

**Appendix 2: Report of Consultation on the Meadway Centre Draft
Planning Brief**

**THE MEADWAY CENTRE DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF
REPORT OF CONSULTATION
November 2013**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report summarises the consultation on the Meadway Centre Draft Planning Brief, which was carried out in November and December 2012. It summarises the consultation measures undertaken in section 2, and discusses the results of consultation in section 3.
- 1.2 The next stage after consultation is to adopt the Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This is expected to take place in November 2013.
- 1.3 For any further information on this consultation exercise or the production of planning policy for the area, please contact the Planning LDF Team:

E-mail: LDF@reading.gov.uk

Tel: 0118 9373337

Address: Planning LDF Team
Level 8
Civic Offices
Reading
RG1 7AE

2. DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTATION EXERCISE

- 2.1 Consultation on the Meadway Centre Draft Planning Brief was undertaken for a six-week period, beginning on 9th November and ending on 21st December 2012.
- 2.2 The consultation on the Draft Brief followed an earlier period of consultation between February and April 2012. This earlier consultation sought the views of the community at the earliest stage on what the Brief should contain, which issues it should tackle, and how the centre should be developed. This was a wide-ranging consultation with a good response rate, and the report of consultation is available on the Council's website¹. Because this earlier consultation had been so wide-ranging, it was not considered necessary to undertake a consultation of the same extent on the Draft Brief.
- 2.3 In summary, consultation consisted of the following:
- A letter or e-mail containing the leaflet to identified important stakeholders;
 - A press release;
 - Brief available online;
 - Hard copies of the Brief available in libraries and the Civic Offices;
 - A drop-in/exhibition over two days in a vacant unit in the Meadway Precinct.
- 2.4 Consultation also led to coverage in the local press, e.g. getreading.co.uk on 1st March².

Mail-out

- 2.4 A letter or e-mail was sent out to identified important stakeholders. These were in many cases the same individuals and organisations that were specifically consulted in February 2012. Those consulted are set out in full in Annex 2, but in summary included:
- The landowners;
 - Essential infrastructure or service providers and statutory consultees, e.g. Thames Valley Police, Environment Agency;
 - Any individuals or community groups on the Planning section's consultation database with a postcode beginning in RG30 2, RG30 3 and RG30 4; and
 - Any individual or organisation that responded to the February to April consultation with contact details.

¹ <http://www.reading.gov.uk/documents/servingyou/planning/supplementary-guidance/23536/Meadway-Report-of-Consultation-0612.pdf>

² http://www.getreading.co.uk/business/s/2123386_tilehurst_people_call_for_redevelopment_of_meadway_precinct

Availability of Brief

- 2.5 The Brief was available online, with the webpage (www.reading.gov.uk/meadwaycentre) referenced in the letters and e-mails. The Brief was also available in all Reading Borough libraries and at the reception of the Civic Offices during the consultation period.

Drop-In Event

- 2.6 Council officers used the vacant unit 21 of the Meadway Precinct (the same unit as used for the drop-in event in March) to hold a drop-in exhibition on Friday 30th November and Saturday 1st December 2012. Officers were on hand to discuss the Brief between 10am and 4pm on both days, and there was a display featuring images of and information about the centre and the consultation.

3. RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

Written Responses

- 3.1 A total of 11 responses were received to the Draft Brief. This reflects the fact that this consultation was a much more focussed consultation than the February consultation, which resulted in 361 responses, which was much broader and wide-ranging.
- 3.2 A summary of the responses received is set out in Annex 1. This also includes the Council's response to the comment, which sets out how the comment has been taken into account in considering amendments to the Brief.

Drop-In Event

- 3.3 Around 30 people attended the drop-in event held on the 30th November and 1st December 2013. This is significantly fewer people than attended the corresponding drop-in events in March, but the comments in 3.1 also explain why this was the case.
- 3.4 The comments made during the drop-in event largely reflected those received in writing during both consultation periods in 2012. Examples include general support for the principle of redevelopment, dismay with the decline of the precinct in terms of both its popularity and its condition, specific types of shops being supported e.g. a post office, DIY shop, and some scepticism about the benefit of including housing.

ANNEX 1: SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED AND COUNCIL RESPONSE

Ref	Respondent	Document section/topic	Summary of response	Draft Council response
005161	Mr Tony Martin	Housing	Would oppose any extra housing due to the current congestion. There is not the capacity to handle any more traffic in Honey End Lane and the access from Asda is poor.	No change needed. The Brief states that the effects of additional trips would need to be mitigated by enhanced provision for non-car transport. This is an accessible District Centre and an appropriate location for additional housing in line with adopted Core Strategy policy.
		Housing	The current density of housing, particularly council/affordable houses seems high, so any more affordable housing would be negative for the area.	No change needed. Reading has a very strong need for new affordable housing, and adopted development plan policy seeks to ensure that new residential developments contribute to meeting this need. However, there are a variety of different types of affordable housing, and the Council will consider what is appropriate on each individual site.
		Open space	Apprehensive about providing more public spaces, as fear it would encourage youths to congregate and make others feel intimidated.	No change needed. It is appreciated that there can be issues with public spaces if they are poorly-designed and managed. However, well-designed open spaces can have the opposite effect. The Brief is clear on the need for good design of the public realm, and also on the need to ensure safety and security through design.
		Transport & access	It would be good to have a separate cycle path up the meadway, as there is a nasty pinch point at the pedestrian refuge, and cars park on the bay just past Liebenrood Road squeezing the space badly.	No change needed. The Brief does identify the need for the provision of enhanced cycling facilities. However, these would need to be fairly and reasonably related to the development, and therefore the scale and form of the development will inform the cycling facilities provided.
		Retail & leisure	Prefer to see Asda expand (e.g. at Lower Earley), including a café, rather than the addition of smaller shops, as these would be more expensive.	No change needed. An expanded superstore is one possible option, potentially containing other uses, where it would fulfil the principles in the Brief. However, the Meadway Centre is a district local centre, which should fulfil a wide variety of local needs for services and facilities. As such, diversity of its offer is essential to its survival. A simple superstore would no longer be a genuine district centre, and would need to be accompanied by other units, services and facilities, as is the case at Lower Earley.

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

		Retail & leisure	Opposes the pub, which would be a bad idea given the demographic. If a pub must be included it should be geared to more than just drinking.	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief does not specifically propose a pub. However, a pub may be acceptable as part of a mix of uses, as it can often play an important role at the centre of the community. Where there are likely to be significant effects on safety and security as a result of such a proposal, the strong guidance in the Brief (and elsewhere) would mean that such a proposal would be unlikely to be acceptable. However, this is often a matter of how the pub is managed, which is more a matter for other Council functions, e.g. licensing.</p>
005171	Mr John McLeod	Retail & leisure	Believes a high-quality pub/bar could enhance the area, but needs to be done carefully (e.g. The Moderation in Caversham)	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief does not specifically propose a pub. However, a pub may be acceptable as part of a mix of uses, as it can often play an important role at the centre of the community. Where there are likely to be significant effects on safety and security as a result of such a proposal, the strong guidance in the Brief (and elsewhere) would mean that such a proposal would be unlikely to be acceptable. However, this is often a matter of how the pub is managed, which is more a matter for other Council functions, e.g. licensing.</p>
		Layout and Design - <i>Safety and Security</i>	Good policing and CCTV would be essential.	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief specifically highlights security as a key issue and mentions the need for CCTV. However, policing is not a matter for the Brief.</p>
005101	Ms Shelagh Howard	General	The ideas for the Meadway look good, but it is not clear how much support you will get from Asda.	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Council will continue to endeavour to engage with Asda and the owners of the Asda site.</p>
		Layout and Design - <i>Landscape</i>	Hopes there is a total commitment to more trees and green, in contrast to what happened at Battle Hospital.	Noted. No change needed.
		Layout and Design - <i>Scale, Height and Massing</i>	Must ensure proposed buildings are not too dominant on the skyline.	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief contains guidance on height (p13), which should ensure that buildings are not overly dominant.</p>
		Land uses	To make the centre more attractive and communal there should be a cafe, outdoor seating in fine weather, a bank and Post Office.	<p>Partially agreed. Change proposed.</p> <p>The Brief identifies the need for some of these land uses, although, in the case of a post office for instance, the Council's planning powers cannot insist on this type of facility being available. However, the Brief does not currently mention external seating, and should be amended to do so.</p>

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

000013	Highways Agency	General	Do not have any comment at this time.	Noted. No change needed.
005235	Mrs Margaret Horne	General	Congratulations on the immense work you have put in on consultations and the reporting thereof	Noted. No change needed.
		Housing	Housing does not appear to have been favoured in the consultation. However, it is good to include some residential accommodation to make an area truly mixed use. Good to know that "people are around" once the shops and cafes close - deter crime and increase safety - particularly at night. There would not need to be a huge amount of housing to bring this about - as it is now, there are some flats above the shops.	Noted. No change needed. It is agreed that housing should be included within the proposal for the reasons described as well as others.
003192	Thames Water	Vision	The vision for the Meadway Centre is supported.	Noted. No change needed.
		Implementation	At this stage, without knowing the precise type, location and scale of development it is unclear what the net increase in demand on Thames Water's existing water and wastewater infrastructure networks will be. In respect of proposals for new development it will be essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water and wastewater infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that the development would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances, this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the statutory undertaker, then the developer needs to contact the undertaker to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development. It can take 18 months to 3 years to deliver local network upgrades and 3 to 5 years for strategic solutions.	Noted. No change needed. It is noted that there may be a lead-in time for any upgrades to water and wastewater infrastructure to be delivered, if they are needed. Policy CS34 of the Core Strategy ensures that development will only be acceptable where there will be sufficient water resources, sewerage and wastewater infrastructure, so this policy will be applied in assessing proposals. In general terms, this is a matter for the developers of any scheme in liaison with Thames Water, but a Utilities and Drainage Statement should be included with any application, as set out in the 'Implementation' section. It is worth remembering that there is already a significant amount of development on this site, so infrastructure upgrades may well not be needed, but this will depend on the form and scale of the development.

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

		Implementation	<p>The requirement for planning applications to be submitted with a Utilities and Drainage statement is strongly supported. We would expect that a Utilities and Drainage Statement should cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and how it can be met. • The proposed developments demand for sewage treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and how it can be met. • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and how it can be met. 	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The content of Utilities and Drainage Statements is set out in the Council's Validation Checklist (on the Council's website) and this broadly includes the issues identified here.</p>
		Implementation	<p>TWUL would expect to be consulted on most major planning applications. Our "Water Services Infrastructure guide for Local Planning Authorities" (2010) will be of assistance to you when determining which planning applications to consult TWUL on and in the preparation of LDF documents.</p>	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Council generally consults Thames Water on major planning applications.</p>
002645	Environment Agency	Sustainability	<p>The existing centre is largely made up of impermeable surfacing, and the nature of the topography of the site and surrounding areas has the potential for surface water runoff to enter surface drains and leave the site to surrounding areas quickly. Redevelopment of the site offers opportunities to include more sustainable drainage options such as permeable paving and green roofs which will retain pluvial water, and reduce pressure on the surface water sewers. As such we feel the Development Principle on Sustainability (17) should also explicitly reference the promotion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for any redevelopment proposals.</p>	<p>Agreed. Change proposed.</p> <p>This Development Principle should refer specifically to the potential for SuDS due to the character of the site.</p>
004167	Chillingham Ltd	General	<p>While concurring with its broad thrust, Chillingham do not consider that the principles set out in our email of 5 April have been fully reflected in the Draft Brief and have a number of specific concerns.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See below for response to specific issues.</p>

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

General	The draft Brief doesn't recognise that the District Centre boundary has been extended through the Development Plan review. It should be referred to in the Brief and acknowledged as an opportunity for development, potentially in conjunction with redevelopment or remodelling of adjacent existing buildings within the centre.	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief clearly shows the boundary of the centre on p5. The proposals clearly cover the whole site contained within this boundary, as indicated, for instance, on Figure 4 showing the development principles. The history of the boundary is not of particular relevance.</p>
General	The Brief needs to be commercially realistic. As such it needs to recognise explicitly that the site is currently in two principal ownerships. The ownership structure also includes long-leasehold interests which further impact upon the ability and timescales for assembling land that is required to bring forward development proposals.	<p>Partially agreed. Change proposed.</p> <p>The Brief recognises that the site is in two principal ownerships, and this has underpinned the proposals for the site. Nevertheless, it is agreed that this could be further reinforced in section 2, under 'Description of the Site', and in section 6 'Development Options'.</p>
Vision	Chillingham supports the broad principle that the Meadway Centre will be developed in order to provide a high quality, thriving and inclusive district centre for the local community it serves. However, it is essential that the Vision is commercially realistic. As currently drafted, the Brief is overly prescriptive and could work against delivering a viable development scheme at the centre if it is applied in its current form.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is considered that the Brief is sufficiently flexible to allow a commercially realistic scheme to come forward that meets the development principles set out in the document.</p>
Land uses	While it is acknowledged that, as a district centre, the Meadway Centre should continue to accommodate a broad mix of uses, it is important that the Brief is not too prescriptive in terms of the range of uses allowed within the centre. Chillingham are concerned with the apparent strict requirement that there should be no reduction in the overall diversity of uses and units. Diversity, we feel should not and can not be determined by the number of units in a centre. The overall offer provided by occupiers of the centre is what determines diversity and having a range of modern accommodation that is attractive to the market is important. The Brief should not, therefore, seek to preclude the loss, or remodelling, of existing units that would facilitate suitable accommodation that is attractive to the market. Desirable uses such as cafes and banks rely upon high levels of passing footfall, so a range of suitable accommodation is required to attract anchor attractions to the centre.	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief states that "there should be no reduction in the overall diversity of uses and units". This is a statement of adopted development plan policy in Core Strategy policy CS26 that the range of uses will be widened in the identified centres. The guidelines use the word 'diversity' rather than 'number' because it is diversity that is important rather than number of units of a floorspace figure. There is no implication that diversity will be judged on the basis of total number of units or total amount of floorspace.</p>

	Land uses	<p>Chillingham have particular concern in relation to the suggestion at paragraphs 5 and 6 that the Meadway Centre is an appropriate location for an intensification of residential uses at the site and that the site should deliver new affordable housing. Such requirements to increase the residential offer within the centre is a potential impediment to achieving the key aspects of the vision for the centre, namely to provide a range of district centre services and facilities for the local community. Such a requirement is unnecessarily burdensome and contrary to the overarching objectives set out in the NPPF for the planning system to support, not hinder, economic growth. There is already a significant amount of residential accommodation within the centre and further residential accommodation could threaten the viability of a redevelopment scheme to enhance the offer of the centre. We would suggest that the Brief be revised to acknowledge this and make clear that the Council's overall priority is to secure a successful redevelopment of the centre, retaining (and perhaps increasing) where feasible and viable residential accommodation, but ensuring that the principal focus remains upon shopping and service facilities which meet the needs of the local community.</p>	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>There is no absolute requirement in the Brief to increase the amount of residential. However, 5.2 states that an intensification of residential is sought on the site, which is in line with the Council's adopted Core Strategy. Paragraph 3.23, in outlining the spatial strategy for district and local centres, emphasises the role of increased housing in these locations. Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy links development intensity to accessibility levels, and specifically refers to access to district and local centres.</p> <p>However, it is an absolute requirement that there be no net loss of residential. This is adopted policy (Core Strategy policy CS17) and cannot be over-ridden in a Supplementary Planning Document. Retaining at least the same level of housing on site will be essential to ensuring that there is activity at various times of the day, contributing to safety and security and the overall vitality and viability of the centre.</p> <p>No justification is given as to how increasing the level of residential accommodation renders the development unviable, or how it prevents other uses (most of which would be ground floor uses) being delivered. Different mixes of uses in different layouts will have different levels of viability, but the Council does not believe that there is any justification for a blanket assertion that increasing residential will necessarily make development unviable.</p> <p>In terms of what the priorities for the centre should be, these are set out in the Vision, which specifically mentions that the centre will be a desirable place for people, including families, to live.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship to the national priority for economic development, it is considered that the provision of housing is entirely in line with this aim. Numerous ministerial statements and policy documents published recently have made clear how important the Government considers new housing to be for economic growth, and the local business sector often identifies sufficient housing as a key infrastructure requirement to growth in the area.</p>
--	-----------	--	--

<p>Layout and Design - <i>Layout</i></p>	<p>While we acknowledge that there would be merit in comprehensive redevelopment of the entire district centre site, including the site of the Asda store, this would appear to be unlikely to be achievable in practice. While this is acknowledged elsewhere in the Brief, it should be expressly acknowledged at 5.3.</p>	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>Paragraph 6 already acknowledges that a comprehensive scheme may not be possible. This part of the Brief sets out broad principles that will apply to any development, and is not the place to discuss the different potential scenarios. Potential development scenarios are dealt with in section 6.</p>
<p>Layout and Design - <i>Layout</i></p>	<p>The analysis at 5.3 should recognise that partial redevelopment / extension of the shopping precinct site may be the most / only viable option and that the Council remain open-minded about considering any such option on its merits, taking into account the wider objectives set out elsewhere in the Brief.</p>	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>Page 20 contains some commentary which states that partial redevelopment may be acceptable where it meets the development principles of the Brief, which is conceivable but unlikely. However, simple extension of the precinct will not be acceptable. It will do nothing to address the fundamental problems with the precinct, or centre, as it stands, and a proposal for extension has been assessed and rejected through the planning application process for precisely this reason. It would therefore be misleading for the Brief to indicate that simple extension may be possible when, in all likelihood, it will not be.</p>
<p>Layout and Design - <i>Density and Mix</i></p>	<p>It is not accurate to comment (as set out at para 13 of 5.3) that district centres should necessarily be locations of higher-density development than surrounding residential areas and indeed there are many examples of successful district centres around the country which are not. This commentary should be revised in a manner which makes clear that while higher density forms of development will be encouraged, other forms of development may be acceptable where they would meet the objectives set out in the Brief.</p>	<p>No change needed.</p> <p>Paragraph 13 is not a commentary on what is the case elsewhere, rather it is a statement of the strategy for Reading, as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. That spatial strategy includes additional development for a mix of uses in identified district and local centres, and paragraph 3.23 of the Core Strategy highlights the benefit of higher-density development in such locations. This is given policy expression in CS4, which links accessibility to development density, and states that proximity to a district or local centre will be one of the determinants of development density. As such, paragraph 13 is simply an expression of the adoption development plan policy, which cannot be over-ridden by a SPD.</p>

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

		Development options	Para.6.6 is prescriptive and confusing in its intention. On one hand, the Brief seeks to ensure that any redevelopment of the precinct does not prejudice future development layouts for the Asda site. On the other hand, however, the Brief directs development to respect the existing Asda layout by, for example, ensuring that there is an entrance to the development that is close to the Asda entrance. It would be unfortunate for a redevelopment scheme to be brought forward for the precinct that is overly-dependent upon the existing orientation of the Asda store and then for the Asda store to be redeveloped at a later date. The Brief should seek to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian access between any redeveloped precinct and the Asda store, though be sufficiently flexible so that linkages can be adjusted, as necessary, at a later date should the Asda site be redeveloped.	<p>Agreed. Change proposed.</p> <p>It is vitally important that any development of the precinct only relates well to the Asda store, and enables good linkages between the two, because redevelopment of the Asda store could happen much later, if at all. However, it is not the intention that the layout of the precinct development has the effect of preventing a reorientation of the Asda site if that would be beneficial. Therefore, the linkages should work with both a retained Asda and with a future development of the site. Of course, these difficulties demonstrate why a comprehensive development would be preferable.</p>
003105	Mr Keith Elliott	General	Fully support the content of the Draft Planning Brief.	Noted. No change needed.
		General	I hope that, if and when development occurs, the greater part of the brief's objectives can be met. I was disappointed that important elements of the Battle Hospital planning brief never got incorporated into the development (e.g. the lost piazza of West Reading). Please fight to ensure that the residents of West Reading get a development that doesn't squander the opportunity for real improvements to the area.	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Council intends to ensure that development proposals reflect the objectives of the Brief. In the case of Battle, the applications were judged against policy at the time, including the Revised Planning Brief, and considered to be acceptable. The areas of open space within the development correspond to those sought within the Brief.</p>
002264	Natural England	General	Nothing within the Draft Planning Brief that is likely to have substantial impact upon any of Natural England's existing concerns, so no specific comments.	Noted. No change needed.
		Natural Environment	Recommend that where appropriate you use redevelopment as an opportunity to protect, create and enhance Green Infrastructure, which can play an invaluable role in improving the quality of urban living and is considered beneficial to physical health and mental well being, the provision of essential ecosystem services such as water management and urban cooling and aiding climate change adaptation.	<p>Noted. No change needed.</p> <p>The Brief seeks additional green infrastructure in line with policy DM17 (Green Networks) of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, which focuses in particular on creating a network of green. On this site, an opportunity has been identified for bridging an existing gap within the network, south of Asda, and this should inform any development proposals.</p>

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

004993	Mr Roderick Standing	General	I fully agree with most of the Council's policies regarding the centre as specified in the Draft Planning Brief, but feel that some policies are unnecessarily fussy.	Noted.
		Vision	It would be unnecessary to demolish Asda simply to make it harmonise with a redeveloped precinct. Demolishing Asda would be inconvenient to local residents, and Asda may be tempted to increase their prices to recoup expenditure.	No change needed. The Brief does not insist on the redevelopment of Asda, but recognises that a comprehensive solution is likely to deliver the best option in the long-term. A beneficial long-term development will be worth some short-term disruption, although the 'Implementation' section of the Brief does discuss how to minimise this through phasing where possible. The redevelopment of the Asda store would only take place if viable, and would not therefore necessitate the raising of prices.
		Vision	Not sufficient justification for redeveloping the precinct. No evidence it is structurally unsound, and signs of delapidation are due to neglect. Disagree that customers are put off shopping there due to the appearance, as most customers use a particular centre because of location, goods/prices, using shops which are close together, and/or car parking charges. Owners of the precinct may be tempted to raise rents to recover cost of redevelopment. If the buildings are structurally sound, it should be thoroughly renovated and smartened up rather than redeveloped.	No change needed. The issues with the centre have been widely documented in the documents produced so far, and do not necessarily relate to structural unsoundness, of which the Council has no particular evidence. The consultation responses show substantial local support for redevelopment, and the reasoning for why this is considered a better option than simple refurbishment are set out in the Brief itself.
		Access & transport	No need to eliminate the gentle slopes of the car park at a large cost.	No change needed. The Brief states that, where new areas of parking are provided, these should avoid the slope issues that have been raised by a number of respondents as being a problem, particularly for elderly people. If these new areas of parking are being provided anyway, meeting this requirement should not present a major issue.
		Layout and Design - <i>Safety and Security</i>	No explanation or credible alternative is given for the advice to avoid roller shutters on p29. This should be clarified for shopkeepers.	Agreed. Change proposed. There are alternatives to roller shutter shopfronts that also provide security, including lattice grilles and internal shutters. Paragraph 10.4.5 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document provides guidance, but it is agreed that the alternatives should be highlighted here.

ANNEX 2: INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED ON THE DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF

Mrs K Abbott
Ability Housing Association
Mr Omar Adhikari
Age Concern Reading
Ms Vivienne Akerman
Alan Place Residents Association
Mr Terry Alway
Mr Craig Anderson
Councillor James Anderson
Mrs M Anderson
Mrs Ann Armstrong
Mr and Mrs J Arnott
Asda Stores Ltd
Mr Fred Ashcroft
Mrs Cheryl-Anne Ashfield
Mr Mike Atkinson
Mr. Malcolm Avenell
Councillor Mohammed Ayub
Mrs Susan Baker
Councillor Isobel Ballsdon
V Barker
Mr Mark Barrett
Barrett Estate Services
Mrs Annie Bass
BBOWT
Professor Nigel Bell
Mrs Pamela Bell
Eileen and John Benham
Councillor Daisy Benson
Berkshire West Primary Care Trust
Mr Joseph Bishop
Britt Bjoro And Dave Long
Dr Kevin Blackburn
Mrs Elizabeth Blair
Mr Barry Blewitt
Miss J Bottiglieri
Mr John Boxall
Mrs S Brailsford
Mrs Judith Brazell
Dr Carol Brickley
Mrs Cathy Bristow
British Estate Services
Mr Fred Brown
Jodie Brown
BT Repayments Planning Department
Mr Craige Burden
Isabel Burn
Mr Scott Calder
Mrs E Campolucci
Mrs E Card
Mrs Michelle Cardwell
Mrs Margaret Cassidy
Mr Piers Caswell
Catalyst
Mrs V Cechova
Mrs L Chandler
Mr Kelvin John Chaplin
Chillingham Ltd
Mr Leslie Chubb
Carol Cissewski
Mrs S Clancy
Mr Charlie Clare
Dr Samantha Coates
Mr J Colbourn
Mr David Cole
Mr Peter Coles
Mr R Constance
George and Sheila Cook
Mrs M Cook
Tim Cook
Mr Mike Copsey
Mrs Lisa Corrigan
Mrs E Coulson
Ms Barbara Crabb
CRAG
Mr Michael Cragg
Mrs D Cripps
Miss Grace Crossley
Mr Sean Cullen
Councillor Andrew Cumpsty
Ian Cuthbert
Mr Ronald Cutting
Miss Camellia Dara
Councillor Richard Davies
Mrs Ann Davis
Mrs M Day
Miss Patricia Day
Mrs Virginia Day
Dee Park Residents Association
Mrs Nikola Dennison
Mr Derek Dibley
Mrs K Dix
Jeffrey Dobson
Mr Keith Downer
Briony and David Downey
DPP
Miss Joanna Driver
Ms K Southwood-Duke
Mrs Tracey Dunk
Councillor Ricky Duveen
Mrs Heather Dyer
Councillor Melanie Eastwood
East Tilehurst NAG
Councillor Rachel Eden
Mr Alun Edwards
Councillor Deborah Edwards
Councillor Kelly Edwards
Mrs Lynn Eggleton
Mr P Elford
Mr Dean Ellis
Ms Liz Ellis
Miss Mandy England
Eric and Shirley Englefield
Councillor John Ennis
Environment Agency Planning Liaison
Mr R Farley
Mr David Farrell
Mrs Jackie Faulkner
Mr Sunil Fernandes
Miss Caroline Fish
Mrs Sheila Fisher
Miss L Fitzpatrick
My Anthony Ford
Mr Colin Ford
Mrs H.O. Fortnum
Mr Garry Foster
Mrs C Frost
Mrs Carol Froud
Mr William Froud
Mr Donald Gauntlett
Councillor Jan Gavin
Mrs Dorothy Gibert
Miss Helen Gibson
Gillbe
Mr Patrick Ginnelly
Councillor Paul Gittings
Mr D Goss
Mrs Jessie Goss

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

Mr Stuart Gould
Granville Road Residents Association
Mrs Janet Gray
Mr Jonathan Green
Mr David E J Gregory
Mrs Lesley Griffiths
Ms S Grover
Mrs Claire Gulliver
Mr T Gutteridge
Councillor Sarah Hacker
Mrs J Hagger
Mr N Haines
Mr Peter Hallbery
Miss Dawn Halpin
Miss Nicola Hamblin
Mr David Harris
James Harris
Councillor Tim Harris
Mrs Tracey Harris
Mrs Maureen Harrow
Mr William Harrow
Mrs Mary Hatchwick
Mr Melvyn Hawkins
Mrs R Hawkins
Health And Safety Executive
Mr. Peter Hempstead
Mr Paul Higginbotham
Mr Steve Higgs
Highways Agency Network Strategy
Mrs Erika Maria Hill
Mr Dave Hobley
Mr John Hoggett
Mr and Mrs Holland
Mrs Helen Holliday
Holybrook Parish Council
Ms Hopkins
Mr Brian D Hopkins
Councillor Ed Hopper
Miss P Hornsby
Councillor Graeme Hoskin
Ms Shelagh Howard
Dr Chris Howlett
Mrs Lis Howlett
Mr Vincent Hudson
Mrs W Hunt
Mrs Penny Hunter
Mrs V Hurn
Ms Catherine Hutchison
Miss Freda Hyatt
Inglewood Court Residents Association
Mr and Mrs Ireland
Mr & Mrs Jarrett
Mrs Jane Jarvis
Mrs J Jenner
Mr Graham Jerome
Norman Johnson
Mrs Susan Johnston
Mr John Jones
Councillor Peter Jones
Councillor Tony Jones
Miss Milli Jwalli
Dr M Karim
Mrs Angela Kennedy
Mrs T Kennedy
Councillor Gul Khan
Ms S Kiely
Mrs Rose Larter
Ms S Law
Mr Andrew Laylry
Miss Dawn Lee
Mr D Li
Mrs Diana Lincoln
Mrs Sheila Lines
Councillor Marian Livingston
Mr D Long
Mr David Looker
Mr Anthony Love
Mr D Lovelock
Councillor Jo Lovelock
Mr Ian Mackinder
Mr I Madelin
Mr Richard Mallett
Mrs R Mansor
George Martin and Ruth Hutchinson
Mrs L Martin
Mr Tony Martin
Councillor Chris Maskell
Mrs Hazel Matthews
Mrs Susan McCready
Mrs Elaine McDonald
Mrs G McDonald
Mrs M McDermott
Councillor Eileen McElligott
Miss Paula McEntee
Mr John McLeod
Mrs Ida McVetis
Marie-Dominique Meunier
Mr Terry Mills
Mrs M Minty
Mr Paul Morris
Miss H Morton
Natural England
Dr Jane Needham
Mrs Jacqueline Nichols
Mrs B Noctor
Norcot NAG
Norcot Residents Association
Mr Derek North
Mrs C Northway
Councillor Meri O'Connell
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Mrs Z O'Gorman
Mr Kiely Oliver
Councillor Mike Orton
Keith Osgood
Mr A Overton
Mrs Mary Oxlade
Councillor Tony Page
Mrs Zoe Page-Smith
Miss Sue Papp
Miss D Parker-Boyes
Parkside Housing Group
Mrs Elizabeth Parsons
Mr Matthew Pentland
Mr Bertram Pepper
Mrs M Pickford
Mr J Pike
Mr William Pocock
Mrs R Porter
Mr Meyrick Price
Pride of Dee Park
Prospect College
Mr J Provino
Raglan Housing Association
Mrs Clotilda Rahman
Councillor Mark Ralph
Ms Zeba Rao
Mr L Ravenscroft

The Future of The Meadway Centre - Report of Consultation (November 2013)

RCRE
Readibus
Reading Civic Society
Reading CTC District Association
Reading Cycle Campaign
Reading Friends of the Earth
Reading Taxi Association
Reading Transport Ltd
Reading UK CIC
Reading Urban Wildlife Group
Reading Youth Cabinet
RFTRA
Mrs Peggy Rigby
Mrs Sandra Rimmer
Malcolm and Nancy Ritchie
I Rivers
Mrs J Robins
Mrs Theresa Robinson
Mr Tom Robinson
Councillor Matt Rodda
Mrs J Rose
Mr C Round
Royal Berkshire Fire And Rescue Service
Mrs Rachel Ruchpaul
Mrs G Rudman
Councillor Pete Ruhemann
Ms V Rush
Mr A Rutter
Mrs M Ryall
Councillor Rebecca Rye
Councillor Jenny Rynn
SAKOMA
Mrs Janette Sassoon
Mrs M Searl
Miss Jackie Serjent
Mr Alok Sharma MP
Mr Christopher Sharp
Mr Matt Shaw
Ms S Sheikh
Mrs M Shelley
David And Gaylene Shepherd
E Sheppard
Mrs J Sheppard
Mr Raymond Shelton
Mrs Victoria Silvey
Mrs I Simmonds
Ms Nicky Simpson
Mrs Norma Sinclair
Mr Thomas Sinclair
Councillor Daya Pal Singh
Councillor Jeanette Skeats
Miss Michelle Sleaford
Mr J Smith
Mr R V Smith
Miss S Smith
Mrs C Snarey
Southcote GLOBE
Southcote NAG
Southcote Residents Association
Mr Graham Spicer
Sport England
Mr Roderick Standing
Mr Ben Stanesby
Councillor Jane Stanford-Beale
Councillor Tom Stanway
Mr Fred Stark
Mrs A Stevens
Councillor David Stevens
Ms Joanna Stewart
Mrs Shelagh Stiles
Mr PJT Stream
Mrs L Sullivan
SusTrans
Mrs E Tapsfield
Mr Frank Tatam
Mrs K Tatam
Mr Malcolm Taylor
Mrs J Temperley
Ms Melanie Tether
Thames Valley Chamber Of Commerce
Thames Valley HA
Thames Valley Police
Thames Valley Police - Crime Prevention Design Team
Thames Water
Mr M Thord
Mr RS Thompson
Councillor Liz Terry
Councillor Bet Tickner
Tilehurst Free Church
Tilehurst GLOBE
Tilehurst Parish Council
Tilehurst Residents and Community Association
Mrs Dorothy Townsend
Transport 2000
TREGA
S E Tucker And J Calcutt
Louise Turner
Mrs C Tull
Mrs Eileen Uden
Mr J Varney
Councillor Sandra Vickers
Dr Shirley VInall
Mrs M Waddell
Mr Johann Wain
Lee & Brian Waite
Mr James Walsh
Warden Housing Association
Mr David Warren
Mr Patrick Way
Mr K Weaver
Mr P Weaver
Mrs R Wells
West Berkshire Council
Western Elms Residents Association
Councillor Rob White
Councillor Jamie Whitham
Mr E Wild
Mr John Wilkins
Mrs P Williams
Councillor Rose Williams
Councillor Richard Willis
Mrs E Winder
Mrs Diane Wood
Mr Tim Wood
Mrs E Woodcock
Mrs Patricia Woodcock
Mr J Woods
Councillor Paul Woodward
Mr Duncan Wooldridge
Mrs Susan Woosnam
Mrs Audrey Young
Mr Mark Young
Mr S Young
Mr M Zamir

A separate list of those consulted on the initial options consultation in February to April 2012 is included in the Report of Consultation (June 2012).