

Arborfield and Barkham Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of representations received by Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) as part of Regulation 16 publication and submitted to the independent Examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990)

Parish/Town name: Arborfield & Newland Parish Council; Barkham Parish Council

Consultation period: 8 July 2019 to 5pm 19 August 2019

Please note: All the original representation documents will be included in the examination pack. The table below is a summary of the representations received so will not be verbatim. As stated in the consultation material, any anonymous comments received during the consultation have not been considered. For completeness, this table records responses where they were received from those key stakeholders (contacted as listed in Appendix 1 of the [Statement of Community Involvement](#)) even if no specific comments were offered on the plan's content. The comments are listed by type of responder and then broadly by date received within each type.

A total of 68 responses were received. Of these 12 were from statutory consultees; 6 were from developers/landowners/agents; 44 were from individuals (residents or individual councillors); 5 from parish councils; and 1 was from an other organisation.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
Statutory Consultee comments			
1.	Transport for London	General	No comments
2.	Chiltern and South Bucks	General	No comments
3.	Highways England	General	No comments
4.	Canal and Rivers Trust	General	No comments
5.	Health and Safety Executive	General	No comments

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
6.	Aylesbury Vale	General	No comments
7.	National Grid	General	Advised that no record of high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines so no specific comments to make on the plan.
8.	Elmbridge Borough Council	General	No comments
9.	Wokingham Borough Council	Policy IRS3	Support with minor modifications: “3. <i>Proposals must conserve, and where possible enhance, Locally valued natural assets.</i> Locally valued natural assets have been identified within the plan as follows (see Map K)...”
		Policy IRS4	Support with minor modifications: 1. Development proposals will need to demonstrate how they protect or enhance the historic and natural character of the area, specifically: a) Arborfield Cross Conservation Area b) Chamberlain’s Farm Area of Special Character c) The Barkham Street Area of Special Character d) <i>Designated heritage assets, The local historic environment, including Listed buildings and their setting of Listed buildings, and Scheduled Monuments</i> e) Locally valued <i>heritage assets (as listed below) and any other non-designated heritage asset that may be historically significant buildings identified through the decision making process.</i>
		Policy AD2	Does not meet the basic conditions as it does not comply with the strategic policies of the development plan. Specifically the policy does not recognise the varying needs of applicants on the housing register, and instead seeks to prioritise housing purely based on local connection measured only by living in the area. No consideration is given to those working in the area. The policy qualifies local connection as being a result of living within either parish for 10 continuous years, which is an onerous threshold that would exclude people wishing to return to the area to be with their family (for example people who have attended university). The policy could therefore impede the allocation of affordable housing to those with the greatest need, contrary to the council’s approach. There are other elements of this policy which are not appropriately supported by the Housing Need Analysis evidence which

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			supports the plan. This includes a requirement for key worker housing without the supporting evidence to demonstrate a demonstrable need.
		Policy AD3	Does not meet the basic conditions as it does not comply with the strategic policies of the development plan. The policy seeks to treat developments within the 5 – 7km zone from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) the same as those within the 5km zone which is inconsistent with the borough’s development plan strategy which is agreed with Natural England. It also seeks to introduce a more onerous Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) requirement on development sites of 0.4ha or larger, which would not be achievable in practice. Its approach is therefore inconsistent with Core Strategy policy and national guidance.
10.	Natural England	General	No comments
11.	Berkshire West CCG	General	Berkshire West CCG has been in detailed discussions with Wokingham Borough Council regarding healthcare provision in the Arborfield/Barkham area. CCG’s strategy is to expand existing provision to provide capacity for new housing development and two existing high quality practices have been expanded to allow for population growth in the area.
12.	Thames Water	Policy AH5	Supportive of policy and supporting text which reflects Thames Water’s pre-planning service.
Developer / landowner / agent comments			
13.	Gladman	General	General comment which suggests that it is important for the Neighbourhood Plan to provide flexibility to ensure that the policies contained within the plan are not overridden upon the adoption of the Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update.
		General	General comment which considers that the requirements of national planning policy and guidance are not fully reflected in the plan. Gladman has suggested a number of modifications to ensure compliance with the basic conditions.
		Policy IRS1	Objection to this policy relating to the use of settlement boundaries, as it is considered that this will preclude sustainable development from coming forward. Use of settlement limits is considered to restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements, which does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the NPPF and contrary to

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			<p>basic conditions (a) and (d).</p> <p>Policy is considered to be overly restrictive and provides no flexibility. Gladman has suggested that additional sites adjacent to the settlement boundary should be considered as appropriate for development, and recommend the following modification, to reflect the approach taken by the Examiner for the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>“When considering development proposals, the Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where they provide:</p> <p>New homes including market and affordable housing; or</p> <p>Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or</p> <p>Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>Development adjacent to the existing settlement will be permitted provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.</p>
		Policy AD3	<p>Policy does not meet the basic conditions as it breaches the requirements of the Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and contrary to basic condition (g).</p> <p>Comment suggests that the Neighbourhood Plan goes beyond the requirements of the strategic policy relating to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and appropriate assessment. Comment suggests that the Neighbourhood Plan should not seek to override or pre-empt findings of Wokingham Borough Council.</p>
		General	<p>General comment which suggests that the plan does not comply with basic conditions (a), (d) or (g).</p>

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
14.	Barton Willmore obo Reading FC	General	General support for vision and objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan. Important that the plan recognises the Aborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location which will provide support for existing services and introduce further facilities and deliver significant infrastructure provision.
		Policy IRS1	<p>General support for this policy, but justification for requirement relating to development proposals outside of development boundaries is unclear and does not meet basic condition (d) as it inhibits sustainable development.</p> <p>Comment suggests that the policy is overly restrictive. Development proposals that lie outside of Development Limits should be assessed on their own merits through decision-making process.</p> <p>Policy could be considered unnecessary as it duplicates requirements in the Neighbourhood Plan, Wokingham Borough's adopted Development Plan and national policy.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to policy as follows:</p> <p>“Development within the Development Limits will be supported; development adjacent to the Development Limits will only be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh its adverse impacts.”</p>
		Policy IRS2	<p>Policy is too restrictive and inhibits appropriate innovation or change. Policy should be amended to reflect the proposed modification to Policy IRS1, as set out above. There is no evidence base to determine what is considered to be a 'significantly important' view and it is not been demonstrated that a selection process has been undertaken to reflect diversity and ambience set out in Annex V.</p> <p>Amendment to policy suggested as follows:</p> <p>1. Development proposals must recognise, respect and preserve <u>should take account of</u> the identity and rural setting of settlements, with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Scale and form of the development b) Density of the development c) Materials used in the development to reflect local character d) Tree and hedgerow planting that reinforces and reflects local biodiversity in the parishes e) The distinctive character of the varied landscape of the area

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			<p>Landscape and Important Views identified (refer Annex V)</p>
		Policy IRS3	<p>Principle of this policy is broadly consistent with national policy, but Part 1b) of the policy should be omitted as it repeats Policy CC03 in Wokingham Borough's Managing Development Delivery DPD.</p> <p>Part 2 of this policy refers to Map L, but neither the map nor the policy identifies designated Public Open Spaces. Policy lacks clarity and is considered unnecessary as it duplicates the requirements of paragraph 97 of the NPPF. Part 2 of the policy should be deleted, with the public open spaces referenced in the supporting text.</p> <p>Locally valued natural assets identified in Part 3 of the policy should be reference in the supporting text rather than policy.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to the policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals should conserve and enhance the natural environment and green spaces of the area, specifically: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Where possible</u>, ensure that there is a minimum loss of biodiversity and where possible to provide a net gain. Where there is likely to be a loss of biodiversity, mitigation measures should be put in place to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity, through the creation of like-for-like habitats. b) Take any opportunities to protect, enhance and extend wildlife corridors between existing open spaces and habitats as a means of mitigating the impacts of development on biodiversity. c) Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of lighting and mitigating the impact of external lighting. d) Contain measures that will help to mitigate the impacts of, and adapt to, climate change 2. Development on designated Public Open Spaces (see Map L) will not be permitted, Public open spaces currently available for recreational purposes include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Arborfield Park b) Junipers Field

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			<p>e) All SANGS</p> <p>d) The cricket and rugby pitches within the Arborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location</p> <p>3. Locally valued natural assets have been identified within the plan as follows (see Map K):</p> <p>a) The Coombes woodland and adjacent areas</p> <p>b) The Holt woodland</p> <p>Rhododendron avenue along Bearwood Road</p>
		Policy IRS4	<p>Comment suggests it is unnecessary to refer in the policy to the Arborfield Cross Conservation Area, Listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments, as the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and policies in Wokingham Borough's adopted Development Plan provide sufficient guidance for designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to the policy:</p> <p>1. Development proposals will need to demonstrate how they protect or enhance the historic and natural character of the area, specifically Where the character of non-designated heritage assets has been identified and would be affected by new development, proposals should demonstrate proportionate consideration of the following non-designated heritage assets:</p> <p>a) Arborfield Cross Conservation Area</p> <p>b) Chamberlain's Farm Area of Special Character</p> <p>c) The Barkham Street Area of Special Character</p> <p>d) The local historic environment, including the setting of Listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments and other historically significant buildings</p> <p>Comments suggesting that the Steering Group engage with WBC to seek the inclusion of the locally valued heritage assets identified in part 2 within WBC's local list.</p>
		Policy TC3	<p>Justification for the text included in the Plan relating to the protection of agricultural land, is unclear and does not meet criteria (e) of the basic conditions or conform to the development plan.</p> <p>Recommend Part 2 of this policy is deleted, as it is considered NPPF paragraph 170 provides adequate basis for</p>

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			the consideration of agricultural land value and that best and most versatile agricultural land should not be subject to blanket protection without weighing up the benefits of development.
		Policy AD1	Support with amendment: Incorporate a Statement of Community Consultation into any applications <u>where appropriate</u> .
		Policy AD2	Part 1 is broadly consistent with national policy. Part 2 introduces complexities which potentially prioritise local connection over need which is inconsistent with WBC's existing affordable housing assessment process. It is suggested the Steering Group engage with Wokingham Borough Council to explore the ability to ringfence affordable housing in practice and securing affordable housing for households with a local connection.
		Policy AD3	It is recommended that this policy is amended to remove reference to requiring 50% of sites where new housing is consented to be open space, including SANG. This requirement is contrary to Wokingham Borough's adopted Local Plan and is not based on a robust assessment of need in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Recommend Part 2 of the policy is deleted as the adopted Core Strategy and Policy TB08 of the Managing Development Delivery DPD provide open space requirements. Recommend Part 3 and 4 of the policy is also deleted, in the absence of any evidence justifying the proposed approach, or demonstrating that the provision of the proposed quantity of SANG is deliverable without compromising viability.
		Policy AD4	Support with amendment, to avoid the policy being overly prescriptive regarding design of new development, currently contrary to criteria (d) of the basis conditions: "All new developments should take account of their context must reflect the rural character and historic context of existing dwellings within the Plan Area . New development must deliver good quality design. In order to achieve this, all new development must wherever possible: a) Recognise, in the design of developments, the distinctive local character or the area and contribute sensitively in order to create dwellings of a high architectural and rural quality, referring to the published Village Design Statements.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			<p>b) Consider the density of any new development which must be in character with the surrounding area, respect the rural nature of the area and be designed to give an impression of spaciousness and variety with uniform houses and plots being avoided.</p> <p>c) Recognise possible impacts of climate change and consequently reflect sustainable development standards.</p> <p>Homes of three or more bedrooms should be designed to allow ground floor living for elderly or disabled people, <u>where appropriate</u>.</p>
		Policy AD5	<p>Comment suggests that it is unreasonable to request all elements to be fully addressed when a scheme, and details influencing flood risk management, will not be fully detailed at outline stage. Policy should be amended as follows:</p> <p>All elements <u>The principles</u> of flood risk management, including SuDS are fully addressed at the outline planning stage and, ideally, in pre-application discussions. This includes SuDS maintenance plans and funding for the lifetime of the development.</p>
		Policy GA1	Policy is considered unnecessary as it duplicates requirements set out in paragraph 108 of the NPPF.
		Policy GA2	Support the principle of this policy, but it should be made clear that the provision of safe crossings of major routes does not necessarily mean a signalised pedestrian crossing should be provided.
		Policy GA3	Support for this policy.
		General	The Plan's Annexes will need to be updated to ensure consistency with the draft plan, including Annex IV which refers to the requirement to prepare development briefs for sites of 0.4 hectares or more, subsequently removed from the draft Plan.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
15.	Barton Willmore obo University of Reading		Near identical response to that submitted on behalf of Reading FC – see summary contained at response 14.
16.	Pegasus obo Greystoke Land	General	<p>Plan is contrary to national policy and guidance as it does not plan to meet its own identified housing needs of approximately 900 homes over the plan period to 2036.</p> <p>The proposed development of 1,800 dwellings at Arborfield Garrison is to meet wider housing needs across the borough up to 2026 and not just the needs of the neighbourhood plan area; this should be acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Comment suggests additional sites are required in the Neighbourhood Plan area to meet local market and affordable housing needs for the period 2026-2036 over and above the Core Strategy Arborfield Garrison SDL.</p> <p>Site is promoted land south of School Lane as a suitable opportunity for housing development to meet local needs and should be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
		Policy IRS2	<p>Objection to this policy and associated protected views 2.1-2.4 which are in the vicinity of the site promoted. There are no statutory or local landscape designations that apply to these views and the area is designated as 'open countryside' on the Wokingham Borough Policies Map. The analysis of viewpoints 2.1 to 2.4 have been recorded from a motorist's perspective rather a pedestrian passing through the countryside.</p>
		Policy AD3	<p>Comment suggests that it is unreasonable for the Plan to suggest that land that may be suitable for development should be constrained to make best use of the site and potential development capacity, without clear evidence to justify the policy requirement.</p> <p>It is also considered unreasonable to compare open space requirements for all development sites with Arborfield Green, brought forward under Garden Village principles, as it may not be necessary for smaller sites to meet wider green infrastructure requirements.</p>
17.	Turley obo David Wilson Homes	General	The Neighbourhood Plan should not prejudice or predetermine any decisions which may be made by the Borough Council through the LPU. The plan should also not be prepared on the basis that its policies respond to the need arising solely within the designated Neighbourhood Area.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
		Policy IRS2	Evidence prepared by SLR has concluded that a number of the identified views should be removed and amendments should be made to the policy and accompanying text. References to the Green Belt set out in paragraph 4.15 of the plan should be deleted as the designation of land as Green Belt is not a reflection of its landscape quality or importance or of particular views.
18.	Linden Homes	Policy IRS1	Policy is not supported by evidence or a criteria-based assessment and is overly restrictive, contrary to national policy. Suggested amendment to the policy: “Development within the Development Limits will be supported, development adjacent to the Development Limits will only be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh its adverse impacts. This is necessary to allow the determining Authority to make an appropriate judgement by weighing up the planning balance”
		Policy IRS2	Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to paragraph 117 of the NPPF relating to the effective use of land. There is no need to repeat what is already in adopted policy.
		Policy IRS3/Policy AD3	Supportive of deletion of the arbitrary 50% open space requirement, but this should also be justified or removed in Policy AD3. Criteria 2 of this Policy is considered to be overly restrictive, as some forms of appropriate development can support or enhance open space.
		Policy AD1	Supportive of this policy, it is incorrect to state in Criteria 2 that proposals will receive more favourable consideration and is not a matter for policy.
		Policy AD4	Supportive of the principle of this policy and its consistency with the adopted Borough Design Guide, but it should be amended to avoid an overly prescriptive design approach.
Individual's comments			

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
19.	Tim Cox	General	Broadly supports the plan. Additional comments referring to the council's emerging Minerals and Waste Plan and a specific related planning application; not specifically related to the neighbourhood plan itself.
20.	Cllr Gary Cowan	General	Fully supportive of plan proposals.
21.	Harry Dunn	General	General comments around overdevelopment contributing to traffic impacts, lack of school and GP places; not specifically related to the plan itself.
22.	Marion Cherry	Para 7.10 (pg48)	Agreement that Church Lane has become busy and suggestion that this could become a 'one way' system. NB: outside the scope of the plan.
		General	General comments supportive of sympathetic development along Church Lane
23.	Barry Keech	General	Broad comments around current traffic impacts from existing planned developments and unsustainable existing growth; not specifically related to the plan itself.
24.	Thomas Sirs	General	General comments around overdevelopment, lack of affordability, traffic impact, economic impact, air pollution, and urban sprawl; not specifically related to the plan itself.
25.	Gill Powell	General	Fully supportive of plan proposals.
26.	John Egan	General	General comments relating to the inadequacy of existing local infrastructure and traffic congestion at Barkham and the surrounding area.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
27.	Paul Steel	General	Supportive of plan proposals and the commitment of the group. General comments around the biodiversity/ecological richness of the Coombes area and information regarding developments that has occurred within the site.
		IRS3 1.c)	Support with amendment: 'Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the avoidance of lighting <i>or other facilities likely to increase night time human presence</i> , and <i>by</i> mitigating the impact of external lighting.
		IRS3 3.	Support with amendment: 'Locally valued natural assets have been identified within the plan as follows (see Map K). <i>Development on these sites will not be permitted:</i>
		General	Typographical errors highlighted.
28.	Julie Charlton	General	General comment relating to the lack of purpose built homes for the elderly, and those seeking to downsize from larger homes and traffic congestion along Church Lane. Comment identifies an opportunity to promote land for purpose built accommodation for the elderly and a small shop for residents.
29.	Kevin Batson	General	General comment relating to development in Wokingham and local character and problems with existing infrastructure in the area.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
30.	Adele Graham	General	Fully supportive of the plan's proposals.
31.	Chris and Rakesh Nagpaul	General	Wokingham area has been over-developed so there is no separation between settlements and the existing infrastructure is inadequate; not specifically related to the plan itself.
32.	Liz Connolly	General comment	Fully supportive of the plan's proposals.
33.	Robert King	General	Supports the plan proposals in general. Comments submitted to the Steering Group in July 2018 are not contained in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement.
		Policy IRS3	<p>The policy only lists three identified assets. Specific policies should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan for Coombes woodland and the other assets specified.</p> <p>Two options could be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. designate the assets instead as local green spaces, add them to those specified in Policy IRS3.2 (a) to (d) 2. reflect in Policy IRS3 the phraseology used in Policy IRS3.2 by inserting 'Development of locally-valued natural assets will not be permitted.....', before its first sentence
34.	S Armitage	General	'Oppose the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
35.	Peter Matthews	General	Supportive of the plan proposals with modifications – these being less housing development; not specifically related to the plan itself.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
36.	Roderick Stevens	General	Supportive of the plan proposals. General comments around overdevelopment, lack of affordability, traffic impact, air pollution, the need to protect green spaces; not specifically related to the plan itself.
37.	S Deveson	General	General comments that the plan is too detailed to comment on specifically. General comments around overdevelopment, housing for local people, preservation of green / recreational spaces. Comments about the need to consider air quality, health service provision.
38.	Graham Wilkins	General	Opposes the plan. General comments about overdevelopment across the borough and the need to preserve market town character, and friendly community; not specifically related to the plan itself.
39.	Paul Miller	General	'Oppose the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
40.	Susan Edwards	General	Opposes the plan. General comments that government housing targets are too high for the area and these should be reduced.
41.	Eoin Igoe	General	'Support the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
42.	Chris and Laura Heyliger	General	Supportive of plan proposals which reflect the countryside character of the area and which seek to protect the area's heritage, natural environment, and separation of settlements.
43.	Russell Bennison	General	'Oppose the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
44.	M Arris	General	Supportive of plan proposals, particularly around the issue of protecting the rural character of the area.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
45.	Robert Poole	General	Opposes the plan. Broad comments around current traffic impacts from past and existing planned developments and worsening infrastructure; not specifically related to the plan itself.
46.	Phiala Mehring	Drainage and sewerage	Supportive of plan proposals. Specific comments provided that flooding needs to be placed at the heart of planning to ensure effective management and ensure development does not increase future flood risk.
47.	Stewart Young	General	Opposes the plan. General comments around the erosion of the semi rural character of the area, unsustainable increase in housing construction, and inability of road and utilities infrastructure to match housing growth.
48.	Richard Lloyd	General	'Support the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
49.	Deborah Frost	Policies AD1, 2, 3	Supportive of plan proposals subject to modifications – these being that the plan should restrict further housing for the period up to and beyond 2036 given that the parishes of Arborfield and Barkham have taken their share of housing through the SDL.
		TC3	Support expressed for small and sustainable businesses. Additional comments referring to a specific mM Minerals related planning application; not specifically related to the plan itself.
50.	Peter McSweeney	Para 2.3	Supportive of maintaining settlement separation.
		Para 5.8	General comments around the planned neighbourhood centre (through the WBC development plan) and this being delivered as planned.
		Para 6.28	Support for additional houses for older people.
		Para 7.12	Comments that rural roads cannot cope with further development which would be unsustainable.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
51.	Caroline Lavelle	General	Supportive of the plan proposals. General comments that the plan helps to mitigate the threat of additional housing beyond that committed through the SDL.
52.	Graham Powell	General	Supportive of plan proposals, specifically the value placed on landscape character and balance between supporting appropriate development and retaining open space.
53.	John Duffy	General	'Support the plan' option ticked – no additional comments provided.
54.	David Bunney	General	General comments around government housing targets and current planned overdevelopment of countryside and green space with the need to retain recreational use of the countryside. Comments around impact on traffic, and services by increased development. Comments around introducing quantitative density and developable area requirements for any given area to prevent urbanisation.
55.	Barry Thorne	General	Supportive of the plan proposals and comments that the plan presents a thoughtful and balanced approach to future development.
56.	Ken Lane	General	Supportive of plan proposals – comments that the plan complements the NPPF and is an excellent basis for sustainable future development which complements the 'climate emergency' declared by the council. Comments that the plan reflects the views of residents through extensive consultation; principally that existing character should be retained and means of addressing traffic congestion implemented.
57.	Michael Heard	General	Supportive of plan proposals – specifically landscape and heritage aspects. General comments that the area has absorbed its fair share of housing to date.
58.	Frank Connolly	General	Supportive of the plan proposals – general comments around overdevelopment, specifically in relation to bequeathed land.
59.	Beverley Dipper	General	Supportive of the plan proposals and the tone of the plan,
60.	Gary Hammond	General	Fully supportive of plan proposals.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
61.	Kenneth and Jean Bell	General	Supportive of plan proposals – specifically retention of settlement separation, protection of green spaces, and promoting access across the plan area.
62.	Oliver Jones	General	Supportive of plan proposals – specifically the focus on preserving rural character in light of overdevelopment, as well as supportive of the plan’s identification of key local heritage assets, and comments surrounding Church Lane.
Parish / town councils			
63.	Woodley Town Council	General	No comments
64.	Arborfield & Newland Parish Council	General comment	Recognises the amount of work that has gone into the plan which generally represents an excellent document that accurately captures the needs of the area and includes policies that should positively shape future development.
		General comment	Statement that housing developers prioritise (and have admitted to doing so) more profitable larger houses. However it is fair to also recognise the significant number of smaller properties that have been constructed in the area, including 200 rental apartments.
		Policy AD1	Supportive of the principle of containing new development to within the current Development Limits. It is expected that these be retained for the life of the Neighbourhood Plan.
		Policy TC1	The list of community assets is non-exhaustive. It is recommended that the following additional community assets are included: Pound Copse, Arborfield Park, The Old Churchyard Site at Hall Farm, The Arborfield war Memorial, Arborfield Green Pavilion.
		General comment	The Plan, including Policies IRS2 and IRS3, are silent on the protection of trees.
		Policy IRS3	The locally valued natural assets should be expanded to include those additional assets listed above in response to TC1.
65.	Barkham Parish Council	General comment	Supportive of the plan’s proposals, including reference to the Resident’s Survey in Annex III. Parish Council welcome recognition, in the Landscape and Important Views Report, for the importance that some countryside is left for future generations to enjoy.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
			Barkham Parish Council welcome reference to the provision of a medical centre on the Arborfield Garrison SDL to serve existing and new residents.
66.	David Cornish obo Finchampstead Parish Council	IRS1	Supportive subject to modifications – Additional reference should be made to preserving a green gap along Barkham Ride i.e. preserving openness to the parish of Finchampstead.
		IRS3	Additional reference should be made to protecting California Country Park adjoining the NP area.
		7.10 (C)	Fully supportive of references to the risks to Commonfield Lane and the need to retain its rural character.
		Policy GA2 and para 7.15	Additional references should be included to joining up walking and cycling routes between Arborfield and Barkham and Finchampstead parish and beyond.
67.	Swallowfield Parish Council	General	Fully supportive of the plan proposals. More explicit policy reference should be made to ‘cross-border’ co-operation with other parish councils.
Other organisations			
68.	Stewart Richardson obo Barkham Village Residents Association (BVRA).	General	Summary provided of the key issues raised from the survey of local residents undertaken in autumn 2016 covering the protection of gaps between settlements, locally important views, community facilities (medical centre at Arborfield Green), housing for local needs and traffic congestion in Barkham and the surrounding area.