

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 9th September 2026, at the School Green Centre, RG2 9EH, commencing 19:30.



Bruce Winton
Chief Executive and Clerk to the Parish
Council
4th September 2026

Members: Cllrs Bowler, Boyer, Hoyle, Jahromi, James, Masseron, Peer (Chair) and Pollock H

Agenda

82. Public Questions

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

83. Apologies and declaration of members' interests

- 83.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** approval of apologies for absence
83.2 To **RECEIVE** members' declarations of interest, and any related person interest in respect of the agenda

84. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 84.1 To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 8th July 2026 as a correct record of the meeting and to authorise the Chair to sign the same*
84.2 To **CONSIDER** matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2026

85. Response to WBC CIL Consultation

- 85.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the council's response to Wokingham Borough Council's consultation on Construction Infrastructure Levy*

86. Schedule of Deposited Plans

- 86.1 Planning applications are being reviewed weekly. Plans deposited following the most recent planning email which require urgent attention will be forwarded as received

87. Appeals

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

88. Enforcement Notices

- 88.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Closed Enforcements tables for July/August 2026* (for information only)
- 88.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Outstanding Enforcements tables for July/August 2026* (for information only)

89. Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

- 89.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on footpaths including latest report from Shinfield Volunteer Group*
- 89.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on traffic matters
- 89.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal report on any other Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

90. Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 90.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the next scheduled meeting of the NDP Working Party is Thursday 24th September

91. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) August 2026

- 91.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** an update on the August 2026 NPPF*

92. Correspondence

- 92.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** an update on the proposed solar farm south of Spencers Wood
- 92.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the council's response to WBC's consultation on a Parking Consolidation Order*

93. Future Meetings

- 93.1 To **NOTE** the next meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee meeting is Wednesday, 7th October 2026

*** indicates papers attached**

**** indicates papers to follow**

Minutes of a meeting of
Planning & Highways Committee
Held on Wednesday 8th July 2026
At School Green Centre commencing at 19:30

Present: Cllrs N Boyer, R Hoyle, L James, N Masseron, D Peer (Chair) and H Pollock

Attending: B Winton (Clerk)
S Herring (Deputy Clerk)
BCllr Johnson
4 Member of the Public

26/PC/67

Public Questions

67.1 To receive and consider any public question.

A member of the public, who lived opposite the bakery on the Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, had been involved in a recent serious accident. It was reported that vehicles were travelling too fast despite the speed limit being reduced to 30mph. Parking was another issue that caused problems as individuals were ignoring double yellow lines, and parking on the pavements resulting in reduced visibility for those exiting driveways. Lorries delivering to the One Stop Shop were causing additional hazards.

Possible steps that could be taken were:-

- The speed indicator device is relocated further along the road
- Community Speed Watch monitor this area of the Basingstoke Road
- Raise awareness with the Police
- Amend loading times for shops
- Introducing parking permits
- Hard physical changes to the road and parking

It was noted that the responsibility of this road was with WBC.

ACTION –

- Clerk to add to the list of traffic issues and discuss further with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC)
- BCllr Johnson to contact the Community Speed Watch team
- BCllr Johnson to ask for more volunteers for the Community Speed Watch team via social media

20:00 3 members of the public left the meeting

26/PC/68**Apologies and declarations of Members' Interest**

- 68.1 Receive and consider approval of apologies for absence
- Apologies had been provided by Cllr Jahromi and BCllr Glover
- 68.2 Declarations of Interests
- Cllr Hoyle declared that he was related to BCllr Glover
- Cllr H Pollock declared that she was involved in the Campaign for Fairer Housing

26/PC/69**School Green Centre Car Park**

- 69.1 Apologies had been received from BCllr Betteridge and M Gould, Head of Network Management, WBC
- Cllr Betteridge had cancelled attendance due to a borough ward commitment.
- Members discussed various concerns around the usage of the carpark and were concerned that the implementation of any potential charges could seriously affect hirers of the School Green Centre. If charges were to be implemented there should be a period of at least 2 hours free of charge. SPC would not be interested in buying the car park.
- ACTION – Deputy Clerk to invite Matt Gould, WBC and BCllr Betteridge to the next meeting of the committee in September 2026 to discuss the School Green Centre Car Park**

26/PC/70**Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 70.1 The minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 10th June 2026 were approved and signed as such by Cllr Peer.
- Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr James
Approved: Unanimously
- 70.2 Actions and Matters Arising from the meeting held on 10th June 2026
- 26/PC/59.2 (53.5) Cllr H Pollock and Elaine Butler to request TPOs for the trees on land at the Glebe
- This was in hand.
- 26/PC/59.2 (53.5) Clerk to add land owned by the Diocese of Oxford to the next agenda
- This was on the agenda – see minute 26/PC/78.1
- 26/PC/63.1 Facilities Manager to order a bundle of 5 solar powered CCTV cameras for siting at various locations around the parish when required
- This was in progress

26/PC/63.2 Clerk to arrange a meeting of the Traffic Working Party

This would be done.

ACTION - Clerk to arrange a meeting of the Traffic Working Party

26/PC/64.1 Clerk to add an agenda item to the next meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee for release of funding for the renewal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan

This had been done and approved by Full Council at their meeting held on 24th June, minute 26/79.1.5.

26/PC/64.1 Clerk to engage the Consultant once the release of funding was approved

This had been done and the first meeting of the working party was scheduled for 24th September.

26/PC/64.1 Clerk to contact the local residents' associations for nominations to join the SPNDP working party

This would be done.

ACTION – Clerk to contact the local residents' associations for nominations to join the SPNDP working party

26/PC/64.1 Cllr Peer to ask Cllr Bowler if she would be interested in joining the SPCNDP working party

Cllr Bowler had confirmed that she would like to be a member of the working party

26/PC/64.1 Cllr H Pollock to join the SPCNDP

This had been noted.

26/PC/64.2 Clerk to chase Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) for a response and report back to committee when a decision had been made on the Assets of Community Value submissions

This was on the agenda – see minute 26/PC/79.1

26/PC/65.2 Deputy Clerk to check on progress of fixing the lights on the 20mph school warning sign by Shinfield View Care Home

On checking the WBC website this was still showing as unresolved. The Deputy Clerk had chased this up but no response had been received to date.

26/PC/71

Terms of Reference

71.1 Terms of Reference for the Planning and Highways Committee

Members **APPROVED** the Terms of Reference for the Planning and Highways Committee for 2026/27 as presented.

Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr Peer
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Deputy Clerk to add to the agenda of the Full Council meeting in July

26/PC/72

Committee Membership

72.1 Cllr Bowler had requested to join the Planning and Highways Committee.

Cllr Bowler had recently attended a BALC training course on Introduction to Planning and had sent her apologies for this meeting as she was attending another training course.

Members of the committee **AGREED** to propose to Full Council that Cllr Bowler join the Planning and Highways Committee.

Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr Peer
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Deputy Clerk to add to the agenda of the Full Council meeting in July

26/PC/73

Schedule of Deposited Plans

73.1 Planning applications were circulated to members weekly. Plans deposited following the most recent Thursday planning email which required urgent attention would be forwarded as received.

The following application required consideration:-

73.2 PA261486 - 1 Ilbury Close

Cllr H Pollock had raised concerns regarding the planning application and Cllr Boyer had suggested a response that was approved by the Committee. It was also noted that this property was showing on the Live Enforcement Notices.

The Chair thanked Cllr H Pollock for bringing this to the attention of the Committee.

ACTION – Deputy Clerk to submit the response to the planning application on the WBC planning portal

- 73.3 PA261069 / 261070 / – Shinfield Infant And Nursery School, School Green, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9EH

Proposal: Full application for the proposed installation of a replacement pedestrian gate following demolition of the existing front boundary dwarf wall, fencing and gate.

It was **NOTED** that this application had been approved.

26/PC/74

Appeals

- 74.1 Planning inspectorate appeals relating to Shinfield Parish

There were no new or ongoing cases relating to Shinfield Parish.

26/PC/75

Enforcement Notices

- 75.1 Closed Enforcements tables for June 2026

This month there were

5 cases deemed no breach
4 cases voluntary compliance
1 not expedient

Members **NOTED** the Closed Enforcement Tables

- 75.2 Outstanding Enforcements tables for June 2026

Bismillah House - 9 ongoing cases
10 new enforcement notices since the last meeting

Members **NOTED** the outstanding Enforcement tables

26/PC/76

Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

- 76.1 A verbal report on Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath matters

- Shinfield Volunteer Group Footpath Report
The Shinfield Volunteer Group Footpath Report – June 2026 had been circulated to members prior to the meeting. This would also be published in the August SPC electronic newsletter.
- Footpath 17 – this was on hold dependent on the budget and may be included with the funding for work on flooding on Church Lane.
- Shinfield Grange – cut back vegetation
- Footpath 20 – complaints had been received about brambles. SPC had dealt with this.

- 76.2 Traffic Matters

See correspondence 26/PC/80.2

76.3 A verbal report on any other Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath matters

Footpath along Grazeley Road

It was noted that there was no bus service to Grazeley and a footpath from Mere oak park and ride to Grazeley would give residents the opportunity of a 30min bus service into Reading. The creation of a 'non-firm' footpath would need to go along the edge of the field and permission would need to be obtained from the landowner. Cllr Masseron referred to the Active Travel Plan for proposed footpaths.

ACTION – BCLlr Johnson to raise with BCLlr Betteridge

Road Safety on Basingstoke Road

This had previously been discussed – see minute 26/PC/67.1

20:22 *BCLlr Johnson left the meeting*

26/PC/77

Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan (SPNDP)

77.1 The next meeting of the Working Party would follow the usual pattern of the evening after Full Council meeting starting with 24th September.

The ONH consultant had been commissioned to assist with the plan.

77.2 Assets of Community Value

See minute 26/PC/79.1

26/PC/78

Land owned by the Diocese of Oxford

78.1 A planning application had been submitted in 2011 for 175 dwellings on Shinfield Glebe but an appeal had been dismissed by the Secretary of State. Members felt that if this was resubmitted, it may have more chance of being approved due to changes in planning.

26/PC/79

Assets of Community Value

79.1 A verbal update on registering Assets of Community Value (ACV)

The Clerk had not received any further communication from WBC regarding the ACV that had been submitted.

ACTION – Clerk to chase Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) for a response and report back to committee when a decision had been made on the Assets of Community Value submissions.

Correspondence

80.1 West Berkshire Local Plan update

Members NOTED the West Berkshire Local Plan update

ACTION –

- All members of the committee to review the West Berkshire Local Plan update
- Clerk to request automatic notification relating to the West Berkshire Local Plan update

80.2 Approval of Grazeley 30mph speed limit

Members NOTED that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for a reduction in speed limit to 30mph had been signed off and was likely to be implemented in the summer of 2026.

80.3 Church Lane traffic improvements

Wokingham Borough Council had acknowledged receipt of a residents petition and outlined the the current status.

“Any surveys, assessments or investigations that have been undertaken or are planned.

From Monday 6 July, an automatic traffic counter will be installed on Church Lane, just before St Mary’s Church. This will record the speed, volume and type of vehicles travelling in both directions. The equipment will consist of pneumatic tubes fixed to a lamp column and laid across the carriageway.

At the same time, cameras will be installed to monitor turning movements into and out of the road at both entry points. The three days with the highest traffic levels will then be analysed in detail. We expect this data to be returned to us by 24 July.

Alongside this work, officers will assess the feasibility of closing Church Lane to through traffic. A key consideration will be whether there is sufficient safe space for vehicles to turn around at either end of the road.

The next steps in the process.

Once these investigations are complete and a decision has been made on what measures may be possible, we will write to the lead petitioner with the outcome. If any measures can be taken forward, we will outline what they are, the next steps involved, and an indicative timeframe.

An indicative timeline for when residents can expect a formal response or decision.

Based on the current programme, we aim to provide a decision by 7 August. If this changes for any reason, we will provide a further update.”

80.4 Wokingham Borough Council Local Plan 2045

Timetable

30 June 2026 Publish notice of intention to commence local plan preparation

6 July 2026 Call for Sites starts

“Landowners, developers and others are invited to suggest sites they believe have potential for development. The information gathered will be used to help us understand how development might be managed when preparing our new local plan – the Wokingham Borough Local Plan 2045.”

1 September 2026 Call for Sites Ends

5 October 2026 Scoping consultation starts

16 November 2026 Scoping consultation ends

26 February 2027 Publication of Gateway 1 self-assessment

8 November 2027 Consultation on local plan content and evidence starts

20 December 2027 Consultation on local plan content and evidence ends

14 February 2028 Gateway 2 advice sought

14 August 2028 Consultation on proposed Local Plan starts

9 October 2028 Consultation on proposed Local Plan ends

4 December 2028 Gateway 3 advice sought

5 March 2029 Submit for examination

31 July 2029 Adoption

25/PC/81

Date of the next meeting

81.1 The date of the next meeting will be Wednesday, 9th September 2026

The meeting ended at 20:55

List of actions

Minute	Action	Responsibility
26/PC/67.1	Clerk to add Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood to the list of traffic issues and discuss further with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC)	Clerk
26/PC/67.1	BCllr Johnson to contact the Community Speed Watch team	BCllr Johnson
26/PC/67.1	BCllr Johnson to ask for more volunteers for the Community Speed Watch team via social media	BCllr Johnson
26/PC/69.1	Deputy Clerk to invite Matt Gould, WBC and BCllr Betteridge to the next meeting of the committee in September 2026 to discuss the School Green Centre Car Park	Deputy Clerk
26/PC/70.2 (26/PC/63.2)	Clerk to arrange a meeting of the Traffic Working Party	Clerk
26/PC/70.2 (26/PC/64.1)	Clerk to contact the local residents' associations for nominations to join the SPNDP working party	Clerk
26/PC/71.1	Deputy Clerk to add Terms of Reference to the agenda of the Full Council meeting in July	Deputy Clerk
26/PC/72.1	Deputy Clerk to add membership of the committee to the agenda of the Full Council meeting in July	Deputy Clerk
26/PC/73.2	Deputy Clerk to submit the response to planning application PA261486 on the WBC planning portal	Deputy Clerk
26/PC/76.3	BCllr Johnson to raise a potential footpath on Grazeley Road with BCllr Betteridge	BCllr Johnson
26/PC/79.1	Clerk to chase Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) for a response and report back to committee when a decision had been made on the Assets of Community Value submissions	Clerk
26/PC/80.1	All members of the committee to review the West Berkshire Local Plan update	All Committee members
26/PC/80.1	Clerk to request automatic notification relating to the West Berkshire Local Plan update	Clerk

Shinfield Parish Council Response to Wokingham Borough Council's Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule Consultation

Introduction

Shinfield Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on Wokingham Borough Council's Draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.

The Council's principal concern relates to the proposal to establish a separate charging zone for Loddon Valley Garden Village (LVGV) and to apply a nil CIL rate to development within that zone, with infrastructure instead being secured through Section 106 agreements. The Draft Charging Schedule confirms that all forms of development within LVGV would attract a £0 CIL rate.

Whilst Shinfield Parish Council understands the challenges associated with delivering infrastructure for a long-term strategic development, it is concerned that the proposed approach risks creating substantial inequity between communities affected by growth and reducing the ability of Parish Councils to mitigate the local impacts of development. This is based on the actual experience of development within the parish of Shinfield.

Scale of Growth Experienced in Shinfield

Shinfield Parish Council has extensive practical experience of accommodating large-scale strategic growth over an extended period. The South of M4 Strategic Development Location was originally planned in 2010 to deliver approximately 2,500 dwellings. However, development within the area has delivered over 3,300 dwellings, with further dwellings approved or anticipated through the continuing build-out of the Strategic Development Location.

As a consequence, the Parish has accommodated growth significantly in excess of that originally envisaged. This has resulted in increasing pressure on highways, community facilities, open spaces, sports provision, active travel infrastructure and local services. The ability to utilise Community Infrastructure Levy receipts has provided an important mechanism through which the Parish Council has been able to address emerging infrastructure needs and respond flexibly to the impacts of development as they have arisen.

Shinfield Parish Council's experience demonstrates that even where substantial infrastructure is secured through Section 106 agreements, additional local investment is invariably required to ensure that facilities are fully equipped, operational and capable of meeting the needs of both existing and new residents. This experience reinforces the importance of retaining a locally accountable funding mechanism for communities affected by large-scale development.

The Impact on Shinfield Parish

Shinfield Parish has already experienced one of the highest levels of growth within Wokingham Borough through the South of M4 Strategic Development Location and other large-scale developments.

As a result, residents continue to experience:

- Increased traffic congestion on key routes serving the Parish;
- Additional pressure on parks, play areas, open spaces and community facilities;
- Growing demand for sports provision and recreational infrastructure;
- Increased pressure on active travel routes and public rights of way;
- Greater demand for community services and facilities delivered by the Parish Council.

Shinfield Parish Council has utilised its share of CIL receipts to invest in infrastructure and facilities that directly benefit local residents and help communities adapt to the effects of growth.

The proposal to fully remove CIL from one of the largest planned developments in the Borough creates a concern that future communities affected by strategic development may not have access to a comparable mechanism for addressing local impacts.

Concerns Regarding the Proposed Nil CIL Rate

The Draft Charging Schedule states that infrastructure requirements within LVGV will instead be secured through Section 106 agreements.

Whilst Section 106 agreements undoubtedly have an important role in delivering strategic infrastructure, they are fundamentally different from CIL.

From a parish perspective:

- CIL provides a transparent and predictable mechanism through which communities receive a share of developer contributions.
- Parish Councils have discretion to direct funds towards local infrastructure priorities identified by residents.
- CIL enables investment in smaller-scale projects that would not normally form part of a Section 106 agreement.
- CIL provides flexibility to respond to changing community needs over time.

By contrast, Section 106 funding is negotiated on a site-specific basis and does not automatically provide funding directly to Parish Councils.

The Council is therefore concerned that the proposed approach significantly reduces the certainty that communities affected by LVGV will receive meaningful resources to address **local** impacts.

Flexibility During Long-Term Development

The Council is also concerned that a funding approach relying solely upon Section 106 obligations does not adequately recognise the evolving nature of long-term strategic developments.

Over the lifetime of major developments, road layouts, housing densities, dwelling numbers, design codes, land uses and infrastructure requirements frequently change through Reserved Matters applications, detailed design work and subsequent amendments. The South of M4 Strategic Development Location itself has evolved significantly from its original concept, with housing delivery already substantially exceeding the number of dwellings originally envisaged.

Whilst Section 106 agreements are negotiated at an early stage and are necessarily tied to specific infrastructure obligations, Community Infrastructure Levy provides a flexible mechanism that allows local authorities and parish councils to respond to the unforeseen consequences of development as they emerge.

The Council therefore questions how a Section 106-only regime can provide equivalent flexibility in addressing infrastructure needs arising from changes made throughout the development process, particularly on a scheme expected to be delivered over several decades. The Council would submit that the long-term nature of Loddon Valley Garden Village may strengthen the case for retaining a CIL mechanism. The longer a development is built out, the greater the likelihood that infrastructure requirements, community priorities and development impacts will differ from those anticipated when the original Section 106 obligations were negotiated. As developments evolve, additional demands can arise on local infrastructure, facilities and services that were not reasonably foreseeable when the original planning obligations were negotiated.

Shinfield Parish Council Experience

It is SPC's experience that Section 106 obligations do not cover all costs associated with delivering, equipping and operating community infrastructure.

For example, new football and cricket pitches and pavilions at Manor Ground and High Copse incurred additional expenses such as cricket site screens and nets, football goal posts, grounds maintenance equipment, changing room equipment and even basic tables and chairs for community rooms.

Without CIL funding these items, SPC would have been left with high-quality facilities that could not have been fully equipped, brought into operation or managed effectively for community use. The Council feels therefore that this flexibility of local action should be retained for LVGV and all future developments.

S106 considerations have never involved parish and town councils, and they are often done “to” and not with those councils. There should be a meaningful and formal mechanism through which affected parish and town councils are involved in the development, review and monitoring of Section 106 obligations, with that involvement continuing through Reserved Matters applications and any subsequent material amendments.

Long-Term Implications and Precedent

The Council is also concerned about the wider policy implications of the proposed change.

Shinfield Parish Council's own experience demonstrates the difficulty of accurately predicting all infrastructure requirements at the outset of a long-term development. The South of M4 Strategic Development Location has already delivered substantially more homes than originally anticipated, whilst many aspects of the development have evolved through the planning process over time.

The Council would suggest that the long-term nature of Loddon Valley Garden Village strengthens, rather than weakens, the case for retaining a flexible funding mechanism such as CIL. The longer a development takes to deliver, the greater the likelihood that local circumstances, community needs, development layouts and infrastructure requirements will change. The flexibility provided by CIL enables local communities to respond to those changes in a way that fixed planning obligations cannot always achieve.

The Draft Charging Schedule identifies LVGV as a distinct charging zone and proposes a nil CIL rate across all development types within that area.

If this approach becomes established, there is a risk that future strategic developments could similarly be excluded from the Borough's CIL regime.

This could lead to a situation where:

- Communities experiencing the greatest levels of growth receive the least direct access to developer contributions;
- Parish Councils become increasingly dependent upon Borough-level funding decisions and the uncertainty associated with that scenario;
- Opportunities for locally determined infrastructure improvements are reduced;
- Confidence in the fairness of the developer contribution system is undermined.

Shinfield Parish Council believes that communities accommodating significant growth should have access to mechanisms that enable local investment and local decision-making.

Support for Concerns Raised by Neighbouring Communities

Whilst the focus of this response is the impact on Shinfield Parish, the Council also recognises and shares concerns expressed by neighbouring communities that will be affected by the Loddon Valley Garden Village development.

The scale of LVGV, comprising approximately 3,930 dwellings together with significant employment, transport and community infrastructure, will have effects extending beyond the immediate development boundary.

Strategic developments create transport movements, demand for services, and pressure on infrastructure across a much wider area than the development site itself.

Shinfield Parish Council therefore recognises the importance of ensuring that communities neighbouring LVGV are able to secure appropriate mitigation and local enhancements that help address the impacts arising from such a substantial development.

Community Infrastructure Levy provides a degree of local democratic accountability because local communities can see how funds generated by development are reinvested to address its impacts. The proposed approach offers no equivalent assurance regarding the identification, prioritisation or delivery of parish-level infrastructure improvements arising from Loddon Valley Garden Village.

Conclusion

Shinfield Parish Council does not consider that the proposed nil CIL rate for Loddon Valley Garden Village provides sufficient assurance that communities affected by the development will receive an equitable share of infrastructure investment.

The Council requests that Wokingham Borough Council:

1. Establish a clearly defined and transparent mechanism that guarantees an appropriate level of funding available directly to the Parish Councils affected by the development;
2. Ensure that affected Parish and Town Councils are formally involved in the development, monitoring and review of Section 106 obligations throughout the lifetime of the development, including Reserved Matters stages and any subsequent amendments; and
3. If a nil CIL rate is retained, establish a ring-fenced parish-level infrastructure fund from Section 106 contributions to provide communities affected by Loddon Valley Garden Village with a level of local infrastructure funding broadly equivalent to the neighbourhood benefits that would otherwise arise through CIL.

In addition, there should be formal assurances regarding how local communities will influence the allocation of infrastructure funding secured through Section 106 agreements and how parish-level priorities will be addressed. This approach should apply to LVGV and to any future strategic developments within the Borough.

Shinfield Parish Council supports sustainable development that is accompanied by appropriate infrastructure, mitigation and meaningful local involvement in funding decisions. However, communities that accommodate or are impacted by major growth should retain access to fair, transparent and locally accountable funding arrangements that enable Parish Councils to respond effectively to the needs of their residents.

Arborfield & Newland Parish Council response to Wokingham Borough Council's Draft Charging Schedule Consultation for Community Infrastructure Levy

The most significant change within WBC's draft CIL charging schedule, and hence the focus of the representation from Arborfield & Newland Parish Council, is the application of a nil rate for CIL to the Loddon Valley Garden Village (LVGV) strategic allocation. Arborfield Parish Council wishes to register its concerns regarding this proposal.

The background paper argues that CIL is an unsuitable funding mechanism because:

- it is fixed at the time outline permission is granted
- it cannot be indexed for inflation
- LVGV is a long-term scheme

Whilst we understand the rationale for the preference for S106 over CIL, our objection is that, from a Parish point of view, our **residents** are bearing significant changes in their environment and in their community as a result of the construction of LVGV. Our **existing residents** are not going to experience any improvement in facilities or amenities that could benefit their day-to-day lives amidst the transformation of the rural environment in which they originally chose to live. With funding, the Parish Council could help to alleviate the impact of these changes by providing local improvements that would help residents to be more accepting of the larger scale changes that are happening around them.

Therefore, the Parish Council believes that if the nil CIL route is to be followed, then alternative funding needs to be provided to the affected Parishes in mitigation. Without alternative mechanisms, the decision to remove CIL for this large scale development is **unacceptable** and **harmful** to the long-term wellbeing of Arborfield & Newland community. Without Parish level funding, the improvements to infrastructure and community facilities that are important, at local level to support growth, will not occur.

Considering the impact on residents

LVGV will be delivered over at least **two decades** bringing:

- greatly increased volume of construction traffic
- major roadworks
- pressure on local services
- the loss of greenfield landscapes and historic rural identity
- increased congestion on roads already highly congested and unsuitable for upgrades such as footpaths, cycle lanes and streetlights
- noise, air quality impacts, and settlement coalescence

Under this proposed regime, Arborfield Cross will be sandwiched between two huge Strategic Development Locations. The village is therefore highly likely to suffer from more traffic congestion (negating the benefits of the village improvement scheme) and may lose its sense of identity and community in direct contradiction of the Arborfield

and Barkham Neighbourhood Plan. Opportunities to make more cohesive communities, mixing existing and new residents, will be lost.

Impact of a nil CIL rate

Under a nil CIL rate:

- **no CIL funding flows to the affected Parishes**
- **no local mitigation is guaranteed**
- **no investment is secured for community facilities, public realm, or parish-level infrastructure**

The Parish is expected to shoulder the burden without receiving the standard mechanism of compensation available to every other local community affected by major development. Removing CIL deprives the Parish of its only guaranteed local funding stream and the only infrastructure contribution that is legally and automatically shared with Parish Councils.

The Parish Council is also concerned that WBC will set a precedent for future largescale developments with this nil CIL approach to LVGV and the impact this will have across the Borough.

Without CIL:

- Arborfield receives **no automatic allocation**
- All funding becomes dependent on **negotiated S106**, which is controlled entirely by the Borough
- Parish priorities (community halls and spaces, play areas, allotments, footpaths, local traffic calming) risk being **ignored or deprioritised**

The background paper acknowledges that S106 will be used instead of CIL, but S106:

- is **not shared with parishes**
- is **not guaranteed**
- is **not flexible for small-scale local projects**
- is **not designed to fund parish-level community infrastructure**

This leaves Arborfield with **no mechanism to secure local benefit** from a development that will completely transform the area.

LVGV's scale demands **more** local mitigation, not less - it includes:

- 3,930 homes
- 100,000 m² employment land
- three schools
- major highways upgrades
- a new district centre
- extensive green infrastructure

This is one of the largest developments ever proposed in Wokingham and as a result, it:

- increases pressure on Arborfield's existing facilities
- changes movement patterns
- affects local identity and cohesion
- requires investment in parish-level amenities

Removing CIL at precisely the moment when Arborfield needs **more** support is both hard to comprehend and to justify to our residents.

The background paper states that S106 will secure all required infrastructure. However:

- S106 is **site-specific**, not community-wide
- S106 cannot be used for **general parish improvements**
- S106 does not provide **ongoing funding**
- S106 is negotiated behind closed doors
- S106 does not guarantee **any allocation to Parish Councils**

CIL exists precisely because S106 **cannot** meet local community needs.

Arborfield & Newland already has a number of speculative developments in the pipeline which will bring many more residents, more traffic and few amenities. Even from these smaller developments, S106 monies have been used to fund improvements and amenities in other areas of the Borough bringing no benefit to the local community.

Removing CIL removes the Parish's voice and removes the ability of the Parish to meet its residents' needs.

To summarise, under the proposed approach, the future will look like this:

- LVGV will transform the area
- Arborfield will absorb the impact with detrimental effects
- The Borough will control all infrastructure funding
- The developer will benefit from reduced financial obligations
- The Parish will receive **no CIL, no automatic funding, and no guaranteed mitigation**

This is a **deeply inequitable outcome**.

Conclusion

Arborfield Parish Council **strongly opposes** the nil CIL rate for Loddon Valley Garden Village unless alternative, assured funding is made available for the Parishes affected by this huge development.

Arborfield Green and LVGV will have local amenities built into their communities leaving Arborfield Cross and the remainder of the Parish with very little to offer existing, and future residents in new speculative developments, in the way of community facilities.

The Parish Council has some sound ideas on local improvements that could be made to mitigate the impact of LVGV and bind the communities, old and new.

Arborfield & Newland Parish Council request that Wokingham Borough Council, either:

1. **Consider a positive CIL rate for LVGV;** or
2. **Create a ring-fenced, parish-allocated S106 mechanism** that guarantees Arborfield receives the equivalent of the CIL share it would otherwise be entitled to; or
3. **Make a guaranteed community funding allocation to the affected Parishes of an amount sufficient to achieve the improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of LVGV** – the amount could be determined in collaboration between the parties.

Arborfield & Newland Parish Council would be very happy to meet with WBC officers and members to discuss the measures cited above and potential plans for local improvements.

Without such measures, Arborfield will be left carrying the weight of a 20-year strategic development and a very disillusioned local community with very limited local amenities of their own — a position the Parish Council cannot and is not happy to support.

Introduction

Wokingham Borough Council have started a consultation on proposed changes to CIL.

These are described as “targeted changes” which will affect:

- Introducing CIL rates borough wide for purpose-built market student accommodation;
- Introducing CIL rates borough wide for hotel development;
- Introducing CIL rates borough wide for industrial and warehousing development;
- Creating a new charging zone for the Loddon Valley Garden Village allocation; and
- Applying a nil CIL rate within the Loddon Valley Garden Village charging zone.

All the papers relating to this consultation can be found on WBC’s website ([Draft CIL Charging Schedule Consultation](#)).

The Clerk has asked CoPilot to review these papers and identify the potential impacts for both Shinfield and Arborfield parishes. This AI generated report is contained below.

The report sets out Recommendations at Section 8 as follows:

- Object to nil-CIL for LVGV unless the S106 package provides equivalent or better Shinfield-facing certainty.
- Seek a parish-facing infrastructure schedule.

Report: Impacts of the proposed CIL changes for Shinfield Parish and Arborfield Parish

AI Generated

Executive Summary

The proposed Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) CIL partial review is **targeted, not a whole-system replacement**: it introduces borough-wide rates for purpose-built market student accommodation, hotels, industrial and warehousing uses, creates a new Loddon Valley Garden Village (LVGV) charging zone, and applies a **£0 CIL rate** inside that LVGV zone; all other unamended CIL provisions continue to apply, indexed for inflation. The practical effect is a shift for LVGV from a formulaic CIL/neighbourhood-CIL regime to a negotiated Section 106 / Section 278 delivery model, which national guidance allows where site-specific infrastructure and mitigation are needed, provided obligations meet the legal tests of necessity, direct relationship, and fair/reasonable scale and kind.

Core finding

LVGV nil-CIL is not presented by WBC as a financial “gain”; it is presented as a delivery mechanism shift from CIL to planning obligations.

Shinfield impact

Shinfield may benefit from nearby infrastructure, but loses the certainty and flexibility of neighbourhood CIL from LVGV unless equivalent parish-facing S106 commitments are secured.

Arborfield impact

Arborfield hosts most housing and built facilities, so it faces the most direct impact and the greatest need for enforceable phasing, education, highways and community triggers.

WBC’s projected CIL income falls from **£247.544m under the adopted schedule** to **£183.925m under the draft schedule**, a difference of about **£63.619m**, while LVGV infrastructure is intended to be secured through legal obligations rather than CIL. The LVGV viability appraisal includes **£423.598m** of infrastructure in the development appraisal and shows a present-day appraisal profit of **£31.179m**, but that is a developer/appraisal viability output, not WBC net gain.

The key strategic issue for Shinfield Parish Council is therefore not only “how much money is lost”, but **whether the S106/S278 package is as certain, transparent, indexed, enforceable, parish-responsive and early-delivered as CIL would have been flexible**. Shinfield’s own representation already identifies the central risks: phasing uncertainty, pressure on Shinfield services/facilities, active travel deficiencies, flood-related limits on EcoValley usability, the need to assess against the currently adopted CIL regime until a replacement schedule exists, and the need for conditions/S106 obligations including sports provision, cycle and toucan-crossing measures, a 20mph zone, and a dedicated monitoring sum.

1. Proposed CIL changes and comparison with the existing regime

WBC’s consultation page states that the changes are limited to: new borough-wide rates for purpose-built market student accommodation, hotels, industrial and warehousing development; a new LVGV charging zone; and a **nil CIL rate** in that LVGV zone.

In the draft schedule, the new LVGV zone is shown at **£0** for residential development, sheltered housing, extra care/residential institutions and retail, while the new borough-wide proposed rates are **£500/sq m** for purpose-built market student accommodation, **£50/sq m** for hotels, and **£35/sq m** for industrial/warehousing.

Under the existing regime, CIL is a charge on new development used to support infrastructure; charging authorities must set rates using evidence on infrastructure needs, funding gaps and viability, and can set low or zero rates for strategic sites where viability evidence supports that approach. Under the proposed LVGV approach, infrastructure would instead be secured “solely” or primarily through Section 106 / Section 278 planning obligations; the WBC draft schedule says the alternative use of Section 106 is considered the practical and effective way of securing infrastructure improvements for LVGV.

2. Shinfield Parish impact assessment

2.1 Direct and indirect exposure

Shinfield’s formal representation records that the **country park falls within Shinfield Parish**, while the proposed housing and other facilities fall within Arborfield Parish. That means Shinfield’s direct built-development CIL exposure may be limited, but its service, transport, landscape, flood, recreation and active-travel exposure is significant because the application has a “close functional relationship” with Shinfield and potential to affect the parish’s transport network, services, facilities, landscape setting and day-to-day functioning.

The key financial impact for Shinfield is the loss of a possible flexible neighbourhood-CIL route from LVGV if the zone is nil-rated. National CIL guidance says that where chargeable development is in a parish with a neighbourhood plan, **25% of relevant CIL receipts** is passed to the parish, and where development straddles parish boundaries it is apportioned by gross internal area. With LVGV at £0 CIL, Shinfield's mitigation must instead be negotiated into the S106/S278 package, including where infrastructure demand falls on Shinfield even if the chargeable floor space is outside Shinfield.

2.2 Infrastructure that may benefit Shinfield

The WBC [Infrastructure-Delivery-Plan-August-2025.pdf](#) identifies LVGV-related items that could benefit Shinfield or the wider Shinfield functional area: active travel enhancements in Shinfield, a Shinfield Eastern Relief Road toucan crossing, SERR improvements, A327/SERR roundabout upgrades, bus strategy/subsidy, rights-of-way improvements, community facilities, potential Shinfield Health Centre extension or new/branch GP provision, sports hub provision, country park, SANG and open space. WBC's LVGV public page similarly lists schools, community facilities, retail/employment space, a country park, health/sports facilities, bridges over the M4 and River Loddon, and walking/cycling routes.

Shinfield's representation and facilities evidence also identify parish-facing asks: two junior grass football pitches at High Copse Pavilion, alternative sports facilities, a mountain bike trail, the Arborfield Road Cycle Scheme, Arborfield Road and Shinfield Eastern Relief Road toucan crossings, and a 20mph zone. These are not "nice-to-have" items in the parish evidence: they are framed as necessary to mitigate increased recreation demand, enable safe/sustainable access to education, and address traffic/highway impacts.

2.3 Shinfield risks

The major Shinfield risks are **timing and enforceability**. Shinfield's representation says indicative phasing could allow substantial housing ahead of confirmed social and physical infrastructure, with infrastructure triggers deferred to later agreement, which creates a risk that delivery is reactive rather than proactive. It also raises concern that education provision may not be available in time, increasing pressure on schools in neighbouring parishes and requiring longer travel distances for pupils.

Flooding also affects the claimed EcoValley benefit: SPC acknowledges EcoValley's potential, but argues that flood zones and winter flooding may reduce year-round recreation and sever active travel connections across the site. This matters for Shinfield because the project's claimed benefit to existing communities depends partly on the EcoValley being accessible, usable and connective throughout the year.

3. Arborfield Parish impact assessment

Arborfield faces the most direct physical impact because the LVGV housing and most built facilities are identified as falling within Arborfield Parish. The WBC LVGV page lists the University of Reading application for up to **2,800 homes** and the Gleeson application for up to **430 homes**, with schools, centres, sports/health facilities, open space and highway infrastructure attached to the overall proposal.

For Arborfield, the nil-CIL approach means the parish should not assume a large neighbourhood-CIL stream from the LVGV housing unless the CIL position changes. Instead, Arborfield's benefits must be secured through planning obligations: two primary schools, a secondary school, local/district centres, access roads, spine-road connections, active-travel links, green/blue infrastructure, SANG/open space, and community/leisure provision. The risk is that these benefits are negotiated, phased and potentially varied over many years, rather than paid as a formulaic charge with a clear neighbourhood share.

Arborfield also has differential exposure because existing Arborfield Green infrastructure continues alongside LVGV. The IDP identifies Arborfield Green SDL requirements including a new 2FE primary school, Bohunt School sixth form, Eversley Road improvements, cycle-network improvements, bus-service improvements, mobility hubs, community centre, indoor sports shared at LVGV, and outdoor sports contributions to Grays Farm. Therefore, Arborfield's key task is to ensure LVGV obligations do not blur, displace or delay Arborfield Green commitments, and that cumulative impacts across Arborfield Green, LVGV and surrounding growth are monitored transparently.

5. WBC financial position from LVGV

5.1 What the evidence does show

The evidence shows a **CIL-income reduction** in WBC's funding-gap modelling, not a published net-gain figure. The draft schedule's projected CIL income is **£183.925m**, compared with **£247.544m** under the adopted schedule; the difference is about **£63.619m**. The reason WBC can still show a smaller residual funding gap under the draft position is that LVGV infrastructure is removed from the CIL-funded infrastructure gap because it is expected to be secured through legal obligations.

The LVGV financial viability appraisal is a developer-site viability document prepared for WBC, not a WBC treasury forecast. It includes **£423.598m** of infrastructure costs and a present-day feasibility summary with **net realisation £1.736bn**, **total costs £1.705bn**,

and **profit £31.179m**; a sensitivity appraisal with grown inputs shows **profit £352.644m**. These are appraisal outputs indicating viability under assumptions; they do not state WBC's net fiscal position, council-tax income, business-rate retention, land receipts, borrowing exposure, or long-term service-cost balance.

5.2 Evidence-based conclusion

WBC expects to **forego CIL from LVGV** under the proposed nil-rate, but to secure substantial infrastructure through S106/S278 instead. On the available evidence, the financial test for WBC is not "profit versus loss" but whether the negotiated obligations fully replace the infrastructure value, timing certainty, indexation, monitoring transparency and parish-level flexibility that CIL would otherwise provide.

6. Schools and education infrastructure

The WBC IDP states LVGV education infrastructure includes **2 × 3FE primary schools including early years provision**, delivered from **2029 onwards**, with a total cost of **£27m**, plus a new **8FE secondary school and 300-pupil sixth form** in **2031–34** at **£39.3m**. The IDP says LVGV itself generates a requirement for around **5FE secondary**, but an **8FE school** is to be delivered to ensure viable future operations, which may create wider strategic capacity if admissions/catchments allow.

The public WBC LVGV page says the University of Reading application proposes two primary schools and one secondary school, while the University of Reading application page describes two primary schools up to three forms of entry and a secondary school up to twelve forms of entry. However, a WBC FOI response on LGV school phasing said information on the schools to which children would be allocated before LVGV schools become available was "not available", and contingency planning to enlarge local schools was also "not available". That is an important evidence gap for Shinfield, because national guidance expects education contributions to reflect known pupil yields, planned/committed capacity, temporary and permanent needs, and potential use of schools outside the plan area

7. Wider infrastructure benefits and constraints

Potential wider benefits include highways/transport works, bus subsidies, mobility hubs, rights-of-way improvements, active-travel enhancements in Shinfield, community facilities, health provision, sports hub, swimming-pool contribution, country park, SANG, open space, civic space, cemetery provision, waste facilities and utilities. The University of Reading application also describes 125 hectares of open space, Eco Valley, biodiversity net gain, SuDS, flood alleviation, public transport priority routes, new links over the M4 and River Loddon, and utilities including a substation and broadband.

The constraint is that many of these benefits are only as reliable as their **legal triggers and delivery phasing**. The SPC representation highlights lack of enforceable infrastructure triggers and the possibility that housing occupations precede schools, healthcare, sustainable transport and community infrastructure. National guidance also emphasises monitoring/reporting of obligations, trigger points and future income, and allows monitoring fees where proportionate and reasonable.

8. Recommendations

For Shinfield Parish Council

1. **Object to nil-CIL for LVGV unless the S106 package provides equivalent or better Shinfield-facing certainty.** Require named obligations for High Copse junior pitches, alternative recreation, active-travel links, toucan crossings, 20mph measures, flood-resilient EcoValley access, and monitoring
2. **Seek a parish-facing infrastructure schedule:** each item should have trigger, delivery body, indexation basis, longstop date, enforcement route, commuted maintenance sum, and reporting frequency.

For Arborfield Parish Council

1. **Focus on direct LVGV obligations inside Arborfield:** schools, local/district centres, community facilities, health/sports provision, roads, construction management and green/blue infrastructure.
2. **Separate LVGV from Arborfield Green delivery accounting.** Arborfield Green already has its own IDP commitments, including primary, sixth-form, bus, community-centre and sports obligations; LVGV should not dilute or substitute those commitments.
3. **Insist on transparent neighbourhood-equivalent mitigation** if nil-CIL proceeds, because the parish will not receive the usual neighbourhood CIL share from LVGV chargeable development if the charge is £0.

Joint recommendation

Shinfield, Arborfield, Earley and Winnersh should pursue a **single public LVGV obligations tracker** covering S106, S278, CIL assumptions, phasing, school delivery, transport, health, open space, flood mitigation, monitoring fees and variations.

Conclusions

The proposed CIL change is best understood as a **delivery-model switch**, not a simple tax cut or WBC profit mechanism. WBC's own materials show LVGV moving to a £0 CIL zone with infrastructure secured through S106/S278, while projected borough CIL income falls by about £63.6m compared with the adopted schedule. The viability work shows substantial LVGV infrastructure costs and developer appraisal outputs, but not WBC's net financial gain.

For **Shinfield**, the central issue is securing enforceable mitigation for a development largely outside the parish boundary but functionally connected to Shinfield's roads, facilities, health, recreation and green infrastructure. For **Arborfield**, the issue is direct growth management: ensuring schools, centres, roads, open space and community infrastructure arrive early enough and are not weakened by later viability or phasing revisions.

Planning Inspectorate Appeals for RG2 & RG7 within Shinfield Parish as at :-

4th September 2026

Item 87.1

Case Reference	Site Address	Post Code	Case Type	Linked	PA	Status	Decision Date	Comments
APP/X0360/C/25/3374730	Land at Gravelley Bridge Farm	RG7 1LG	Enforcement Notice Appeal		N/A	3	10/03/2026	The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.
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. Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/C/23/3314060	Uplands, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AP	Enforcement Notice	L2	222052	3	17/11/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI succeeded in part. 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/22/3311543	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 to house domestic garaging and ancillary storage with first floor games room

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

Reference	Address	Case Detail	Closed Date	Closure Reason
RFS/2025/090880	Land At Stanbury House, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Reading, RG7 1AJ	U/A works on site without PP	10 June 2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091186	14 Grovelands Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1DP	Breach of condition re replacement tree planting	8 June 2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091358	10 Railton Close, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 8TB	Dog breeding	30 June 2026	No breach
RFS/2026/091367	14 Blackwater Close, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1DT	BofC 4 - 6 PP193340	5 June 2026	Not expedient
RFS/2026/091426	Mallards, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1AD	Breach of condition 13 - Delivery Hours F/2014/1372	3 June 2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091429	1 Woodsend Close, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG6 4AT	more than one stand alone solar equipment without PP	16 June 2026	No breach
RFS/2026/091450	Land At Stanbury House, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Reading, RG7 1AJ	Advertisements on Heras fencing	29 June 2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091463	27 Huick Road, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9YG	Flag pole erected without permission	17 June 2026	No breach
RFS/2026/091464	1 Regis Close, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 8TA	Fence erected too close to neighbours property without PP	24 June 2026	No breach
RFS/2026/091466	Mallards, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1AD	possible BofC re the shop and conditions parking and layout	17 June 2026	No breach

Wokingham Borough Council – Previous month's closed Enforcement Cases for Shinfield Parish - September 26

For further information about a case, please contact planning.enforcement@wokingham.gov.uk, quoting the reference number

Confidential: Information that needs to be handled with care to avoid loss, damage or inappropriate access. Information which incorrectly disseminated could cause some distress to a limited number of individuals.

Reference	Address	Case Detail	Closed Date	Closure Reason

Wokingham Borough Council – Previous month’s closed Enforcement Cases for Shinfield Parish - September 26

For further information about a case, please contact planning.enforcement@wokingham.gov.uk, quoting the reference number

Confidential: Information that needs to be handled with care to avoid loss, damage or inappropriate access. Information which incorrectly disseminated could cause some distress to a limited number of individuals.

Reference	Address	Case Detail	Case Status
RFS/2025/090264	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	Tree works application 223088 replanting not undertaken.	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2025/090266	Bismillah House (formerly Foxglade), Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	Construction of extended area of hardstanding.	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2025/090858	Land North of Church Lane, Church Lane, Three Mile Cross	Non-compliance with conditions on 250435	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2025/090909	Land To The North Of, Croft Road, Spencers Wood, Reading	death of these trees on site	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2025/090934	Land North Of, Croft Road, Spencers Wood, Reading, RG2 9EX	BofC re landscaping	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2025/090984	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	Unauthorised workshop	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091036	Land North of Church Lane, Church Lane, Three Mile Cross	Erection of poles with lighting and cameras	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091040	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	refusal of 252320	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091137	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	TPO removal to facilitate hardstanding at the rear	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091170	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	Unauthorised fencing	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091185	12 -14 Grovelands Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1DP	PP 251536 withdrawn re amenity lane	Awaiting application

Wokingham Borough Council – Live Enforcement Cases for Shinfield Parish - September 26

For further information about a case, please contact planning.enforcement@wokingham.gov.uk quoting the reference number

Confidential: Information that needs to be handled with care to avoid loss, damage or inappropriate access. Information which incorrectly disseminated could cause some distress to a limited number of individuals.

Reference	Address	Case Detail	Case Status
RFS/2026/091195	Bismillah House, Brookers Hill, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BX	Extensions to existing outbuilding	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091283	Shire Hall, Shinfield Park, Shinfield, Reading, RG2 9XY	Site vibrations	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091305	12 Coningham Road, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 8QP	installed a large plastic waste storage tank - 1m from boundary	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091350	1 Ilbury Close, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9DE	Unauthorised construction	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091411	11 Grazeley Road, Three Mile Cross, Wokingham, RG7 1BL	large shed in the rear and put it into the front garden	Awaiting compliance
RFS/2026/091428	87 Garrett Drive, Shinfield, RG2 9LD	Fence higher than 2m & garage converted with no PP	Awaiting application
RFS/2026/091471	3 Bays Crescent, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1DF	Beauty business running from property without PP	Awaiting application
RFS/2026/091477	The Old Bakery, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Reading, RG7 1AA	Car park removed – Breach of condition	Awaiting application
RFS/2026/091491	1 Simonds Grove, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1BH	Garage conversion & units in rear garden without permission	Awaiting application
RFS/2026/091501	40 Copenhagen Rise, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1YT	Installation of climate control/cooling fan compressor units no PP	Investigation ongoing
RFS/2026/091512	Crosfields School, Shinfield Road, Shinfield, Berkshire, RG2 9BL	3rd Entrance being used for access without permission	Investigation ongoing

Wokingham Borough Council – Live Enforcement Cases for Shinfield Parish - September 26

For further information about a case, please contact planning.enforcement@wokingham.gov.uk quoting the reference number

Confidential: Information that needs to be handled with care to avoid loss, damage or inappropriate access. Information which incorrectly disseminated could cause some distress to a limited number of individuals.

Reference	Address	Case Detail	Case Status
RFS/2026/091545	Croft House, Croft Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG2 9EY	TPO tree cut back and roots damaged TPO-1958-2024	New case
RFS/2026/091592	12 Falcon Avenue, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 8EL	Building converted into a habitable studio unit.	Site visit pending
RFS/2026/091597	5 Anson Crescent, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 8JT	Separate house created without permission	Site visit pending

Wokingham Borough Council – Live Enforcement Cases for Shinfield Parish - September 26

For further information about a case, please contact planning.enforcement@wokingham.gov.uk quoting the reference number

Confidential: Information that needs to be handled with care to avoid loss, damage or inappropriate access. Information which incorrectly disseminated could cause some distress to a limited number of individuals.

SVG Footpath Report – August 2026

Welcome to our August report which contains a bit more information than last month's.

Shinfield Footpath 6.

The situation with this footpath was well documented last month and I am pleased to report that following discussions with Reading University we have a workable resolution.

It seems the contractor may not have understood his obligations with regard to working over a public right of way. The University's project manager for the track building discussed the issues with the contractor and the misleading signs were replaced with user friendly ones. The contractor does also have a man to shepherd walkers through the potentially dangerous area during working hours.

I took the opportunity to draw to the attention of the project manager the long grass on the footpath from the "U" bend out to the last kissing gate going east towards Cutbush Lane East. Almost every year the University can rely on the cattle in the field to keep the grass mown. Without the cattle due to the track build, the grass has been rampant. I explained to the project manager that this section of footpath is a headland path and therefore the responsibility of the landowner to keep the foliage cut for a width of 1.5 metres.

This was very quickly addressed for which we thank the University personnel for doing. The path should be open and it should be clear to all walkers where to go.

Shinfield Footpath 18.

We learned that this footpath was closed due to a serious leak from the sewer pipe that runs under the footpath in places. This has occurred a few times but was quickly repaired this time by Thames Water contractors. This path running from Church Lane is very important and links into Reading footpath 13 as part of a popular circular walk.

Shinfield Footpath 31A.

Working on behalf of WBC I led a Loddon Valley Group working party to replace the finger sign at the Pump Lane end of this footpath.

The original had mysteriously disappeared so I have attached a photo of the new one just to be boring!!



If you encounter an issue with the footpaths, please let us know because we may not be aware of it as was the case with footpath 6 initially. I can be contacted by email at ramblerray@gmail.com or you could advise the parish office and they will pass on your report.

Implications of National Planning Policy Framework

August 2026 on Shinfield Parish Council

The government issued a new NPPF in August 2026. The document runs to 130 pages plus appendices. This is an AI generated summary of that document for the benefit of councillors.

AI GENERATED FROM COPILOT

I have reviewed the attached [National Planning Policy Framework.pdf](#). This is a substantial rewrite of the NPPF rather than a minor update. For Shinfield, the most significant implications are likely to arise from housing delivery, Green Belt policy, development around rail stations, neighbourhood planning, infrastructure provision, sports facilities protection and the increased emphasis on sustainable transport and healthy communities. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Executive Summary: What matters most for Shinfield

1. Stronger presumption in favour of development within settlements

The framework now explicitly states that development within settlements should generally be approved unless adverse impacts substantially outweigh benefits. At the same time, development outside settlements is tightly controlled but includes a wider range of exceptions. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield

- Increased pressure for development within settlement boundaries.
- Greater importance of clearly defining settlement boundaries through the Local Plan.
- Potential intensification within existing built-up areas.

2. Major changes to Green Belt and "Grey Belt"

This is probably the single biggest issue for Shinfield.

The framework formalises:

- "Grey Belt" land.
- Green Belt review methodologies.
- Development around well-connected stations.
- New Green Belt "Golden Rules". [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Key changes include:

- Green Belt boundaries can be altered without exceptional circumstances where land around well-connected stations has been identified through plan-making. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)
- Development on Grey Belt land is specifically supported where criteria are met. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)
- Green Belt assessments must identify Grey Belt land through a standardised process. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield

- Significant implications for future Local Plan reviews around Reading's fringe.
- Increased pressure on land between settlements.
- Greater scrutiny of strategic gaps.
- Potential challenges in protecting separation between Shinfield, Reading, Spencers Wood and neighbouring settlements.

However, there is also useful support because settlement gaps may still be protected if necessary to maintain separate identities. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

3. Development around railway stations

A completely new and important policy.

Residential and mixed-use development outside settlements may be acceptable where it is:

- Within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (normally around 800m).
- Well-related to the station.
- Supported by infrastructure. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield Although Shinfield itself lacks a mainline station, the area's relationship with Green Park Station, Reading Station and planned transport infrastructure may become increasingly relevant in strategic planning discussions.

4. Significantly stronger housing delivery expectations

The framework reinforces:

- Meeting objectively assessed housing need.
- Five-year land supplies.
- Housing Delivery Test consequences.
- Faster build-out expectations. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Notable changes include:

- Local plans must identify enough sites to exceed requirements where appropriate.
- Allocations must include more small sites.
- Housing delivery below 75% automatically creates an "evidenced unmet need".
[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This will place continuing pressure on Wokingham Borough Council to demonstrate housing delivery, potentially increasing development pressure in strategic growth locations.

5. Neighbourhood Plans remain important

Good news for parish councils.

The new framework:

- Retains neighbourhood plans.
- Continues to require planning authorities to set neighbourhood-level housing figures.
- Provides continuing protection where neighbourhood plans are less than five years old and allocate housing. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield Your neighbourhood plan remains an important tool, but it cannot plan for less development than the Local Plan requires.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

6. Much stronger protection for sports facilities

This is particularly important for Shinfield given:

- High Copse.
- Manor Ground.
- Millworth Lane proposals.
- Football and cricket facilities.

Policy HC7 states that development should not result in the loss of:

- Playing fields.
- Sports facilities.
- Recreational land.
- Allotments.

Unless replacement or exceptional justification exists. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This considerably strengthens arguments for retaining council-owned sporting facilities and securing replacement provision where development occurs.

7. Greater emphasis on infrastructure before development

The framework places a much stronger expectation on:

- Water infrastructure.
- Drainage.
- Wastewater capacity.
- Electricity supply.
- Social infrastructure. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This could be particularly relevant where residents raise concerns about:

- Thames Water capacity.
- Sewerage infrastructure.
- Flood risk.
- School places.
- Healthcare capacity.

The framework gives increased weight to these matters.

8. Much greater emphasis on community infrastructure and health

The Healthy Communities chapter is significantly stronger.

It requires:

- Recreational provision.
- Playing spaces.
- Community facilities.
- Health infrastructure.
- Green infrastructure. [\[National_P..._Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National_P..._Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This supports:

- School Green Centre.
- Community hubs.
- Playing pitch provision.
- Outdoor recreation.
- Allotments.
- Youth facilities.

9. Sustainable transport becomes central

Transport policy has shifted from highway capacity toward a "vision-led" approach.

Development should:

- Prioritise walking.
- Prioritise cycling.
- Prioritise wheeling.
- Support public transport.
- Reduce reliance on private cars. [\[National_P..._Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National_P..._Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This aligns strongly with:

- Active travel projects.
- Shinfield Studio development.
- Cycling infrastructure discussions.
- Links to Green Park.
- Future strategic transport proposals.

10. Climate change and drainage requirements strengthened

Climate and flood risk provisions are significantly expanded.

The framework:

- Requires more climate resilience.
- Gives increased emphasis to SuDS.
- Supports tree planting.
- Encourages nature-based solutions.
- Requires future climate impacts to be considered. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

[\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Potential impact on Shinfield This will strengthen objections and negotiations where proposals do not adequately address:

- Surface water flooding.
 - Drainage.
 - Heat resilience.
 - Green infrastructure.
 - Biodiversity.
-

Key Parish Council Actions

For Shinfield Parish Council I would suggest particular attention to:

1. **Future Green Belt and Grey Belt assessments.**
2. **Protection of settlement gaps.**
3. **Maintaining an up-to-date neighbourhood planning position.**
4. **Protecting sports and recreation land.**
5. **Ensuring infrastructure delivery keeps pace with growth.**
6. **Monitoring transport-led development opportunities around stations.**
7. **Using the strengthened Healthy Communities policies to support community facility investment and Section 106 negotiations.**

[\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Overall, my initial view is that the **largest strategic risk for Shinfield is the expanded Green Belt/Grey Belt and station-led development framework**, while the **largest opportunity is the stronger national support for community facilities, sports provision, infrastructure and healthy communities.** [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

If helpful, I can also produce a **Shinfield-specific briefing note comparing the new NPPF against current Wokingham Local Plan policies and identifying which strategic sites around Shinfield could be most affected.**

National Planning Policy Framework 2026 vs Wokingham Local Plan and Implications for Shinfield

Executive Summary

The 2026 NPPF represents the most significant national planning change since the adoption of the Wokingham Local Plan. For Shinfield, the principal issues are likely to be:

1. **Increased pressure for additional housing development.**
2. **New Grey Belt and station-led development policies.**
3. **Stronger requirements to link housing growth with infrastructure delivery.**
4. **Greater protection for sports facilities and community infrastructure.**
5. **Increased emphasis on climate resilience, drainage and water infrastructure.**
6. **Potential implications of the AWE Burghfield Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for future development allocations and plan-making.**

[\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

1. Wokingham's Current Position

The adopted Wokingham Local Plan already allocates substantial growth in and around Shinfield:

- Shinfield Strategic Development Location.
- Former Shinfield Studios area.
- Existing developments around Three Mile Cross.
- Growth associated with the University area.
- Continued expansion towards Arborfield and Spencers Wood.

The Local Plan generally assumes:

- Higher housing delivery.
- Existing settlement-led growth.
- Strategic transport improvements.
- Green Belt protection west of Shinfield.

The new NPPF pushes further in several areas. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

2. Housing Delivery Pressure

NPPF Change

The NPPF significantly strengthens requirements to:

- Meet housing need in full.
- Maintain five-year housing land supply.
- Increase housing delivery.
- Allocate sufficient development land. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Where delivery falls below 75% of requirement an "evidenced unmet need" is deemed to exist. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

Historically Wokingham has been one of Berkshire's major growth authorities.

If future housing delivery falls:

- Pressure for additional allocations will increase.
- Brownfield opportunities will be pursued more aggressively.
- Edge-of-settlement sites may receive increased attention.

Shinfield remains one of the Borough's most sustainable growth locations due to:

- proximity to Reading;
- existing education provision;
- public transport links;
- existing strategic growth commitments.

Consequently Shinfield remains vulnerable to being identified as a location capable of accommodating further growth beyond that already allocated.

3. Green Belt and Grey Belt

NPPF Change

The framework now formally introduces:

- Grey Belt.
- Standardised Green Belt assessment methodology.
- Greater emphasis on releasing lower performing Green Belt land.
- Development opportunities around well-connected stations.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

The western part of the parish lies close to important Green Belt areas separating Reading from surrounding settlements.

The NPPF still recognises:

preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another; and maintaining settlement identity. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

This remains highly relevant to:

- Reading/Shinfield separation;
- Shinfield/Spencers Wood separation;
- Reading/Arborfield separation.

However, development promoters are likely to argue that some land performs weakly against Green Belt purposes and therefore constitutes "Grey Belt".

For Shinfield this means:

Risk

Some Green Belt parcels may face greater development pressure than under previous national policy.

Opportunity

The NPPF's new assessment framework provides a clearer basis for demonstrating that particular parcels remain strategically important in preventing settlement coalescence.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

4. Sports Facilities

This is one of the strongest areas for Shinfield.

NPPF Change

The NPPF significantly reinforces protection for:

- playing fields;
- recreation land;
- sports facilities;
- allotments. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Development causing loss should generally be refused unless replacement or exceptional justification exists. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

This strengthens the planning position of:

- High Copse cricket and football facilities;
- Manor Ground;
- Millworth Lane sports proposals;
- future sports hub projects;
- allotments and recreation grounds.

Given the Council's current investment programme in sports infrastructure, the revised NPPF is broadly supportive of future parish objectives.

5. Community Infrastructure

NPPF Change

The Healthy Communities chapter is substantially stronger. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Local plans are expected to:

- identify infrastructure deficits;
- protect community facilities;
- secure recreational provision;
- provide healthcare and education infrastructure. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

This provides stronger support for:

- School Green Centre;
- community halls;
- sporting hubs;
- youth facilities;
- community meeting spaces;
- future cultural infrastructure.

It should also strengthen the Council's case when seeking S106 or CIL investment connected to major housing schemes.

. Water Infrastructure and Thames Water

NPPF Change

The new framework places far greater emphasis on:

- wastewater capacity;
- drainage systems;
- water supply;
- strategic utility planning. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

This may become one of the most useful planning tools available to the Parish Council.

Future objections or representations can draw more directly upon:

- sewage network capacity;
- treatment capacity;
- surface water flooding;
- utility constraints.

The burden is increasingly on plan-makers and developers to demonstrate these issues have been properly addressed. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

7. Transport

NPPF Change

The framework moves away from purely highway-capacity thinking toward a "vision-led" transport model. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport are prioritised.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Implications for Shinfield

Future developments will be expected to:

- support active travel;
- support bus services;
- reduce reliance on private vehicles;
- demonstrate sustainable connectivity.

This supports many of the Council's aspirations around:

- Greenway connections;
- cycling infrastructure;
- sustainable links to Reading;
- links to Green Park Station.

8. Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ)

Why DEPZ Matters

The most significant Shinfield-specific issue not directly addressed by previous policy discussions is the relationship with AWE Burghfield.

Parts of Shinfield are affected by the:

AWE Burghfield Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ).

The new NPPF introduces stronger public safety provisions than previous versions.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Relevant New Policies

Policy P1 requires plans to identify locations where hazards may influence development. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Policy P5 requires decision-makers to address:

- safety risks;
- hazardous installations;
- consultation zones;
- nuclear consultation areas. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Specifically, the NPPF states development within consultation zones around nuclear facilities should only be supported where consultation bodies are satisfied development will be safe and will not constrain operation of the facility.

[\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Assessment for Shinfield

Positive Position

Much of Shinfield's strategic growth has already occurred.

Therefore:

- many large allocations already exist;
- much existing housing forms part of established communities;
- development is already reflected in emergency planning arrangements.

Potential Concerns

Future strategic allocations inside, or partly inside, the DEPZ could face:

- more extensive scrutiny;
- stronger evidence requirements;
- emergency planning assessments;
- consultation with relevant nuclear safety authorities.

The NPPF's stronger public safety wording may make it harder to justify major new residential allocations within sensitive consultation areas if emergency planning concerns arise. [\[National P... Framework | PDF\]](#)

Planning Implication

The Parish Council should ensure that any future Local Plan review explicitly examines:

1. DEPZ boundaries.
2. Population growth within the DEPZ.
3. Emergency evacuation implications.
4. Cumulative development impacts.
5. Whether growth locations remain compatible with public safety objectives.

The new NPPF arguably gives more policy weight to these considerations than previous editions. [\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Overall Risk Assessment for Shinfield

Issue	Risk/Opportunity
Additional housing allocations	High Risk
Grey Belt release	High Risk
Station-led development policy	Medium Risk
Settlement gap protection	Medium Opportunity
Sports facility protection	High Opportunity
Community infrastructure funding	High Opportunity
Water and drainage constraints	High Opportunity
Health and community facility provision	High Opportunity
DEPZ and public safety considerations	Medium to High Opportunity for stronger scrutiny

Conclusion

The biggest **threats** to Shinfield arise from:

- stronger housing delivery requirements;
- Grey Belt policy;
- continued pressure on land around Reading.

The biggest **opportunities** arise from:

- stronger sports facility protections;
- stronger community infrastructure requirements;
- stronger water and drainage policies;
- strengthened public safety policies that may assist consideration of future development proposals within the AWE Burghfield DEPZ.

[\[National Planning Framework | PDF\]](#)

Introduction

WBC are consulting on a consolidation of parking arrangements. What follows is an AI generated summary of the document with specific regard to impacts on Shinfield Parish.

AI Generated CoPilot Summary

I've reviewed Wokingham Borough Council (Various Off-Street Borough Car Parks) (Civil Parking Enforcement) Consolidation Draft Order 20XX. From a **Shinfield Parish Council perspective**, the direct impact appears to be **very limited**, with most of the Order consolidating and updating management arrangements for Wokingham Borough Council's off-street car parks rather than introducing significant new controls.

[\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Key Point for Shinfield

The only Borough-owned car park within Shinfield Parish included in the Order is:

- **School Green Car Park, Shinfield (RG2 9EH).** [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

The draft Order confirms:

- Parking remains available for standard motor vehicles.
- Parking must be within marked bays.
- The car park operates **24 hours per day, all year including bank holidays.**
- **No parking charges apply.**
- Maximum stay remains **up to 24 hours.** [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

What appears to be changing?

1. Formal Civil Parking Enforcement powers

The document modernises and consolidates Borough powers under the Traffic Management Act 2004 for all off-street car parks. It gives clearer authority regarding:

- Vehicle removal.
- Penalty Charge Notices.
- Parking bay enforcement.
- Electric vehicle bays.
- Permit schemes.
- Car park suspensions.
- Civil enforcement procedures. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

For Shinfield residents, this mainly means that School Green Car Park becomes part of a more comprehensive borough-wide enforcement framework.

2. New consistency across all Borough car parks

The Order introduces a consistent approach to:

- EV charging bays.
- Permit holders.
- Disabled bays.
- Electronic permits.
- Electronic payment systems.
- Suspension and dispensation arrangements. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Again, this is largely administrative rather than transformational for School Green.

Potential Implications for Shinfield

Positive Impacts

Stronger enforcement against misuse

- The Borough will have clearer powers to enforce parking rules, including parking outside bays, misuse of reserved bays or unauthorised occupation of the car park. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Future flexibility

- The Order provides mechanisms for introducing:
 - permit controls;
 - reserved bays;
 - EV charging bays;
 - temporary suspensions;
 - event management arrangements; should the Borough wish to do so in future. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Consistency across Berkshire-wide parking management

- The School Green site would be managed under the same legal framework as other Borough-managed car parks. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Possible Concerns

24-hour parking remains permitted

- The draft Order continues to permit stays of up to 24 hours at School Green. It does not appear to introduce any shorter stay limit that might improve space turnover for users of the School Green Centre or adjacent facilities.

[\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

No specific protection for parish users

- There is no special provision for:
 - School Green Centre users;
 - parish council staff;
 - café users;
 - cinema visitors;
 - community groups;
 - sports users. The car park remains a general public facility.

[\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Future changes could be made more easily

- By creating a comprehensive parking order structure, the Borough has a framework through which charging regimes, permit schemes or operational changes could potentially be introduced later through amendments. The draft itself does **not** introduce charges at School Green. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Matters SPC May Wish to Comment On

If Wokingham Borough Council is consulting on this draft, potential Shinfield-specific observations could include:

1. Support retention of **free parking at School Green**.
2. Seek confirmation that no charging proposals are planned for School Green.
3. Request consultation with SPC before any future changes to:
 - charging,
 - permit schemes,
 - EV bay allocation,
 - operational restrictions.
4. Consider whether the existing **24-hour maximum stay** remains appropriate for a community hub site or whether a shorter stay limit might help improve availability. (This is a policy consideration rather than something proposed in the Order.) [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

Overall Assessment

My reading is that this is primarily a **legal consolidation and modernisation exercise**. For Shinfield, the practical impact is minimal because **School Green Car Park remains free, available 24 hours a day and subject to a 24-hour maximum stay**, with no obvious new restrictions or charging proposals affecting parish residents or School Green Centre users. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)

The biggest issue for SPC is probably not what the Order changes now, but ensuring that any future decision to charge or alter the operation of School Green Car Park is made only after consultation with the Parish Council. [\[Wokingham...XX \(1\) \(1\) | PDF\]](#)