

To all members of Planning & Highways Committee

Notice is hereby given and you are summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on Wednesday 8th October 2025, at the School Green Centre, RG2 9EH, commencing 19:30.



Bruce Winton
Chief Executive and Clerk to the Parish Council
3rd October 2025

Members: Cllrs Boyer, Hoyle, Jahromi, James, Lias, Masseron and Peer (Chair)

Agenda

1. Public Questions

- 1.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** public questions

2. Apologies and declaration of members' interests

- 2.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** approval of apologies for absence
2.2 To **RECEIVE** members' declarations of interest

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 3.1 To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 10th September 2025 as a correct record of the meeting and to authorise the Chair to sign the same*
3.2 To **CONSIDER** matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 10th September 2025

4. Schedule of Deposited Plans

- 4.1 Planning applications are being reviewed weekly. Plans deposited following the most recent Thursday planning email which require urgent attention will be forwarded as received
4.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the decision for planning application 233038 - Land East of Hayes Drive of 3 Mile Cross*

5. Appeals

- 5.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** planning inspectorate appeals relating to Shinfield Parish*

6. Enforcement Notices

- 6.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Closed Enforcements tables for September 2025** (for information only)
- 6.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Outstanding Enforcements tables for September 2025** (for information only)

7. Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

- 7.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal report on Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters
- 7.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update regarding the Clerk's letter to the Traffic Commissioners
- 7.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update regarding cars driving across the footpath between School Green Centre and Beke Avenue

8. Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 8.1 To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the terms of Reference for Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party**
- 8.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** a verbal update regarding fee proposals received for the renewal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan
- 8.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update on registering Assets of Community Value

9. Correspondence

- 9.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** any correspondence received.

10. Future Meetings

- 10.1 To **NOTE** the next meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee meeting is Wednesday, 5th November 2025

* indicates papers attached

** indicates papers to follow



Clerk: Bruce Winton
 School Green Centre
 School Green
 Reading
 Berkshire
 RG2 9EH
 Tel: (0118) 988 8220
 E-mail:
clerk@shinfieldparish.gov.uk
www.shinfieldparish.gov.uk

Minutes of a meeting of
Planning & Highways Committee
Held on Wednesday 10th September 2025
At School Green Centre commencing at 19:30

Present: Cllrs Boyer (Vice-Chair), James, Lias, and Masseron

Attending: S Herring (Deputy Clerk)
 R Emberson-Poole (Customer Care Team Member)

1 member of the public

Cllr Boyer, as Vice-Chair of the Committee chaired the meeting in the absence of Cllr Peer, Chair.

25/PC/86 Public Questions

86.1 To receive and consider public questions.

A member of the public requested to raise a question in relation to Footpath 12 from Lidl to Hollow Lane. This was discussed under minute 25/PC/92 Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matter.

25/PC/87 Apologies and declarations of Members' Interest

87.1 Apologies had been received from Cllr Hoyle, Jahromi and Peer and B Winton, Chief Executive Officer and Clerk to the Parish Council

87.2 There were no declarations of members' interests

25/PC/88 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

88.1 The minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 9th July 2025 were approved and signed as such by Cllr Boyer

Proposed: Cllr James
 Seconded: Cllr Lias
 Approved: Cllr Unanimously

88.2 **Actions and Matters Arising from the meeting held on 9th July**

- 25/PC/75.1** ➤ Clerk to pass on details of the next meeting of the Shinfield Meadows residents group to the members of public present at the meeting

This had been done.

- Clerk to arrange for the residents' petition to be published in the next SPC newsletter

This had been done.

- Clerk to investigate when the road would be adopted by WBC

The Clerk had requested this information from Chris Howard, WBC on 21st August and was still awaiting a response

- Council to consider including relevant traffic improvements in the Neighbourhood Development Plan

This would be discussed at the Neighbourhood Development Plan working party.

- Residents to contact Yuan Yang, MP and the Borough Councillors to raise awareness of safety concerns of the roads around the Shinfield Meadows estate

Residents were present at the meeting. There had been no further feedback. It was reported that BCllr Gray was raising this with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC).

25/PC/77.2

- 25/PC/53.5** Clerk to raise the issue of a taxi operation at Bismillah House with the Transport Commissioner

The Clerk had reported this to the Transport Commissioner on 7th August and was awaiting a response.

ACTION – Deputy Clerk to add to the agenda of the next meeting.

- 25/PC/57.3** Clerk to report back once he had received a response from WBC regarding the proposal for a Spencers Wood Village Centre

The Deputy Clerk reported on correspondence received from Chris Easton, WBC that was far from positive. Cllr Masseron requested that the proposed Spencers Wood Village Centre be included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and pointed out that the council were not proposing increasing facilities, just relocating existing ones.

Members of the committee **AGREED** that this be delayed for the time being.

- 25/PC/78.1** ➤ Clerk to feedback the Committee's requests for items to be considered in the budget process for 2026/27 to the Finance and General Purposes Committee

This would be done

- Clerk and Cllr Peer to bring forward costings for a monitoring officer

A cross Council meeting was held on 19th August. Initial discussion with WBC about full engagement on Loddon Garden Village Monitoring would need to take place. It was suggested that time for clarifying what was required be scheduled and presented to the meeting in October prior to a request for approval at Finance and General Purposes Committee.

The Deputy Clerk reported that Stephen Conway, WBC had been invited to the next meeting of ALIGN on 2nd October 2025.

ACTION –

- Clerk to arrange a meeting to clarify with members of the committee what would be required from a monitoring officer
- Clerk to add to the agenda of the next meeting of Planning and Highways Committee

- 25/PC/79.2** Deputy Clerk to respond to the PA250005 reinforcing the previous objection of the Council and requesting that appropriate party wall rights had been obtained

Comments had been submitted. This had now been approved.

- 25/PC/79.3** Deputy Clerk to submit an objection to PA251536, 14 Grovelands Road, based on Cllr Lias comments

Cllr Boyer declared an interest, as a neighbour of the property concerned.

Comments had been submitted.

Cllr Boyer reported that WBC had requested that the application be resubmitted as change of use.

- 25/PC/82.1** ➤ Presentation by Jules Shaw, UoR on pump tracks to be added to the agenda of the next Facilities Committee meeting

This will be on the agenda for the October Facilities Committee meeting. Members of the Planning and Highways Committee to be invited to attend the presentation.

ACTION –

- Deputy Clerk to set up a pre-meeting to discuss the proposal for a pump track prior to the next Facilities Committee meeting
- Deputy Clerk to invite members of the Planning and Highways Committee to the presentation by Jules Shaw, UoR on pump tracks prior to the next Facilities Committee meeting

- Clerk to carry out a search to find out who owns the land for the Hyde End Lane footpath via the Land Registry

ACTION – This item would be carried forward to the next meeting

25/PC/82.2 Deputy Clerk to add Woodcock Lane to the next agenda of the committee

This was on the agenda – see minute 25/PC/92.3

25/PC/83.2 Clerk to apply for Assets of Community Value for the Manor Ground Pavilion and land; High Copse Pavilion and land; and land adjacent to Alder Grove School

The Clerk will proceed with this action on return from annual leave.

25/PC/89

Schedule of Deposited Plans

89.1 Planning applications were circulated to members weekly and comments noted on the WBC planning portal.

89.2 Planning application 233038 – Land east of Hayes Drive of 3 Mile Cross.

Members **NOTED** that the decision had been delayed to 30th September 2025

89.3 Planning Application 242598 for the fitness Centre at Millworth Lane

Following an objection from Sport England, the Clerk had spoken to them to explain the current plans for the fitness centre and they had agreed to withdraw their objection. Revised plans had been submitted and the deadline for comments was 12th September.

ACTION – Cllr Johnson to speak to BCllr Rance regarding her objection to the application.

89.4 Planning Application 241861-Spencers Wood Primary School

Conditional approval had now been received for the Spencers Wood Primary School.

25/PC/90

Appeals

90.1 Planning inspectorate appeals relating to Shinfield Parish

There was one change this month. Planning application 240307 Front Plot At Shinfield Court Three Mile Cross – appeal decided in favour of the Plymouth Brethren. SPC had objected to this application.

25/PC/91

Enforcement Notices

91.1 Closed Enforcements tables for August and September 2025

- 15 cases were deemed no breach
- 1 case – application submitted
- 2 cases – voluntary compliance
- 1 case – Notice served
- 2 cases – other

Members **NOTED** the report

91.2 Outstanding Enforcements tables for August and September 2025

There were six cases new to the committee

- two showing as a new case (37 Caribou Walk and 3 Simonds Grove)
- one showing as a new case in August was subsequently deemed 'no breach' (262 Hyde End Road)
- three cases showing investigation ongoing (1 Woodsend Close and two for Shire Hall)

Members **NOTED** the report

25/PC/92

Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

92.1 Footpath matters

Cllr Masseron had submitted a written report that was circulated with the agenda. The main points were:-

- The signposting on Bolton Drive/Beke Avenue and Fulbrook Avenue had been delayed by WBC.
- The University of Reading (UoR) had carried out a surface upgrade on Footpath 16.
- The University of Reading (UoR) had carried out a surface upgrade on Footpath 15
- Shinfield Volunteers Group had removed a tree stump from footpath 13.

92.2 A member of the public raised concern about a fire to a tree on the footpath 12 from Lidl to Hollow Lane and continuing anti-social behaviour (ASB). Pictures were submitted showing rubbish that had been collected by the SVG showing empty bottles of alcohol. The path was in a poor state, was unlit and secluded making it an attractive area for groups gathering and engaging in ASB. There were three protected trees along the path that restricted work to improve the path. WBC had stated that they did not know when the path would be upgraded.

The member of public requested Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) to sponsor a project to make the area less attractive to those involved in ASB. The path was used to access the number 3 bus and school buses.

Suggestions put forward for improvements were:-

- a) Improved lighting
- b) Removal of all unnecessary foliage
- c) Improvement to the path up to Hollow Lane

Cllr Lias pointed out that this was the responsibility of WBC.

SPC were not against supporting improvements, however, there would need to be a formal proposal. It was noted that no funding was approved at this meeting.

ACTION – Member of public to put forward a formal proposal for further consideration

92.3 Update on Woodcock Lane, Footpath 25, Three Mile Cross

An online meeting was held on 10th July with Laura Buck and Andy Glencross, WBC, Cllrs Hoyle, Lias, BCllr Glover and the Deputy Clerk.

There was a process for reclassification of the path from a BOAT to a Bridleway via a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO). Laura had sent the appropriate forms for completion if the Committee wished to go ahead with this process, however, it was explained that there needed to be justification for the change. Evidence needed to be gathered by speaking to local people with the submission of written evidence of usage, sourcing historical records followed by a consultation. If there was an objection it would need to be presented to the Planning Inspectorate. Lengthy timescales are involved with an estimated timescale of 2027-2028 before it was likely to be resolved.

It was evident that this would be a lengthy piece of work that was not considered a priority at the current time.

25/PC/93

Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan (SPNDP)

93.1 Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

The next meeting was scheduled for 25th September 2025 at 19:30. It was reported that the current plan did not have an end date but would lose its purpose if it deviated too far from the Local Plan.

It had been agreed to obtain expert advice and the Clerk was obtaining quotes for a consultant. The cost would require Full Council approval.

93.2 Assets of Community Value (ACV)

The Clerk would proceed with applying for Assets of Community Value for the Manor Ground Pavilion and land; High Copse Pavilion and land; and land adjacent to Alder Grove School on his return from annual leave.

ACTION – Clerk to apply for Assets of Community Value for the Manor Ground Pavilion and land; High Copse Pavilion and land; and land adjacent to Alder Grove School

25/PC/94 Spencers Wood Village Centere

94.1 This had been previously covered under minute 25/PC/88.2 (57.3)

25/PC/95 Correspondence

95.1 Outline planning application was due to be submitted for 90 new homes on a proposed development by City and Country to the east of Trowes Lane, Swallowfield.

Members **NOTED** the information.

95.2 Royal Elm Park Development

An invitation had been received to attend a VIP reception on 2 October 2025 from 12:30 to 13:30 in the Directors Suite at the Select Car Leasing Stadium to view the next phase of the plans for the Royal Elm Park.

The Royal Elm Park development secured outline planning permission in 2018, reserved matters approval is now being sought for the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale details linked to Phase 5 of the Hybrid Planning Permission.

ACTION – Deputy Clerk to circulate the invitation to members of the committee

95.3 Charvil Neighbourhood Plan consultation

CLlr Lias had drawn attention to an article in The Reading Chronicle dated 3rd September regarding the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan.

ACTION – Members to read through the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan and report back on any observations

95.4 Solar Canopies at MereOak Park and Ride

SPC had received a communication from David Smith, Development and Planning Manager – Commercial property, WBC setting out information relating to a prior Approval Notification for the installation of solar canopies over the existing parking bays at MereOak Park and Ride.

“The proposal supports the Council’s Climate Emergency Action Plan, contributing to local renewable energy generation and reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The site is already identified for this purpose in the CEAP.

ACTION – Members were invited to comment on the notification

25/PC/96

Date of the next meeting

96.1 The date of the next meeting will be Wednesday, 8th October 2025

The meeting ended at 21:00

List of actions

25/PC/82.2

25/PC/78.1	➤ Clerk to arrange a meeting to clarify with members of the committee what would be required from a monitoring officer	Clerk
	➤ Clerk to add to the agenda of the next meeting of Planning and Highways Committee an item to discuss a monitoring officer for the LGV development	Clerk
25/PC/82.1	➤ Deputy Clerk to set up a pre-meeting to discuss the proposal for a pump track prior to the next Facilities Committee meeting	Deputy Clerk
	➤ Deputy Clerk to invite members of the Planning and Highways Committee to the presentation by Jules Shaw, UoR on pump tracks prior to the next Facilities Committee meeting	Deputy Clerk
	➤ Clerk to carry out a search to find out who owns the land for the Hyde End Lane footpath via the Land Registry	Clerk
25/PC/89.3	Cllr Johnson to speak to BCllr Rance regarding her objection to Planning Application 242598 for the fitness centre at Millworth Lane	Cllr Johnson
25/PC/93.2	Clerk to apply for Assets of Community Value for the Manor Ground Pavilion and land; High Copse Pavilion and land; and land adjacent to Alder Grove School	Clerk
25/PC/95.2	Deputy Clerk to circulate the invitation to attend a VIP reception on 2 nd October 2025 regarding the Royal Elm Park Development to members of the committee	Deputy Clerk
25/PC/95.3	Members to read through the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan and report back on any observations	All members of the committee
25/PC/95.4	Members were invited to comment on the notification regarding Solar Canopies at MereOak Park and Ride	All members of the committee



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Mr Douglas Bond
The Mitfords, Basingstoke Road
Three Mile Cross
Reading
RG7 1AT

Our ref: APP/X0360/W/24/3354607
Your ref: 233038

22 September 2025

Dear Douglas Bond,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78
APPEAL MADE BY WATES DEVELOPMENTS LTD
LAND EAST OF HAYES DRIVE AND NORTH OF CHURCH LANE, THREE MILE
CROSS, READING, BERKSHIRE
APPLICATION REF: 233038**

This decision was made by the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, Matthew Pennycook MP, on behalf of the Secretary of State

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI, who held a public local inquiry between 25 February and 11 March 2025 into your client's appeal against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council to refuse your client's application for outline application for the proposed erection of up to 148 dwellings together with associated infrastructure including public open space, with access only to be considered, in accordance with application Ref. 233038, dated 5 December 2023.
2. On 20 February 2025, this appeal was recovered for the Secretary of State's determination, in pursuance of section 79 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 6 to, the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990.

Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision

3. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be dismissed, and planning permission refused.
4. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions, except where stated, and agrees with her recommendation. He has decided to dismiss the appeal and refuse planning permission. The Inspector's Report (IR) is attached. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

Environmental Statement

5. In reaching this position, the Secretary of State has taken into account the Environmental Statement which was submitted under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Having taken account of the Inspector's comments at IR5.1, the Secretary of State is satisfied that the Environmental Statement complies with the above Regulations and that sufficient information has been provided for him to assess the environmental impact of the proposal.

Procedural matters

6. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on flood risk matters was updated on 17 September 2025. Revised paragraph 27 states where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied.
7. The Secretary of State considers the proposed development meets these criteria, and the sequential flood test need not be applied. However, given a flood sequential test for the proposed development was submitted and passed, and taking into account his conclusions at paragraphs 18 and 31 of this letter, the Secretary of State considers the proposal is acceptable in flood risk terms regardless of whether the application of the sequential test is required.
8. Therefore, the Secretary of State does not consider the revised guidance raises any matters that would require him to refer back to the parties for further representations prior to reaching his decision on this appeal, and he is satisfied that no interests have thereby been prejudiced.

Matters arising since the close of the inquiry

9. A list of representations which have been received since the inquiry is at Annex A. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the issues raised do not affect his decision, and no new issues were raised in this correspondence to warrant further investigation or necessitate additional referrals back to parties. Copies of these letters may be obtained on request to the email address at the foot of the first page of this letter.

Policy and statutory considerations

10. In reaching his decision, the Secretary of State has had regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
11. In this case the development plan consists of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (CS) (adopted January 2010), the Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) (adopted February 2014), the Shinfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) (made January 2017), the Central and Eastern Berkshire Minerals and Waste Plan (adopted January 2023), and Saved Policy NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (saved February 2013).

12. The Secretary of State considers that relevant development plan policies include those set out at IR6.4-6.23.
13. Other material considerations which the Secretary of State has taken into account include the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published on 12 December 2024 and updated on 7 February 2025, and associated planning guidance (the Guidance), as well as other documents including:
- Land South of the M4 Strategic Development Location Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted October 2011) (IR6.24);
 - Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment (November 2019);
 - The Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019.

Emerging plan

14. The emerging plan comprises The Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update 2023-2040. The Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update 2023-2040: Proposed Submission Plan was submitted for examination on 28 February 2025. The Secretary of State considers that the emerging policies of most relevance to this case includes Policy SS7 (IR6.25).
15. Paragraph 49 of the Framework states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: (1) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan; (2) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies in the emerging plan; and (3) the degree of consistency of relevant policies to the policies in the Framework. Having regard to the stage of preparation, the Secretary of State agrees with parties that the policies in the emerging Local Plan should be given limited weight (IR7.1), and has proceeded on that basis.

Main issues

The effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the countryside.

16. For the reasons given at IR15.1-15.10, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that whilst key landscape features would be retained and enhanced, their context would be dramatically altered by replacing open fields with a housing estate, that the hedges would appear as being submerged in ditches which would detract from their current visual value (IR15.4), and that attractive countryside landscape would be lost (IR15.8). He agrees with the Inspector at IR15.1 that the settlement boundary is out of date, and therefore considers that the relevant policies do not carry full weight. He further agrees that the settlements of Three Mile Cross, Reading and Shinfield would remain separate and there would be no conflict with point 5 of CS Policy CP19 in terms of coalescence (IR15.6).
17. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector at IR15.10 that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the countryside, and that this harm attracts significant weight. He further agrees that it would conflict with CS Policies CP1, CP3 and CP11, and MDD Policies CC02, CC03 and TB21.

The effect upon surface drainage

18. For the reasons given at IR15.12-15.18, the Secretary of State agrees that given the drainage difficulties of the site, a pumped solution is acceptable; that the appellant has demonstrated that the site can be drained satisfactorily; and that there is no other viable option at present (IR15.17). He further agrees that the proposal would not have an adverse effect upon surface water drainage and would not conflict with MDD Policy CC10, SNP Policy 8, or paragraph 182 of the Framework.

The safety and wellbeing of future residents of the proposed development, and the wider public, with regard to the proximity of the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) site at Burghfield (AWE(B))

19. For the reasons given at IR15.19-15.58, the Secretary of State agrees that the likelihood of a radiation emergency is very low (IR15.26), but even though the potential radiation dose is unlikely to be physically harmful, people might be anxious and worried about being exposed to radiation, and getting caught up in a nuclear emergency could have a negative impact on people's mental health (IR15.32).
20. The Secretary of State agrees that the demand on Blue Light services and other public services would be greater than usual in the event of a nuclear incident, that additional population adds to demand (IR15.36) and that whilst not every single aspect of the Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP) is affected by population changes, it cannot be said that the whole of the OSEP is not affected by population changes (IR15.47). He further agrees at IR15.39 that it cannot be assumed that everyone on the site would have enough food and provisions in their home to last up to 48 hours of sheltering, and that people who are not normally particularly vulnerable can become much more vulnerable if they do not have what they need. He agrees that this would put pressure on support agencies or it could result in people suffering if they do not get the necessary support (IR15.39), and further agrees that activating the OSEP would also divert other public resources (IR15.43).
21. The Secretary of State has taken into account the appellant's comments that there is no evidence that Blue Light services would not cope with the additional demand, but agrees with the Inspector that the appellant has not provided substantive quantitative evidence that the Blue Light services would cope with demand without other duties being affected (IR15.36). He shares the Inspector's lack of confidence that people in non-contaminated parts of the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) would be released as quickly as the appellant suggests (IR15.41). He has also taken into account the appellant's offer to provide monitoring stations on the appeal site but agrees with the Inspector that the proposed condition would not meet the relevant tests (IR15.44). He further agrees that it is the circumstances today that must be taken into account (IR15.48), and that it is not for this appeal to judge whether or not the OSEP has incorporated an unnecessary amount of population (IR15.50).
22. Like the Inspector, the Secretary of State gives great weight to the evidence of the ONR's witnesses and to the ONR Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019 (REPPIR) witness's professional view that he had no confidence that the OSEP is adequate (IR15.53). He agrees that the OSEP is already under significant pressure, and that the appeal Scheme, cumulative with approximately 301 consented but

unbuilt units to come forward in the DEPZ (IR15.54), would unacceptably add to the existing pressure (IR15.54).

23. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees at IR15.55 that although there is a tiny chance of an accident occurring, the consequences would be significant throughout the DEPZ as a whole; that the radiation dose at the appeal site is highly unlikely to cause physical harm but there could well be psychological harm; and there may also be harm resulting from the shelter period; and that there would be many resources required in an emergency which would be diverted from elsewhere and there would undoubtedly be strain on Blue Light and other public services. Like the Inspector, he concludes that the appeal proposal would cause an unacceptable risk of harm to the safety and wellbeing of future residents of the proposed development, and the wider public (IR15.58, IR15.67). He considers that this carries substantial weight against the proposal.

The future capability and capacity of AWE(B) to operate effectively

24. The Secretary of State has taken into account that the nuclear deterrent is critical to UK defence policy, and that AWE(B) is essential for the delivery of Continuous at Sea Defence (CASD) which has been a cornerstone of the defence of the UK for over 6 decades. He agrees that the current global security landscape is reinforcing the criticality of that capability. For the reasons given at IR15.59-15.65, the Secretary of State agrees at IR15.59 that if the ONR were to declare the OSEP inadequate, then AWE(B) would not be able to operate, and that the consequences of AWE(B) not being able to operate would be very serious in terms of national security.
25. He notes that while an exemption from the REPPiR is a possibility, the evidence before him is that there is no history of an exemption being used for sites such as AWE, such exemptions are only normally applied at times of extreme national emergency, and an exempted site would still need adequate off-site emergency planning in place (IR15.61). He agrees that an exemption should not be relied upon as a fall back (IR15.62). The Secretary of State further agrees at IR15.63 that if AWE could not operate because the OSEP had become inadequate, it would have an economic impact too, as it is a significant employer in the area.
26. The Secretary of State agrees at IR15.67 that the future capability and capacity of AWE(B) to operate effectively would be at an unacceptable risk. Given its critical importance for national security, he considers that this carries very substantial weight. He further agrees that the proposal would be contrary to MDD Policy TB04 and paragraphs 102(b) and 200 of the Framework (IR15.67).

Other matters

27. For the reasons given at IR15.69-15.72, the Secretary of State agrees at IR15.72 that the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Grade II Listed Building known as The Thatch; that the development of these fields would cause some harm to the setting of the building; and that the overall harm to the significance of the asset would be less than substantial and at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm. He therefore considers that the proposal conflicts with MDD Policy TB24. In line with paragraph 212 of the Framework, he considers the harm to this designated heritage asset carries great weight.
28. In line with the heritage balance set out at paragraph 215 of the Framework, the Secretary of State has considered whether the identified 'less than substantial' harm to

the significance of the designated heritage asset is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Taking into account the public benefits of the proposal as identified in this decision letter, overall he considers that the public benefits of the appeal scheme are collectively sufficient to outbalance the identified 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Building. He considers that the balancing exercise under paragraph 215 of the Framework is therefore favourable to the proposal.

29. The Secretary of State is the Competent Authority for the purposes of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and for the reasons set out at IR15.73 and Annex E of the IR, he agrees with the Inspector that he is required to make an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of that plan or project on the integrity of any affected European site in view of each site's conservation objectives. That site is the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The Secretary of State agrees with the assessment and findings in Annex E of the IR. He therefore adopts Annex E as the necessary Appropriate Assessment in his role as the Competent Authority on this matter, and agrees that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites.
30. For the reasons given at IR15.74-15.77, the Secretary of State agrees that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is triggered (IR15.74). He further agrees that in the circumstances of this case, including the Council's housing land supply of 1.7 years, the addition of 148 homes to the supply of housing carries very significant weight. He further agrees at IR15.77 that given the serious problem of affordability in the area and a persistent unmet need for affordable housing, the proposed affordable housing carries very significant weight.
31. The Secretary of State agrees at IR15.78 that whilst the housing would be in a sustainable location in respect of being close to local amenities and employment, a sustainable location is an expectation of the planning system and so carries neutral weight. He further agrees at IR15.79 that the preservation of trees and hedgerows carries neutral weight as removing them would be harmful; that their long-term management, including the removal of waterlogging (which is bad for them) carries a small amount of weight; and that the surface water drainage of the site would, to some extent, help to reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere and that this carries a small amount of weight.
32. The Secretary of State agrees at IR15.80 that the provision of Public Open Space carries a small amount of weight, and agrees at IR15.81 that 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) carries a small amount of weight. He further agrees at IR15.82 that the combined sustainability improvements, comprising new and upgraded cycleways, footways and crossing points, and a financial contribution to bus provision, carry a very small amount of weight.
33. The Secretary of State agrees at IR15.83 that there would be economic benefits to the proposal in terms of employment during the construction period and has taken into account that a planning obligation encourages the use of local labour. He agrees that the economic benefits carry a small amount of weight, and has included the expenditure of future residents in local shops and businesses (IR15.84) within this weighting.
34. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions at IR15.85-87.

Planning conditions

35. The Secretary of State has had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR14.1-14.7, the recommended conditions set out at the end of the IR and the reasons for them, and to

national policy in paragraph 57 of the Framework and the relevant Guidance. He is satisfied that the conditions recommended by the Inspector comply with the policy test set out at paragraph 57 of the Framework. However, he does not consider that the imposition of these conditions would overcome his reasons for dismissing this appeal and refusing planning permission.

Planning obligations

36. The Secretary of State has had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR14.8-14.11, the planning obligation dated 31 March 2025, paragraph 58 of the Framework, the Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, as amended. For the reasons given at IR14.8-14.11, he agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the obligation complies with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 and the tests at paragraph 58 of the Framework. However, the Secretary of State does not consider that the obligation overcomes his reasons for dismissing this appeal and refusing planning permission.

Planning balance and overall conclusion

37. For the reasons given above, the Secretary of State considers that the appeal scheme is not in accordance with Policies CS CP1, CP3, CP11, and MDD CC02, CC03, TB04, TB21 and TB24, and is not in accordance with the development plan overall. He has gone on to consider whether there are material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in line with the development plan.

38. As the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework indicates that planning permission should be granted unless: (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

39. Weighing in favour of the proposal is the contribution to the housing land supply and the provision of affordable housing, which each carry very significant weight; the long term management of trees and hedgerows, surface water drainage of the site, provision of Public Open Space, BNG, and economic benefits, which each carry a small amount of weight; and sustainability improvements which carry a very small amount of weight.

40. Weighing against the proposal is the unacceptable risk to the future capability and capacity of AWE(B) to operate effectively, which carries very substantial weight; the unacceptable risk of harm to the safety and wellbeing of future residents of the proposed development and the wider public, which carries substantial weight; harm to the character and appearance of the countryside, which carries significant weight; and the less than substantial harm (lower end) to a Grade II listed building, which carries great weight.

41. The Secretary of State has concluded that the heritage balancing exercise under paragraph 215 of the Framework is favourable to the proposal.

42. The Secretary of State considers that there are no policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance which provide a strong reason for refusing the

development proposed. However, He considers that the adverse impacts of granting permission, including the unacceptable risk to the future capability and capacity of AWE(B) to operate effectively and the implications for national security, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. The presumption in favour of sustainable development therefore does not apply.

43. Overall, in applying s.38(6) of the PCPA 2004, the Secretary of State considers that the conflict with the development plan and the material considerations in this case indicate that permission should be refused.

44. The Secretary of State therefore concludes that the appeal is dismissed and planning permission refused.

Formal decision

45. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's recommendation. He hereby dismisses your client's appeal and refuses planning permission for outline application for the proposed erection of up to 148 dwellings together with associated infrastructure including public open space, with access only to be considered, in accordance with application Ref. 233038, dated 5 December 2023.

Right to challenge the decision

46. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged. This must be done by making an application to the High Court within 6 weeks from the day after the date of this letter for leave to bring a statutory review under section 288 of the TCPA 1990.

47. A copy of this letter has been sent to Wokingham Borough Council, the Atomic Weapons Establishment/Ministry of Defence, and the Office for Nuclear Regulation, and notification has been sent to others who asked to be informed of the decision.

Yours faithfully

Laura Webster

Decision officer

This decision was made by the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, Matthew Pennycook MP, on behalf of the Secretary of State, and signed on his behalf

Case Reference	Site Address	Post Code	Case Type	Linked	PA	Status	Decision Date	Comments
APP/X0360/W/24/3354607	Land east of Hayes Drive and north of Church Lane		Planning (W)		233038	3		WBC refused planning application 233038. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/23/3329586	Land adjacent to 176 Hyde End Road	RG2 9ER	Planning (W)		231229 223646	3	22/05/2024	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/24/3337926	253 Shinfield Road	RG2 8HF	Householder (HAS)		232141	3	05/04/2024	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/23/3326997	Belamie Gables, 210 Hyde End Road	RG7 1DG	Planning (W)		223802	3	08/02/2024	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI succeeded in part.
APP/X0360/C/23/3314060	Uplands, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AP	Enforcement Notice	L2	222052	3	17/11/2023	WBC Enforcement Notice modified to allow for wall to be reduced in height
APP/X0360/W/22/3309384	Uplands Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AP	Planning (W)	L2	222052	3	17/11/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3290427	Land rear of 182 Hyde End Road Spencers Wood	RG7 1DG	Planning (W)		212507	3	23/02/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3298882	Woodside & Wayside House Reading	RG2 9BE	Planning (W)		211578	3	07/02/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3303625	14 Coningham Road READING	RG2 8QP	Planning (W)		221225	3	02/02/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/22/3303676	Istana, Lambs Lane READING	RG7 1JB	Householder (HAS)		201752	3	02/02/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3297923	Land Adjacent to lane End House Shinfield	RG2 9BB	Planning (W)		213681	3	20/12/2022	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3298797	2 Grovelands Road READING	RG7 1DP	Planning (W)		214165	3	07/11/2022	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3296611	1 Westlands Avenue READING	RG2 8EB	Planning (W)		220104	3	10/08/2022	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/21/3275086	Willow Tree House Brookers Hill READING	RG2 9BX	Planning (W)		203560	3	18/02/2022	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/19/3228974	12 Cutbush Lane West READING	RG2 9AH	Planning (W)		190152	3	07/09/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/21/3271017	David Hearn Motor Engineers Reading	RG7 1BA	Planning (W)		201557	3	03/09/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/21/3274461	12 Coningham Road READING	RG2 8QP	Planning (W)		202984	3	01/09/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/21/3269974	30 Grazeley Road Reading	RG7 1BJ	Planning (W)		201629	3	31/08/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/21/3269790	Land at Croft Road Spencers Wood Shinfield	RG2 9EY	Planning (W)		203108	3	25/06/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/19/3240232	Land rear of Diana Close Spencers Wood Berkshire	RG7 1HP	Planning (W)		171004	3	01/02/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/20/3258638	Land at Carney's Yard, opposite Puleyn Transport Yard READING	RG7 1HB	Planning (W)		200596	3	11/01/2021	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/20/3247817	8 Pattinson Road READING	RG2 8QJ	Householder (HAS)		193231	3	02/07/2020	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/19/3230479	Land adjacent to Eventide Three Mile Cross	RG7 1HD	Planning (W)		183198	3	07/10/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/19/3222049	Leyland Gardens Reading Berkshire	RG2 9AN	Householder (HAS)		181780	3	01/08/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/19/3221827	Derydene, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AL	Householder (HAS)		181100	3	25/04/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/18/3211871	182 Hyde End Road READING	RG7 1DG	Planning (W)		181676	3	07/03/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed

Case Reference	Site Address	Post Code	Case Type	Linked	PA	Status	Decision Date	Comments
APP/X0360/W/18/3199728	Land at Lambs Lane and Beech Hill Road Spencers Wood Berkshire	RG7 1JB	Planning (W)		172495	3	08/01/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3186553	Mallards, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AD	Planning (W)	L1		3	12/12/2018	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/C/17/3186555	Mallards, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AD	Enforcement Notice	L1	NA	3	12/12/2018	WBC issued enforcement notice. Developer appealed.
APP/X0360/W/18/3204770	Shinfield Court, Church Lane Wokingham Berkshire	RG7 1HB	Planning (W)		171916	3	13/11/2018	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3183251	Etudieltawjus, Sussex Lane READING	RG7 1BY	Planning (W)		163635	3	05/03/2018	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/18/3192970	2 Kendal Avenue READING	RG2 9AR	Householder (HAS)		173001	3	16/02/2018	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3174092	Floyers Barn Wokingham	RG7 1DL	Planning (W)		162924	3	18/10/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3173465	Culverwood, Shinfield Road READING	RG2 9BE	Planning (W)		162495	3	05/09/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3172028	Land adjacent to Grange Lodge Shinfield	RG2 9AL	Planning (W)		163561	3	19/07/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3172361	R/O 27-29 The Square Spencers Wood	RG7 1BS	Planning (W)		163287	3	19/07/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/17/3169333	Lambs Farm Business Park READING	RG7 1PQ	Planning (W)		162594	3	28/06/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/16/3161433	219a Hyde End Road SPENCERS WOOD	RG7 1BU	Planning (W)		160982	3	25/05/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/17/3171035	15 Deardon Way READING Berkshire	RG2 9HE	Householder (HAS)		163279	3	23/05/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/X/16/3152152	24 Fawn Drive READING	RG7 1WL	Lawful Development Certificate		160876	3	22/02/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/24/3356530	95 Hyde End Lane Ryeish GreenSpencers Wood,	RG7 1ES	Householder (HAS)		242085	3		WBC refused planning application 242085. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/23/3320252	25 Newlands Close, Shinfield	RG2 9LG	Planning (W)		230315	3		WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3311543	Parkside House Lambs Lane READING	RG7 1JE	Planning (W)		222478	4	23/05/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Change of use of land to residential and erection of detached building
APP/X0360/W/22/3303884	Parrot Farm Shingfield Wokingham	RG2 9EA	Planning (W)		213156	4	28/03/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Change of use permitted
APP/X0360/W/22/3304042	Land west of Kingfisher Grove Reading Berkshire	RG7 1LZ	Planning (W)		201002	4	31/01/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. 49 homes at Kingfisher Grove
APP/X0360/W/19/3238203	Land to the south of Cutbush Lane Shinfield Berkshire	RG2 9AG	Planning (W)		181499	4	10/03/2020	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. 249 dwellings south of Cutbush Lane
APP/X0360/W/19/3235895	Land south of Reading Road and Arborfield Road Shinfield Berkshire	RG2 9EA	Planning (W)		181631	4	06/01/2020	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. SANG was built
APP/X0360/W/18/3203707	Hartley Court Farm, Hartley Court Road READING	RG7 1NH	Planning (W)		162923	4	01/07/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Change of use agricultural building to office & storage permitted
APP/X0360/W/19/3223579	Berkshire Caravans READING	RG7 1HB	Planning (W)		182831	4	18/06/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Change of use to caravan storage and sale was permitted
APP/X0360/W/18/3204133	Land at Parklands Spencers Wood Wokingham	RG7 1AS	Planning (W)		171737	4	28/02/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. 55 dwellings at Parklands
APP/X0360/D/18/3215332	Parkside House, Lambs Lane READING	RG7 1JE	Householder (HAS)		182015	4	30/01/2019	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. 2 storey side extension permitted
APP/X0360/W/15/3097721	Land at Stanbury House Spencers Wood	RG7 1AJ	Planning (W)		O/2014/7101	4	18/09/2018	WBC Failed to give notice in time. Developers Appeal to PI was allowed. 57 homes at Stanbury House

Case Reference	Site Address	Post Code	Case Type	Linked	PA	Status	Decision Date	Comments
APP/X0360/C/16/3153193	Paddocks Reading Berks	RG7 1NG	Enforcement Notice		161915	4	02/07/2018	WBC issued enforcement against change of use with planning permission. Appeal was allowed and enforcement notice quashed. Planning permission granted for 3 years
APP/X0360/W/16/3159579	Mallards, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AD	Planning (W)		161522	4	09/02/2017	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Extended post office and retail with flat above permitted
APP/X0360/W/24/3350981	Front Plot At Shinfield Court Three Mile Cross	RG7 1HB	Planning (W)		240307	4		Appeal decided in favour of the Plymouth Brethren
APP/X0360/W/21/3282034	12 Coningham Road READING	RG2 8QP	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/19/3235522	22 Cutbush Lane West READING	RG2 9AH	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/21/3267866	Land at and to the Rear of Willow Tree House READING Berkshire	RG2 9BX	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/17/3191447	Land at the Manor Shinfield Berks	RG2 9BX	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/18/3215339	Land at Lambs and Beech Hill Road Spencers Wood Berkshire	RG7 1JE	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/18/3206531	Land at Lambs Farm, Back Lane SWALLOWFIELD	RG7 1PQ	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn
APP/X0360/W/15/3129177	SHINFIELD LODGE THREE MILE CROSS	RG7 1HB	Planning (W)		NA	5	NA	Appeal was withdrawn

KEY	
1 =	New case not previously report
2 =	Case in progress
3 =	Complete - WBC original decision upheld
4 =	Complete - WBC original decision overturned
5 =	Complete - Appeal withdrawn
Lx =	Linked cases
xxxx	Indicates changed since previous report