclude that in my estimation 811 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory. This means that the Council can demonstrate a 5.43 year supply of deliverable sites.

109. The Covid-19 pandemic is likely to have implications for the housebuilding industry as with other sectors of the economy. The evidence indicates that a number of developers are temporarily closing their construction sites to protect employee and customer welfare. For those remaining open, the lockdown will impact on the availability of support services. Customer confidence is also likely to be reduced with a consequent effect on the buying and selling of property.
110. The Appellant has concluded that the effects would be felt for a 3 to 6 month period, which does not seem unreasonable. On that basis the conclusion is that a further 168 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory to take these factors into account. Whilst it is contended that this is an optimistic assessment, it is equally possible that a bounce back will occur once the crisis ends. Indeed, it is reasonable to surmise that housebuilders and their suppliers will be keen to rectify losses if it is possible to do so.
111. At this stage the economic effects of Covid-19 cannot be known. However, even if all of the impacts suggested by the Appellant are accepted, the Council would still be able to demonstrate about 5.2 years supply of deliverable sites.

### **Other matters**

#### *Affordable housing*

112. Policy CP5 in the CS establishes a minimum requirement for 40% affordable housing on sites such as this, subject to viability. The *Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013-2036* (2016) identifies a need for 441 dpa. In the 6 years since 2013, 1,317 affordable dwellings have been delivered or an average of 220 per annum. This means that a backlog will accumulate year on year. If this were to be addressed over the next 5 years, delivery would have to amount to over 700 affordable dpa. This is not far off the total annual housing requirement, which demonstrates the scale of the issue and that the need is acute.
113. Wokingham is an expensive area in which to live and incomes are not keeping pace with price rises. The average house price to average income ratio now stands at 12:1. The evidence shows that there were 1,860 households on the Council's Housing Register on 1 April 2019 and that this had risen by 247 from the preceding year. In December 2019, 1,502 households were on the Help to Buy South Register, with 40 specifying a preference for a shared ownership dwelling in Finchampstead.
114. The proposed development would provide 50% affordable housing, which would amount to 59 units and be above that required by policy CP5 in the CS. The S106 Agreement indicates that the mix would be 66% social rented units and 34% shared ownership units with a mix of flats, bungalows and houses. Taking account of all of the above factors the affordable housing provision would clearly be an important benefit.

#### *Self-build and Custom-build housing*

115. Under the *Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act* (2015) local authorities have a legal duty to keep a Register of those who wish to acquire serviced plots. The *Housing and Planning Act* (2016) requires local authorities to grant sufficient permissions to meet the demand on their Register on a rolling

programme of 3 years by the end of each base period. Paragraph 61 of the Framework indicates that the housing needs of different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. This includes people who wish to commission or build their own homes. As this is a relatively new provision, neither the CS nor the MDD LP include policies that relate to this issue. However, the emerging Local Plan does address this type of home provision and will be considered in due course by an Examining Inspector.

116. The evidence shows that in the first Base Period ending on 30 October 2019 there was an overprovision of permissions relative to demand. For Base Period 2 ending on 30 October 2020 the Appellant and Council disagree about the residual requirement is 83 or 62 dwellings. The Council referred to a community-led project of 21 dwellings on its own land, although no planning permissions appear to have been granted to date. The Appellant contends that the Council will fail to comply with its statutory duty within the current base period, on the basis of past provision rates and lack of available sites. That remains to be seen.
117. There is clearly a substantial demand for this type of development. The Council's own Register shows that about 35% of those in Base Periods 1 and 2 had a preference for a serviced plot in Finchampstead. The appeal proposal would help meet this demand through the 6 serviced plots that it proposes to include.

#### *The SANG*

118. The SANG is intended to provide mitigation against likely significant adverse effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. Such impacts would include recreational pressure from the new population and the harm that would arise to the integrity of the interest features of this protected site.
119. It is clear that the size and quality of the SANG would exceed the above requirements. I have already referred to the management of the woodland and this would be secured through a Management Plan in the S106 Agreement. Within this area there would be woodland walks for the public to enjoy. Overall, the SANG would provide a significant recreational resource, not only for the occupiers of the new development but also for existing residents. Even though no parking area would be provided many would be able to walk or cycle from the surrounding area. There would be grassland areas with water features and areas that could be used for informal exercise. The S106 Agreement includes provisions for the future management of the SANG, including funding.

#### *Highway safety and congestion*

120. There is no dispute that the local road network, including Nine Mile Ride, is busy especially during peak periods. The indications are that this will get worse once the Arborfield Garrison SDL is built out. Local residents were particularly concerned about traffic impacts and pedestrian safety.
121. At present Nine Mile Ride is operating below a theoretical capacity of about 1,500 vehicles. However, once the Arborfield Garrison SDL comes on-stream it is anticipated that this will change, and that capacity will be exceeded in

peak periods depending on daily variations. This will also impact on California Crossroads where congestion occurs at busy periods around the 2 mini-roundabouts. The Appellant's Transport Assessment includes agreed trip rates and trip assignments. This shows 67 trips generated in the morning peak and 65 trips in the afternoon peak, which would be spread between the 2 access points. The evidence shows that the additional traffic that would be added from the appeal scheme would amount to less than one vehicle a minute and be insignificant when daily variations are taken into account.

122. I note the concern about the safety of the eastern access, which would be opposite a residential entrance on the south side of Nine Mile Ride. However, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken at this access point and no safety issues were identified. Such arrangements are not uncommon and there is no evidence that this stretch of road is particularly dangerous or has a high accident rate.
123. Paragraph 109 of the Framework indicates that development should only be prevented or delayed if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway grounds or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to the appeal scheme on this basis. This is a matter of importance because it is the statutory authority responsible for highway safety on the local road network. Bearing all of these points in mind, I am satisfied that there would not be an unacceptable highway impact or that the cumulative effects would be severe.

### **Planning balance and overall conclusions**

124. The appeal site is within a countryside location and outside the development limits for Finchampstead North and the Arborfield Garrison SDL. There would be harm to the character of the area, the Green Route and the landscape. In addition, notwithstanding improvements to the bus service, the opportunities for modal choice would remain limited and it is likely that most journeys would be undertaken by car. These harmful impacts are matters of very substantial weight and importance in the planning balance.
125. I have identified the most important policies for determining this application. Of these the proposed development would conflict with policies CP1, CP3, CP6, CP9 and CP11 in the CS and policies CC02, CC03 and TB21 in the MDD LP. Inevitably there are some with which the proposal would comply, policies CP5 in the CS and TB05 in the MDD LP relating to affordable housing and housing mix being obvious examples. Nevertheless, in my judgement the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
126. Paragraph 11 of the Framework establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The "tilted balance" may be engaged in 2 circumstances. In relation to housing provision, I have concluded that the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites to meet its local housing need. In relation to the most important policies I have found that a few are out of date but not the majority. Overall, I consider that the basket of most important policies is not out-of-date in this case. For these reasons the "tilted balance" would not be engaged. Taking account also of my conclusion in paragraph 125 above, the presumption in favour of sustainable

development would not apply. I can also conclude that the proposal would conflict with policy CC01 in the MDD LP.

127. I have concluded that a few of the most important policies are not consistent with the Framework and therefore it is necessary to consider the weight to be attributed to the conflict. As the presumption in favour of sustainable development in policy CC01 is worded significantly differently to the Framework I consider that the conflict with it should be attributed limited weight. Policies CP9 and CP11 in the CS and policy CC02 in the MDD LP rely on the development limits that have been breached in several of the component parts of the 5 year housing land supply. On the other hand, the Council has been able to demonstrate sufficient deliverable sites without the need to include the Appellant's land. In such circumstances I attribute significant weight to the conflict with these policies.
128. The appeal proposal would include a number of social, environmental and economic benefits. Policy CP17 does not cap housing provision but the Council is providing sufficient deliverable sites to meet its local housing need plus a buffer designed to provide choice and competition in the market. Whilst it is not delivering housing wholly in a plan-led way, the appeal site would not be a plan-led proposal either. In the circumstances I give limited weight to the provision of market housing as a benefit in this case.
129. There is an acute need for affordable housing and this would be provided above the level required under policy CP5. The inclusion of 6 Self-Build and Custom-Build serviced plots would be a benefit that would clearly meet a local demand. In the circumstances I give substantial weight to these benefits.
130. The SANG would be a recreational resource for those living on the development and also residents within the local area. The SSSI would be restored to favourable condition and its biodiversity would be enhanced. I give significant weight to these benefits. An open area is proposed as an education area for Oak Tree Nursery. Whilst I have no doubt that this would enhance the facilities of the nursery, I am not convinced that the condition to secure it would be necessary in order for the appeal development to go ahead. In the circumstances I give this very limited weight as a benefit of the proposal.
131. The proposal would have a range of economic benefits. It would, for example, provide new jobs during the construction period and thereafter. There would be a contribution to economic growth and the generation of household expenditure would help support the local economy and provide local jobs. I attribute limited weight to these benefits.
132. Overall, I consider that the package of benefits should be given substantial weight in the planning balance. However, as I have identified above, there would also be very substantial harm. In my overall judgement the positive factors are insufficient to outweigh the negative ones, and do not indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
133. In this case it is unnecessary for me to undertake an Appropriate Assessment as I am dismissing the appeal. However, if I had done so and a positive outcome had ensued it would not have affected the planning balance or my overall conclusions. I have considered all other matters raised but have found

nothing to change my conclusion that this would not be a sustainable form of development and that the appeal should not succeed.

*Christina Downes*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Sasha White	Of Queen's Counsel
Ms Anjoli Foster	Of Counsel, both instructed by Ms E-J Brewerton, Solicitor to the Council
<i>They called:</i>	
Mr M Croucher BA(Hons) MSc	Principal Planning Officer at Wokingham Borough Council
Mr G Adam BA DipEcon MA FCIHT MILT	Principal Development Control Engineer at Wokingham Borough Council
Mr I Church BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Team Leader at Wokingham Borough Council
Mr W Gardner BSc(Hons) MSc(Merit) CMLI	Landscape Architect at EDP
*Ms E-J Brewerton	Solicitor to the Council

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Christopher Young	Of Queen's Counsel
Mr Oliver Lawrence	Of Counsel, both instructed by Mr A Meader, the Pegasus Group
<i>They called:</i>	
Mr D Ford MSc	Associate Director of Transport Planning Associates
Ms A Tamblyn MA(Oxon) MSc CEnv MCIEEM FRGS	Managing Director of The Ecology Partnership
Mr A Meader BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Senior Director (Planning) of the Pegasus Group
Mr J Atkin BSc(Hons) DipLM CMLI	Director (Landscape) of the Pegasus Group
Dr R Curtis BSc(Hons) PgDip PhD MArborA	Associate Director of Aspect Arboriculture Limited
Mr J Stacey BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Director of Tetlow King Planning
Mr A Moger BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Associate Director of Tetlow King Planning
Mr M Good BSc(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI	Director (Planning) of the Pegasus Group
*Mr B Naish	Solicitor with Osborne Clarke LLP
<i>*Took part in the Planning Obligations and/or the planning conditions sessions only</i>	

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr G Veich	Parish Councillor of Finchampstead Parish Council
Mr M Sheehan BEng MSc DIC	Local resident
Mr R Lewis	Local resident
Mr G Anderson	Local resident
Mrs J Joyce	Local resident

## DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Appeal decision: *Land at Lodge Road, Hurst* (APP/X0360/W/3194044), submitted by Mr White
- 2 Oral statement delivered to the inquiry by Mr Sheehan and appended extract from TA 79/99
- 3 Clarification on the Council's position on benefits, submitted by Mr White
- 4 Extract from Assessment of Walked Routes to School, submitted by Mr Young
- 5 Summary of S106 planning obligations, submitted by Mr Young
- 6 Appeal decisions: *Land east and west of Parsonage Road, Takeley* (APP/C1570/W/19/3234530 and APP/C1570/W/19/3234532), submitted by Mr Young
- 7 Appeal decision: *Land off Meadow Lane/ Chessington Crescent, Trentham, Stoke-on-Trent* (APP/M3455/W/18/3204828), submitted by Mr Young
- 8 Plan showing application site, land at Wheatsheaf Close, Sindlesham, submitted by Mr Young
- 9 Statement of Common Ground on sustainability of location matters
- 10 Note on the *My Journey* initiative, submitted by Mr White
- 11 Consultation response from Thames Water on sewage disposal
- 12 Mr Gardner's position statement on landscape and trees, submitted by Mr White
- 13 Note on foul and surface water drainage strategies, submitted by Mr Young
- 14 *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd and Another; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and Another v Cheshire East Borough Council* [2017] UKSC 37, submitted by Mr Young
- 15 Note on the likely use of the proposed pedestrian crossing and its possible impact on traffic flow, submitted by Mr Young
- 16 Note concerning the Education Space S106 planning obligations, submitted by Mr Young
- 17 Confirmation of instruction date of Mr Moger, submitted by Mr Young
- 18 Woodland Management Plan, submitted by Mr Young
- 19 Refusal notice of the appeal application, submitted by Mr Young
- 20 Landscape and visual addendum by Mr Atkin, submitted by Mr Young
- 21 Note by Mr Adam on the proposed bus and pavement improvements, submitted by Mr White
- 22 Extract from the Panel Report into the RSS for South-East England, submitted by Mr Young
- 23 Arborfield Green District Centre development brief, submitted by Mr Young
- 24 Response to Mr Adam's note at Document 21, submitted by Mr Young
- 25 Draft list of conditions and Council's suggested wording for the construction method statement condition, submitted by Mr White
- 26 Progress on the Arborfield Green District and Local Centres, submitted by Mr White

- 27 Appellant's note regarding the delivery of Arborfield Garrison, submitted by Mr Young
- 28 Explanation of the SANG contingency sum and SAMP tariff guidance, submitted by Mr White
- 29 Arboricultural note relating to the proposed footway widening along Nine Mile Ride, submitted by Mr Young
- 30 Consents for work to protected trees at Barkham and Wokingham, submitted by Mr White

#### DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING THE CLOSE OF THE INQUIRY

- 31 \*Written representation from Ms J Joyce (14/2/20)
- 32 \*Written representation from Ms C Broad (14/2/20)
- 33 \*\*Decision Notice, Minute (point 83) and Committee Report relating to the Nine Mile Ride extension, submitted by the Appellant.
- 34 \*\*\*Note and appeal decision: *Land to the south of Cutbush Lane, Shinfield* dated 10/3/20 (APP/X0360/W/19/3238203), submitted by the Appellant
- 35 Response of the Council to Document 34
- 36 Executed Planning Obligation by Unilateral Undertaking (dated 11 March 2020)
- 37 Executed Planning Obligation by Agreement (dated 12 March 2020)
- 38 Appellant's response to Inspector's question about the impact of COVID-19 on housebuilding
- 39 Council's response to Inspector's question about the impact of COVID-19 on housebuilding
- 40 Secretary of State appeal decision dated 1 April 2020: *Land off Station Road, Long Melford, Suffolk* (APP/D3505/W/18/3214377), submitted by the Appellant

\*I agreed to receive representations from these 2 local residents during the inquiry and they were circulated to the main parties subsequently.

\*\*I agreed to accept these documents after the close of the inquiry as they are factual matters, which the Appellant considered material. The Council confirmed it had no objection.

\*\*\*I agreed to accept this decision after the close of the inquiry on the grounds that it is a relevant material consideration. The Council was given the opportunity to respond.

#### PLANS

- A/1-A/9 Application plans on which the Council made its decision (A/1-A/9)
- B Internal roads plan
- C Revised indicative masterplan (P16-1187\_01 Rev:N)
- D Revised landscape proposals plan (P16-1187\_20 Rev:F)
- E Facilities plan
- F Plan showing the built-up area in the vicinity of the appeal site
- G/1-G/6 Plan showing potential footway widening along Nine Mile Ride
- H Plan of potential bus stop improvements on Nine Mile Ride
- I Proving layout (illustrative)