

## **Chapter 6: Socio-Economics**



| SOCIO-ECONOMICS     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AUTHOR              | Hatch Regeneris                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| SUPPORTING APPENDIX | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| KEY CONSIDERATIONS  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of existing employment;</li> <li>• The generation of temporary employment opportunities during the construction phase;</li> <li>• The creation of net additional long-term employment opportunities from the proposed commercial uses of the Proposed Development;</li> <li>• The net effects of additional expenditure resulting from the additional employees and residents;</li> <li>• The provision of new homes and the contribution of the new homes, including affordable homes, to local policy housing targets;</li> <li>• Implications of the site's new residential population for early years, primary and secondary school places; and</li> <li>• Implications of the site's new residential population upon primary healthcare facilities and open space provisions including children's play space.</li> </ul> |
| CONSULTATION        | An EIA Scoping Report was prepared and submitted to the RBC in September 2018 requesting a formal Scoping Opinion from the RBC on the scope of the EIA. A copy of the EIA Scoping Report is provided in ES Volume 3: Appendix- EIA Scoping. A Scoping Opinion has not been received at the time of preparing this ES. The EIA has proceeded in the absence of a formal opinion received.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

## ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

### Defining the Baseline

#### Current Baseline Conditions

- 6.1** The socio-economic matters which have been taken into account in this chapter include:
- Population and labour market;
  - Housing Supply;
  - Employment;
  - Education;
  - Healthcare; and
  - Open Space and play space.
- 6.2** Data used to establish the current baseline conditions are drawn from a range of sources which are referenced at relevant sections and include:
- The 2011 Census of Population<sup>1</sup>;
  - Office for National Statistics (ONS) Annual Population Survey<sup>2</sup> (APS);
  - The Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES)<sup>3</sup> (ONS);
  - ONS Family Expenditure Survey<sup>4</sup>;
  - National Health Service (NHS) Choices and NHS South Reading Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG);
  - Department for Education (DfE) (school locations and capacity information); and
  - Reading Childcare Sufficiency Assessment<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ONS (2011), 'Census of Population'.

<sup>2</sup> ONS (2018), 'Annual Population Survey'.

<sup>3</sup> ONS (May 2018), 'Annual Business Survey, UK non-financial business economy'.

<sup>4</sup> ONS (2016/17) 'Family Expenditure Survey'.

<sup>5</sup> Reading Borough Council, Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2017, October 2017

<sup>6</sup> ONS (2011), 'Census of Population'.

**6.3** Where baseline information about the Local Impact Area (LIA) is not available, either due to changes in boundaries or as a result of the disclosive nature of the data, the latest Census<sup>6</sup> has been used to provide some additional context.

**6.4** The baseline conditions are considered according to the following spatial areas:

- LIA – defined as Abbey ward in which the site is located, and which encapsulates the Reading town centre and opportunity area;
- Borough – Reading Borough. This is the administrative area in which the site is situated and has been used to assess economic and housing effects;
- Regional – Berkshire and/or South East region. Where appropriate and for benchmarking purposes Berkshire and the South East region has been included to set the relevant baseline data in context; and
- National – England. The National average has been included where appropriate to contextualise the baseline data.

**6.5** In addition to the above spatial scales, community infrastructure facilities are also assessed in relation to a number of 'catchment' spatial scales. These are summarised as follows and have been categorised according to the same spatial area descriptions above:

- Primary Healthcare Facilities (Local) - within one mile for GP surgeries based on advice from the NHS Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU<sup>7</sup>);
- Primary Schools (Local) – within 2 miles of the Site<sup>8</sup>;
- Secondary Schools (Borough) – within Reading, based on school catchment areas; and
- Open Spaces (Local) – within 1km radius of the Site.

#### Evolution of the Baseline

**6.6** It is assumed that the existing uses would remain on site in the absence of the Proposed Development. Where information is available, a qualitative approach has been taken to describe the expected changes in the baseline conditions of the relevant study areas.

### Impact Assessment Methodology

#### Demolition and Construction

**6.7** The following matters are to be assessed:

- Employment.

#### Employment

**6.8** To estimate employment during the demolition and construction phase, Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Labour Coefficients<sup>9</sup> (person years of employment<sup>10</sup> per £1m spend) were applied to the forecasted costs associated with the demolition and construction works. Person years of employment are divided by the expected timescale of the demolition and construction works as set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Construction and Demolition**, to provide the average annual number of jobs.

**6.9** It is acknowledged that whilst some construction workers, paid as a result of the construction activity, may live locally and their expenditure on household goods and services would also support employment in local business, it is also likely that construction workers could be drawn from the wider region depending on the construction role they provide. On this basis, an estimate of the induced effects of this construction expenditure (at local level) cannot be quantified with accuracy.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.healthyrurbandevelopment.nhs.uk/>

<sup>8</sup> Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. This is used as the upper bound for determining eligibility for free school transport. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to assess primary provision.s

<sup>9</sup> See Homes and Communities Agency (2015), 'Calculating Cost Per Job – Best Practice Note. Third Edition'

<sup>10</sup> A person year is defined as the amount of work done by a person in one year on a specific project.

*Completed Development*

6.10 The following matters are to be assessed:

- Employment;
- Local Expenditure and Induced Employment;
- Population and Labour Market Effects;
- Housing Supply; and
- Demand for Community Infrastructure.

*Employment*

6.11 The assessment of employment once the Proposed Development is complete and occupied is based on the proposed schedule of commercial floorspace and land uses (refer **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**).

6.12 The HCA Employment Densities Guide<sup>11</sup> was used to calculate the likely number of full time equivalent<sup>12</sup> (FTE) jobs that would be supported by each type of floor space (both existing and proposed scenarios).

6.13 A series of additionality adjustments (listed below) have been applied to the estimated direct job numbers to estimate net additional job numbers. The adjustments are based on best practice from the HCA's Additionality Guide<sup>13</sup>, and include:

- Deadweight – Deadweight refers to the jobs that are currently generated on-site which will be lost (and replaced) as a result of the Proposed Development coming forward. Deadweight is estimated based on the existing retail floorspace that will be affected as a result of the Proposed Development and by applying standard employment densities to estimate the level of existing employment;
- Displacement – refers to the proportion of outputs (such as jobs) accounted for by reduced outputs elsewhere within the impact areas assessed. Displacement assumptions have been made in line with the afore mentioned HCA Guidance and will vary depend on land use type. These assumptions are set out within the potential effects sections;
- Leakage – refers to the proportion of outputs (jobs) that are lost to outside of the impact area(s) as a result of the Proposed Development. Leakage is assumed to be 0% as the estimated direct jobs are generated by on-site elements of the Proposed Development and would therefore be contained within the LIA and District;
- Multipliers – indirect and induced multipliers have been used to measure the off-site jobs supported by the direct, on-site jobs occurring as a result of the Proposed Development:
  - Indirect (also referred to as supply chain) impacts are generated as a result of spend by the on-site activities on services and/ or supplies required for their day-to-day operations.
  - Induced impacts are associated with local expenditure as a result of those who derive incomes from the direct (i.e. on-site) and / or supply chain (i.e. off-site) impacts of the Proposed Development.
  - A composite multiplier of 1.1 has been used at the Borough level based on the HCA's Additionality Guide.

*Local Expenditure and Indirect Employment*

6.14 The direct effects of household expenditure are estimated based on regional data for spending on convenience and comparison goods, taken from the ONS Family Expenditure Survey (year ending 2017) and applied to the number of dwellings of the Proposed Development. A qualitative judgement is used to assess the scale of the impact / effect on the local economy.

6.15 The indirect spending effects generated from the goods and services purchased by residents of the Proposed Development may also support employment. An estimate of this has been made by applying the average

annual turnover per FTE employee by relevant sector (retail, food services etc) based on data from the ABS to the household expenditure levels.

*Population and Labour Market Effects*

6.16 The estimated population to be generated by the Proposed Development is based on the proposed residential mix of units applied to the average household size (1.99 persons per household) for the local Abbey Ward area, derived from the Census 2011. UK Census data has also been used to estimate the likely proportion that are working age and in employment.

*Housing Supply*

6.17 The impact of the Proposed Development on the district's housing supply has been based on the proposed housing mix set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**.

6.18 A qualitative assessment of the provision of new homes, taking into account the number, type and tenure proposed and the contribution to local housing targets, was undertaken using professional judgement and taking into consideration existing housing quality and housing requirements identified by RBC<sup>14</sup>.

*Demand for Community Infrastructure**Education*

6.19 In the absence of any formal and up to date child yield calculator for RBC, the child yield (for education purposes) generated by the Proposed Development has been based on the child yields used by the neighbouring local authority of Bracknell Forest<sup>15</sup>. As a sense check, we have compared this output to the output derived from applying the LIA's current proportion of 0-15 year olds (according to ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates) to the overall estimated population of the Proposed Development. It can be concluded that the two outputs are broadly in line with each other.

6.20 Schools location and capacity data sourced from the DfE was used to determine existing demand and future school capacity.

*GP Capacity*

6.21 For the effect on capacity of surrounding primary healthcare facilities, the estimated number of residents (calculated using the method set out in section 'Population and Labour Market Effects') is added to the existing population and an average patient list size per FTE GP is calculated. This is then compared with HUDU's benchmark of 1,800 patients per FTE GP's in order to make a judgement on the effect the proposed Development will have on capacity.

*Open Space Provision*

6.22 There are no specific guidelines for open space requirements for RBC. Professional judgement has been adopted to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the existing provision in the local area, which is informed by an understanding of the baseline position and the open space proposed as part of the Development.

*Play Space Provision*

6.23 In the absence of any formal guidance on quantitative play space requirements per child for RBC, a qualitative judgement has been made taking into account the estimated child yield (see *Education*), existing provision and any on-site provision as part of the proposed Development.

*Methodology for Defining Effects*

6.24 Each effect has been assessed based on the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development, and the sensitivity of the affected receptor.

*Receptors and Receptor Sensitivity*

6.25 The sensitivity of each receptor is evaluated as being high, medium, low or negligible based on a review of the baseline position of each receptor and its performance against the benchmark areas. The importance of the receptor in policy terms is also considered. This can be summarised as follows:

<sup>11</sup> Homes and Communities Agency (2015), 'Employment Density Guide, Third Edition'

<sup>12</sup> Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person. A FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to one full-time employee (typically working 35 hours per week), whilst a part-time employee working half the hours is recorded as 0.5 FTE

<sup>13</sup> Homes and Communities Agency (2014) Additionality Guide, Fourth Edition

<sup>14</sup> These are specified and referenced in the baseline section

<sup>15</sup> Bracknell Forest Council, Planning Obligations SPD, February 2015.

**Table 6.1 Definition of Sensitivity of Receptor**

| Sensitivity | Definition                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High        | Evidence of direct and significant socio-economic concern relating to the receptor.<br>May be given a high priority in local, regional or national economic and regeneration policy.                    |
| Medium      | Some evidence of socio-economic concern linked to receptor, which may be indirect.<br>Change relating to receptor has medium priority in local, regional and national economic and regeneration policy. |
| Low         | There is little evidence of socio-economic concern relating to receptor.<br>Receptor is given a low priority in local, regional and national economic and regeneration policy.                          |
| Negligible  | Very low importance and rarity with little or no priority event at the local scale.                                                                                                                     |

**6.26** The magnitude of impact (i.e. change) experienced by a receptor has been determined by considering the estimated change from baseline conditions, both before and, if required, after mitigation. The criteria used for the assessment of the magnitude of socio-economic effects (both beneficial and adverse) are shown in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2 Definition of Magnitude of Change**

| Magnitude  | Criteria                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High       | The Proposed Development will cause a large change to the quality and / or integrity of the resource when compared with existing socio-economic conditions. |
| Medium     | The Proposed Development will cause a moderate change to the quality and / or integrity of receptor when compared with existing socio-economic conditions.  |
| Low        | The Proposed Development will cause slight change to the quality and / or integrity of the receptor when compared with existing socio-economic conditions.  |
| Negligible | No discernible change to the baseline socio-economic conditions.                                                                                            |

*Effect Nature*

**6.27** The nature of effects is defined as either:

- Beneficial – an advantageous effect on the impact area; or
- Adverse – detrimental effects on the impact area; or
- Neutral – neither beneficial or adverse.

*Effect Scale*

**6.28** The scale of neutral, beneficial or adverse effects is based on the following matrix (see Table 6.3 below).

**Table 6.3 Matrix Used to Determine the Scale of Effects**

| Sensitivity of Receptor | Magnitude of Change |            |          |          |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------|----------|
|                         | Negligible          | Low        | Medium   | High     |
| Negligible              | Negligible          | Negligible | Minor    | Minor    |
| Low                     | Negligible          | Minor      | Minor    | Moderate |
| Medium                  | Minor               | Minor      | Moderate | Major    |
| High                    | Minor               | Moderate   | Major    | Major    |

*Effect Duration*

**6.29** Effects that are generated as a result of the demolition and construction works (i.e. those that last for this set period of time) are classed as ‘temporary’; these maybe further classified as either ‘short term’ or ‘medium-

term’ effects depending on the duration of the enabling and construction works that generate the effect in question.

**6.30** Effects that result from the completed and operational as of the Proposed Development are classed as ‘permanent’ or ‘long-term’ effects.

*Categorising Likely Significant Effects*

**6.31** Effects have been defined as either ‘significant’ or ‘not significant’. Based on the above, effects of moderate and major scale are considered significant and those of minor or negligible scale are considered not significant.

**6.32** Following identification of the significance of the likely effects, the requirement for any mitigation to either eliminate or reduce likely significant adverse effects is considered.

**6.33** Where measures have been accounted for to either eliminate or reduce likely significant adverse effects, these have been incorporated into the Proposed Development. The assessment then highlights whether the ‘residual’ effects remain significant following the implementation of suitable mitigation measures.

**BASELINE CONDITIONS**

*Current Baseline Conditions*

**6.34** The baseline conditions are presented for the relevant study areas and where possible reported in the context of regional and national benchmarks.

*Population*

**6.35** There is no existing resident population present on the site. Headline demographic and population data at various spatial levels is set out in Table 6.4. There are currently around 12,630 people living in Abbey ward, comprising 8% of the borough’s population as a whole.

**6.36** The profile of the population in Abbey ward (the LIA) is different to that of the borough of Reading as a whole, as well as the benchmark areas (spatial areas - Southeast, National), with a relatively high proportion of working age population and low proportion of 0-15 year olds and 65+ years old.

**6.37** The proportion of the population of working age in Abbey Ward is 80.6%, over 10 percentage points above that of Reading (69.2%) and higher than all benchmark areas.

**Table 6.4 Demographics (2011)**

|                  | Abbey Ward (LIA) | Reading (Borough) | Berkshire | South East (Regional) | England (National) |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Total Population | 12,630           | 155,700           | 861,870   | 8,634,750             | 53,012,460         |
| 0-15 (%)         | 13.4%            | 19.3%             | 20.7%     | 19.0%                 | 18.9%              |
| 16-64 (%)        | 80.6%            | 69.2%             | 65.8%     | 63.8%                 | 64.8%              |
| 65+ (%)          | 6.0%             | 11.5%             | 13.5%     | 17.2%                 | 16.3%              |

Source: Census 2011

**6.38** The latest available mid-year population estimates (2017) indicate

**6.39** The latest available mid-year population estimates (2017) indicate that the population with the LIA has increased by over 9% since 2011 , which is well above the borough, regional and national averages (see Table 6.5).

**6.40** The 0-15 year age group has seen the largest proportional increase of 33% compared to a 12.1% increase for Reading and a 5.8% increase seen across the region as a whole. In contrast, the proportional increase in population of those aged 65+ has declined compared to an increase seen elsewhere.

Table 6.5 Population Estimates (2011 – 2017)

|                               | MSOA11 <sup>17</sup> (LIA) | Reading (Borough) | South East (Regional) | England (National) |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Population of All Ages (2017) | 13,780                     | 163,075           | 9,080,825             | 55,619,430         |
| % increase from 2011          | 9.1%                       | 4.7%              | 5.2%                  | 4.9%               |
| Working Age Population (%)    | 78.7%                      | 67.2%             | 61.8%                 | 62.8%              |
| Aged 0 to 15 (% increase)     | 32.9%                      | 12.1%             | 5.8%                  | 6.1%               |
| Aged 16 to 64 (% increase)    | 6.5%                       | 1.7%              | 1.8%                  | 1.8%               |
| Aged 65+ (% increase)         | -8.7%                      | 10.9%             | 17.1%                 | 15.8%              |

Source: ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates, 2017

Labour Market

- 6.41
- The labour market data indicates that Reading has a mixed performance against regional and national benchmarks (see Table 6.6).
- 6.42
- The data indicates that economic activity rates for Reading in 2017 were below the regional average and stood at 79.5% compared to 81.4% for the South East.
- 6.43
- Reading’s unemployment rate however shows more favourable job market conditions with 2.4% compared to 3.2% for the South East as a whole.
- 6.44
- Reading has a relatively high proportion of those working in managerial and professional occupations with 56% compared to 50% for the region. Similarly, Reading has a high proportion of the working age population with an NVQ Level 4+ or equivalent, with 48% compared to 41.4% for the South East.
- 6.45
- Labour market information is not available for the LIA as the Annual Population Survey (APS) does not provide data at a sub-District level. The last available data is from the Census 2011 which suggested the LIA performed above the Reading average (74%) with slightly higher economic activity levels (80%).

Table 6.6 Labour Market Profile (2017), Working Age Population

| Labour Market Indicators                                |                                                                      | LIA  | Reading (Borough) | South East (Regional) | England (National) |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Engaged in the Labour Market (for residents aged 16-64) | Economically Active                                                  | N/A  | 85%               | 78%                   | 79%                |
|                                                         | Unemployment                                                         | N/A  | 2.4%              | 3.2%                  | 4.5%               |
| Occupation (% population aged 16-64 employed in...)     | Management or Professional Services                                  | N/A  | 55.9              | 49.9                  | 46.1               |
|                                                         | Admin or Skilled Trades                                              | N/A  | 16.4              | 20.5                  | 20.5               |
|                                                         | Care, Leisure or Retail                                              | N/A  | 15.4              | 15.6                  | 16.4               |
|                                                         | Process, Plant and Machine Operatives and/ or Elementary Occupations | N/A  | 12.1              | 13.5                  | 16.6               |
| Qualifications (% aged 16-64)                           | NVQ Level 4+                                                         | 48.0 | 41.4              | 38.3                  | 48.0               |
|                                                         | No quals                                                             | 5.7  | 5.2               | 7.6                   | 5.7                |

Source: Source: ONS APS, January 2017 to December 2017

Housing Supply

- 6.46
- Headline information on key housing characteristics at various spatial levels are set out in Tables 6.7 and 6.8. This demonstrates that the LIA has a different housing tenure and dwelling type structure to the borough of Reading and the spatial benchmark areas, reflective of the LIA’s location within an inner urban area.

- 6.47
- The proportion of home ownership in the LIA is far lower at 28% compared 54.8% for the borough of Reading. Conversely, the private rented sector plays a far more significant role in the LIA with over 50% of household tenure, compared to 26.1% for Reading and 17.4% for Berkshire.
- 6.48
- As would be expected from an inner urban area, the proportion of detached and semi-detached dwellings in the LIA is relatively low (1.7% and 4% respectively) whereas the large majority of dwellings are flats/maisonettes with 72.7% compared to 32% for Reading as a whole.

Table 6.7 Housing Tenure

|                      | Abbey Ward (LIA) | Reading (Borough) | Berkshire | South East (Regional) | England (National) |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Total households     | 6,330            | 62,870            | 340,530   | 3,555,460             | 22,063,370         |
| Owned (%)            | 28.0%            | 54.8%             | 65.7%     | 67.6%                 | 63.3%              |
| Shared Ownership (%) | 3.2%             | 1.8%              | 1.2%      | 1.1%                  | 0.8%               |
| Social Rented (%)    | 16.3%            | 16.3%             | 14.4%     | 13.7%                 | 17.7%              |
| Private Rented (%)   | 51.4%            | 26.1%             | 17.4%     | 16.3%                 | 16.8%              |
| Living Rent Free (%) | 1.0%             | 1.0%              | 1.3%      | 1.3%                  | 1.3%               |

Source: 2011 Census

Table 6.8 Dwelling Type

|                     | Abbey Ward (LIA) | Reading (Borough) | Berkshire | South East (Regional) | England (National) |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Total dwellings     | 6780             | 65550             | 352250    | 3694390               | 22976070           |
| Detached            | 1.7%             | 12.2%             | 26.9%     | 28.1%                 | 22.3%              |
| Semi-detached       | 4.0%             | 25.5%             | 27.1%     | 27.7%                 | 30.8%              |
| Terraced            | 22.4%            | 30.5%             | 23.2%     | 22.5%                 | 24.6%              |
| Flat/maisonette     | 72.7%            | 32.1%             | 22.2%     | 21.3%                 | 22.2%              |
| Caravan/Mobile home | 0.0%             | 0.2%              | 0.9%      | 0.7%                  | 0.4%               |

Source: 2011 Census

- 6.49
- The submission draft Local Plan for Reading (March 2018) sets out a housing target of 15,433 new dwellings to be delivered in the period 2013-2036, equating to 671 dwellings per annum (dpa) and with an affordable housing target of 30% (on sites providing 10 dwellings or more).
- 6.50
- The submission draft Plan also notes that around 7,600 new homes are expected to be delivered within the central area of Reading over the plan period. The Plan indicates that a mix of different sized dwellings are required in the Central area of Reading and sets maximum threshold for the proportion of one-bedroom units (40%) together with a minimum threshold for the proportion of three bedroom units (5%) in order to ensure a diverse mix of sizes. This mix is also referred to in the draft Hosier Street Development Framework.

Employment and Local Economy

- 6.51
- The draft Submission Local Plan notes that Reading has a thriving economy and is a net importer of labour. The Plan highlights the wide mix of facilities within the central area of Reading with significant amounts of comparison retail and a strong evening economy supported by a variety of leisure, cultural and entertainment facilities.
- 6.52
- Recent available data (2016) of the number of jobs in the LIA was around 42,000, accounting for 40% of Reading’s total workplace-based employment (see Table 6.9).
- 6.53
- The largest sector within the LIA is the professional, scientific and technical sector with 16.7% of total employment. This proportion is well above the average for Reading and the other benchmark areas. Other

<sup>17</sup> Middle Super Output Area 11 is the geography at which data is available that is most consistent with Abbey Ward.

significant sectors within the LIA include retail (14.3%) and business administration and support services (10.7%).

6.54 The construction sector accounts for 5.2% (approx. 222,800) of total jobs within the South East, which is above the national average of 4.6%. In Reading the proportion of jobs within the construction sector is below the regional average, at 2.4% (approx. 2,500 jobs).

Table 6.9 Employment (Workplace-Based)

|                                                  | Abbey Ward<br>(LIA) | Reading<br>(Borough) | Berkshire | South East<br>(Regional) | England<br>(National) |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Total jobs                                       | 42,000              | 105,000              | 525,000   | 4,286,000                | 26,385,000            |
| Agriculture, forestry & fishing                  | 0.0%                | 0.0%                 | 0.0%      | 1.1%                     | 1.3%                  |
| Mining, quarrying & utilities                    | 3.6%                | 1.9%                 | 1.7%      | 1.2%                     | 1.1%                  |
| Manufacturing                                    | 1.2%                | 1.9%                 | 5.1%      | 6.3%                     | 7.9%                  |
| Construction                                     | 1.1%                | 2.4%                 | 4.2%      | 5.2%                     | 4.6%                  |
| Motor trades                                     | 0.7%                | 1.7%                 | 1.7%      | 1.9%                     | 1.8%                  |
| Wholesale                                        | 2.1%                | 3.8%                 | 6.5%      | 4.9%                     | 4.0%                  |
| Retail                                           | 14.3%               | 10.5%                | 8.0%      | 9.4%                     | 9.4%                  |
| Transport & storage                              | 6.0%                | 4.8%                 | 5.0%      | 5.0%                     | 4.9%                  |
| Accommodation & food services                    | 8.3%                | 5.7%                 | 5.5%      | 6.7%                     | 7.4%                  |
| Information & communication                      | 9.5%                | 14.3%                | 13.0%     | 6.0%                     | 4.3%                  |
| Financial & insurance                            | 9.5%                | 4.8%                 | 1.9%      | 2.8%                     | 3.6%                  |
| Property                                         | 1.4%                | 1.4%                 | 1.9%      | 2.0%                     | 1.8%                  |
| Professional, scientific & technical             | 16.7%               | 11.4%                | 11.8%     | 9.0%                     | 9.1%                  |
| Business administration & support services       | 10.7%               | 9.5%                 | 9.7%      | 9.0%                     | 9.0%                  |
| Public administration & defence                  | 8.3%                | 3.8%                 | 2.3%      | 3.0%                     | 3.9%                  |
| Education                                        | 1.9%                | 5.7%                 | 8.4%      | 9.8%                     | 8.7%                  |
| Health                                           | 3.6%                | 13.3%                | 8.6%      | 11.8%                    | 12.5%                 |
| Arts, entertainment, recreation & other services | 3.0%                | 3.8%                 | 5.0%      | 4.9%                     | 4.6%                  |

Source: BRES 2016

Education

Early Years

6.55 The latest Child Care Sufficiency Assessment<sup>18</sup> for Reading suggests that the population of children aged between 0 and 4 years old has increased from 11,93.7 to 12,472 (4.5%) between 2011 and mid-2015. The Assessment attributes growth to international migration and a high birth rate. However, the assessment also identifies that birth rate is decreasing and suggests that child population growth will start to slow.

6.56 According to the Assessment, the borough of Reading has a total of 272 registered child care providers, including child minders, day nurseries and pre-schools. Abbey Ward has 14 registered providers and ranks 10<sup>th</sup> out of 16 wards for child care provision across the borough of Reading.

6.57 In terms of the number of places, Reading has a total of 6,641 registered places for children aged 0-4 years old, the majority (31%) of which are in day nurseries.

6.58 Abbey ward has 629 places, 9% of the total in Reading and over 50% of which are in day nurseries. The vacancy rate amongst all registered places in Abbey ward is 12%, just below the average vacancy rate for Reading of 13%. However, there are no vacancies in the Abbey Ward, specifically amongst day nurseries and child minders.

6.59 Reading's latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan<sup>19</sup> (IDP) reverts to the Child Care Sufficiency Assessment (2017) and notes that inner wards of Reading currently have limited nursery places, and that the increase in entitlement from 15 hours to 30 hours for eligible three and four-year olds, has the potential to generate additional demand for places. However, it concludes that there are no specific priorities for the provision of additional child care places at the moment and that the situation will be subject to ongoing review.

Primary and Secondary

6.60 There is a total of 40 primary school and 10 secondary schools across the borough of Reading. The Council's latest IDP suggests there is a borough-wide lack of surplus capacity within primary and secondary schools, in particular amongst primary schools. According to the IDP, about 10% of primary pupils and 38% of secondary pupils across the Borough's boundaries to attend school in surrounding authorities.

Primary Schools

6.61 For primary schools, the education authority has identified pressure on capacity in the east of Reading, the town centre and along the Oxford Road corridor. According to the IDP, expected housing growth will exacerbate this position.

6.62 Table 6.10 sets out capacity data for primary schools that fall within two miles of the site. This suggests that all schools have a surplus of capacity although to varying degrees. Overall, the information suggests there is a surplus of 1,060 places.

6.63 The site falls within the catchment area of Coley Primary School, which according to the latest available capacity data from the DfE (2017) has a total capacity of 270 and a current pupil roll of 239 giving rise to a small surplus in school places. It should be noted the data above reflects the total surplus within each school and is not reflective of capacity issues that may be apparent within individual year groups.

<sup>18</sup> Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2017, Final Report, October 2017, Reading Borough Council

<sup>19</sup> Reading Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2017, Reading Borough Council

**Table 6.10 Primary School – Capacity 2016/17**

| Name of School                                                          | Capacity     | Pupil Roll   | Surplus      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Alfred Sutton Primary School                                            | 630          | 551          | 79           |
| Coley Primary School                                                    | 270          | 239          | 31           |
| E P Collier Primary School                                              | 420          | 307          | 113          |
| Civitas Academy                                                         | 420          | 101          | 319          |
| Oxford Road Community School                                            | 240          | 236          | 4            |
| Redlands Primary School                                                 | 240          | 234          | 6            |
| Wilson Primary School                                                   | 420          | 414          | 6            |
| Southcote Primary School                                                | 630          | 530          | 100          |
| New Town Primary School                                                 | 420          | 265          | 155          |
| St Michael's Primary School                                             | 420          | 353          | 67           |
| Churchend Primary Academy                                               | 420          | 328          | 92           |
| Katesgrove Primary School                                               | 630          | 614          | 16           |
| Manor Primary School                                                    | 315          | 303          | 12           |
| St Mary and All Saints Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School | 420          | 360          | 60           |
| <b>Total</b>                                                            | <b>5,895</b> | <b>4,835</b> | <b>1,060</b> |

Source: DfE 2017

*Secondary Schools*

**6.64** There are 10 across the Borough of Reading, with the closest to the site being Kendrick School, which has a capacity of 790 and a current pupil roll of 740 in the year 2016/17. Table 6.11 provides a list of secondary schools within the borough together with their capacity information and indicates that a large majority have a current surplus in capacity.

**Table 6.11 Secondary School - Capacity 2016/17**

| Name of School                         | Capacity      | Pupil Roll   | Surplus      |
|----------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| UTC Reading                            | 600           | 381          | 219          |
| Maiden Erlegh School in Reading        | 900           | 358          | 542          |
| The WREN School                        | 1176          | 241          | 935          |
| Highdown School and Sixth Form Centre  | 1440          | 1260         | 180          |
| Reading Girls' School                  | 947           | 487          | 460          |
| Reading School                         | 887           | 959          | -72          |
| Prospect School                        | 1700          | 1282         | 418          |
| Blessed Hugh Faringdon Catholic School | 992           | 885          | 107          |
| Kendrick School                        | 790           | 740          | 50           |
| John Madejski Academy                  | 1100          | 699          | 401          |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>10,532</b> | <b>7,292</b> | <b>3,240</b> |

Source: DfE 2017

*GP's Provision*

**6.65** Based on data from the Health and Social Care Information Centre (HSCIC)<sup>20</sup> and NHS Choices, it is identified that there are currently 12 GP centres based within 1 mile radius of the site providing a total of 37.06 GPs (FTEs) and with a total of 87,013 registered patients (refer Table 6.12).

**6.66** According to the NHS, there is no recommended number of patients per FTE GP per practice. This recognises the differing needs of the registered patients of GP practices. However, as noted earlier, HUDU use a figure of 1,800 patients per GP FTE to benchmark capacity.

**6.67** The average number of patients per FTE GP is 2,348 within 1 mile of the site and 2,216 across the wider NHS South Reading CCG area. Therefore, patient levels at both the local and borough level are exceeding the HUDU benchmark.

**6.68** The two surgeries that are closest to the site include the Reading 'walk-in' health centre (on site) and Chatham Street Surgery (0.3km west of the Site), the latter of which is one of the only surgeries within 1 mile of the site to have a patient list size per FTE GP lower than the HUDU benchmark level.

**Table 6.12 GP Provision**

|                     | Within 1 miles of Site | Reading CCG Average |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| No of GP Centres    | 12                     | -                   |
| No. of GP FTEs      | 37.06                  | -                   |
| Registered patients | 87,013                 | -                   |
| Patients per FTE GP | 2,348                  | 2,216               |

Source: NHS Choices, June 2018

**6.69** The IDP notes that most surgeries within the South Reading CCG area are '*operating close to or at full capacity, and some have increased surgery hours to help meet demand*'. The Plan also notes that the majority of surgeries do not have the capacity to accommodate growth within their current premises. The Plan concludes that one or more new or replacement facilities are required, capable of accommodating the anticipated growth in population in South and Central Reading and that there is also a priority to expand the capacity of existing facilities.

*Open Space and Play Space*

**6.70** Current open space provision within 1km of the site includes:

- Forbury Gardens (2.4 ha);
  - Located approximately 520m east of the site. The area provides ornamental gardens, with a bandstand and kiosk (for snacks and light lunch). There are no formal children's facilities.
- Minister of St Mary the Virgin Gardens (0.4 ha);
  - Located less than 100m east of the Site, the gardens provide around 0.4 ha of open space as part of the Church grounds. There are no formal children's facilities.
- Un-named area adjacent to Broad St Mall (0.2 ha);
  - Located immediately south of the Site is an area of informal green space amounting to 0.2 h with links to the Civic Centre and Hexagon theatre.
- Coley Recreation Ground (5.7ha).
  - Located around 900 metres south west of the Site is Coley Recreation ground comprising formal open parkland and including a football pitch, children's play area, tennis, cricket and basket ball facilities.

<sup>20</sup> Now referred to as NHS Digital

- 6.71
- The Reading Open Space Strategy<sup>21</sup> suggests that the total amount of recreational public open space (POS) remains broadly in line with the national guidelines, but it is unevenly distributed across the borough and that residents in the town centre are further away from POS than those in outer wards.
- 6.72
- Key areas of deficiency include Central Reading, and areas immediately to the north-west, south and east of the town centre are amongst the most poorly supplied in the Borough in terms of recreational open space.
- 6.73
- In addition, the Open Space Strategy notes that play areas and equipment are used to capacity and continuous investment is required to sustain existing provision. The IDP notes that additional future growth will exacerbate these issues<sup>22</sup>.
- 6.74
- The submission Local Plan policy EN9 states that on ‘sites of 50 dwellings or more, or for developments where the availability and quality of existing open space has been identified as deficient, new provision will be sought. Development must ensure satisfactory provision of children’s play areas and neighbourhood parks’.

RECEPTORS AND RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY

- 6.75
- Table 6.13 sets out the receptors assessed, and their respective sensitivity based on the baseline conditions identified in previous sections.

Table 6.13 Sensitivity of Existing Receptors

| Receptor                                    | Sensitivity | Impact Area(s) | Comment                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Population and Labour Market                | Low         | LIA Borough    | The population of both the LIA and borough has been increasing over the last few years and the working age population and economic activity rates are above or in line with national averages. |
| Housing Supply                              | Medium      | LIA Brough     | The provision of new dwellings is a strategic policy priority for both the borough and for central Reading.                                                                                    |
| Local Economy                               | Low         | Borough        | According to the draft Submission Local Plan, Reading has a thriving economy with a wide variety of comparison retail and a strong evening economy.                                            |
| Total Employment                            | Low         | LIA Brough     | Total employment (work-place based) within the LIA represents 40% of total employment across Reading. Both the LIA and Reading have above average levels of jobs within the retail sector.     |
| Employment within the Construction Industry | Low         | Regional       | Employment within the construction industry across the South East is above the national average at 5.2% of total employment.                                                                   |
| GP Capacity                                 | High        | LIA            | The average patient list size per FTE GP across surgeries within 1 mile of the Site is above the HUDU benchmark level.                                                                         |
| Early Years Provision                       | Medium      | LIA            | The latest Childcare Sufficiency Assessment indicates a lack of choice and limited capacity amongst providers in the LIA.                                                                      |
| Primary School Capacity                     | Low         | LIA            | Data on school capacity identifies a current surplus in primary school places in the local catchment area.                                                                                     |
| Secondary School Capacity                   | Low         | Borough        | Data on school capacity identifies a current surplus in Secondary school places across the borough.                                                                                            |
| Open Space Provision                        | Medium      | Borough        | Central Reading is identified as an area deficient in open space according to the borough’s Open Space Strategy.                                                                               |

- 6.76
- Present a table of the receptors that are being introduced on the site as part of the proposed development which may be affected by the proposed development itself. Identify the receptors sensitivity, high, medium, low. Provide a figure identifying the location of the receptors.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS

Demolition and Construction

Loss of Existing Employment

- 6.77
- The construction work associated with the Proposed Development would require vacant possession of 1,231m<sup>2</sup> NIA of existing retail floorspace (refer **ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development (Volume 1)** and **ES Chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction (Volume 1)**). Around 85m<sup>2</sup> of this space is currently vacant and it is expected that before the proposed demolition and construction works commence, the lease agreements for the units will have expired and not been renewed, therefore providing vacant units in advance of works commencing.
- 6.78
- Achieving vacant possession of the units prior to works commencing would result in a temporary loss of retail floorspace and employment potential / jobs for the during of the works programme, before new units / floorspace are provided as part of the completed Proposed Development. By applying the standard employment densities (described in the ‘Methodology’ section) to the currently occupied floorspace, it is estimated that this space currently accommodates up to 73 FTEs (Table 6.14) which would be displaced and would need to be relocated.

Table 6.14 Existing Employment Estimate

| Unit/Use                          | NIA (m²) | Employment Density | FTE |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----|
| The Escape Room (Suis Generis)    | 105      | 70                 | 2   |
| The Forgotten British Gurkha (D1) | 105      | 12                 | 9   |
| Vibes (A3)                        | 108      | 15                 | 7   |
| Units 2 and 3 (A1)                | 831      | 15                 | 55  |
| Units 4 and 5 (A1)                | 0        | 15                 | N/A |
| Block E (Vacant)                  | 82       | 15                 | N/A |
| Total                             |          |                    | 73  |

- 6.79
- It is assumed that these jobs would be able to relocate within the borough and would not be lost to the economy as a whole. However, in the event of a worst case scenario whereby the jobs are not re-located within the borough, the magnitude of change is assessed as minor. The sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as low and the significance of effect is therefore assessed as minor adverse (not significant) at the borough level.

Construction Employment

- 6.80
- The construction of the Proposed Development will provide a number of on-site and off-site employment opportunities.
- 6.81
- In accord with the HCA Labour Coefficients Guidance, it is anticipated that 1,581 person-years of temporary construction employment could be supported as a result of construction activity related to the Proposed Development. Based on an anticipated 30-month construction programme (see **ES Chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction (Volume 1)**) means that an average of 632 jobs could be supported, both on-site as well as off-site (both direct and indirect/supply chain employment), each year during the demolition and construction phase.
- 6.82
- The estimated employment provision during the period of works would be expected to include a broad range of job types and occupations including highly skilled professions alongside lower skilled jobs (labourers). A number of these jobs could be filled by those residing within the borough who are currently unemployed. However, it is also assumed that these jobs will be accessed by people from across the wider region.
- 6.83
- The construction sector currently supports approx. 222,800 jobs across the South East. Based on the analysis presented above, the annual construction employment supported during the construction phase is expected to

<sup>21</sup> Reading Open Spaces Strategy Update Note 2018, January 2018

<sup>22</sup> The Council’s submission Local Plan document states at policy EN9 that all new development should make provision for appropriate open space based on the needs of the development. This can be achieved through on or off-site provision.

annually represent around 0.3% of all employment in the construction sector. On this basis, construction activity is not expected to generate a noticeable change in the baseline conditions at the regional level. As such, the magnitude of change at the regional level is assessed to be low.

- 6.84** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of the effect is assessed to be **minor beneficial** (not significant).

### Completed Development

#### Population and Labour Market

- 6.85** The Proposed Development once complete and occupied is proposed to provide up to 493 residential units ranging in size from one to three-bedroom units (see **ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development (Volume 1)**). Based on the approach outlined within the 'Methodology' section, this is expected to generate a population of around 980<sup>23</sup> persons.
- 6.86** In line with current population trends of the LIA and Borough, it is assumed that around 79%<sup>24</sup> of the new resident population will be of working age (16-64), amounting to around 775 persons. Economic activity rates amongst the resident population are also expected to reflect those of the current local population at around 85% (see Table 6.5).
- 6.87** The current population (as of 2017) of the LIA is estimated around 13,780 (see Table 6.4). The predicted resident population to be generated by the Proposed Development would represent an increase of around 7% of the existing LIA population. The number of working age population and economically active residents would be expected to increase by a similar scale within the LIA. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed to be high.
- 6.88** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of the effect is assessed as **moderate beneficial** (significant) at the local level.
- 6.89** At the borough level (Reading), the current population is estimated around 163,100. The resident population generated from the Proposed Development would represent an increase of around 0.6% of the existing population. The number of working age population and economically active residents would be expected to increase by a similar scale within the LIA. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed to be low.
- 6.90** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of the effect is assessed as **minor beneficial** (not significant) at the borough level.

#### Housing Supply

- 6.91** The Proposed Development is to provide up to 493 residential units, varying in size from one bedroom to three-bedroom and including 83 affordable housing units (see **ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development (Volume 1)**). The mix of units in terms of number of bedrooms is in line with the expected standards set out in submission draft Local Plan and will therefore contribute to creating a diverse mix of housing within the borough.
- 6.92** The provision of new residential units would represent an increase of around 7% in the LIA and would account for 6% of the housing target (of 7,700) for the Central area of Reading (see section 'Housing Supply'). On this basis, the magnitude of change at local (LIA) level is assessed as medium.
- 6.93** With the sensitivity of the receptor as medium, the scale of effect for the LIA is assessed as **moderate beneficial** (significant).
- 6.94** At the borough level, the proposed number of residential units would represent an increase of around 0.8% from the baseline position and would account for around 3% of the borough's overall housing target for the plan period. On this basis, the magnitude of change at borough level is assessed as low.
- 6.95** With the sensitivity of the receptor as medium, the scale of effect for the borough is assessed as **minor beneficial** (not significant).

#### Local Economy

- 6.96** There are likely to be direct spending effects arising as a result of household expenditure arising from the residents of the Proposed Development. Based on regional data from the ONS Family Expenditure Survey, it is estimated that households would spend around £5.05M per annum on convenience and comparison goods.

- 6.97** Given its town centre location, it is expected a proportion of this expenditure (c.50%) would be captured locally within the borough. This spending will help to support the vitality and viability of retail and amenity within the Borough. The magnitude of change is assessed as minor.

- 6.98** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the direct effect of additional household expenditure is considered to be of **minor beneficial** (not significant) at the borough level.

### Employment

#### Existing Employment

- 6.99** In order to assess the impact which the Proposed Development will have on employment, it is important to consider the existing employment on the site that will be affected. This was estimated at around 73 FTEs (see Table 6.15).
- 6.100** Taking account of leakage, displacement and multipliers (see Table 6.15), it is estimated the existing retail floorspace that would be affected by the Proposed Development generates net employment of up to 60 FTEs at the Borough level.

**Table 6.15 Additionality Adjustments to Estimated Existing Gross Employment**

| Additionality Measure                                          | LIA | Borough |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------|
| (1) Gross on-site employment                                   | 73  | 73      |
| Less Leakage – 0%                                              | -   | -0      |
| Less Displacement – 25% (identified as low within the borough) | -   | -18     |
| Plus Multipliers – 1.1 for the borough                         | -   | +5      |
| Net employment                                                 |     | 60      |

#### New Employment Supported On-Site

- 6.101** Once complete, the Proposed Development is expected to include 1,208 sq.m NIA of retail floorspace use class A1, A2 or A3. The gross jobs support on-site have been estimated by applying an average of the A1, A2 and A3 employment density set out in the HCA Guidance which equates to 15.5 sq m per FTE employee. When applied to the 1,208 NIA sq.m of retail floorspace this derived gross on-site jobs of 78 FTEs.
- 6.102** Table 6.16 below sets out the net number of FTE jobs that could be supported by the Proposed Development once additionality factors have been taken in to account.

**Table 6.16 Additionality Adjustments to Estimated Gross New On-Site Jobs**

| Additionality Measure <sup>25</sup>                            | LIA | Borough |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------|
| (1) Gross on-site employment                                   | 78  | 78      |
| Less Leakage – 0%                                              | -   | -0      |
| Less Displacement – 25% (identified as low within the borough) | -   | -19     |
| Plus Multipliers – 1.1 for the borough                         | -   | +6      |
| Net employment                                                 | -   | 64      |

- 6.103** Taking in to account the existing employment, the gross additional on-site jobs are expected to be 5 (78 less 73) and the net additional employment of the Proposed Development generated by the retail floorspace is expected to be 4 FTEs (64 less 60).

<sup>23</sup> Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 10

<sup>24</sup> This represents the proportion of working age population for the LIA according to Mid Year Population Estimates.

<sup>25</sup> Numbers may not sum exactly due to rounding

- 6.104** The 'Baseline' section of this report estimated there to be a total of 42,000 jobs in the LIA. The gross additional on-site jobs (5 FTEs) would account for an increase of less than 1% of the total existing jobs. The magnitude of change if therefore assessed as negligible.
- 6.105** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the effect is assessed as **negligible** (not significant) at the local level.

Indirect Employment

- 6.106** As a result of the estimated level of expenditure and its impact on the local economy (est. £5.5M) (see 'Local Economy'), it is estimated that household expenditure could support new jobs off up to 60 FTEs, with around 50% of these captured within the borough.
- 6.107** Combined with the net additional jobs arising from the retail floorspace (4 FTEs), it is estimated the proposed Development would generate an additional 34 FTE jobs within the borough.
- 6.108** At the borough level, the number of existing jobs is estimated at 105,000. The net additional employment of the Proposed Development together with jobs generated as a result of household expenditure (34 FTEs), would account for an increase of less than 1%. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as negligible.
- 6.109** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the significance of the effect is assessed as **negligible** (not significant) at the borough level.

GP Capacity

- 6.110** The additional population to the local area is likely to increase demand for health care. It is noted that current information indicates that the GP surgeries within 1 mile of the site are already operating above the HUDU benchmark of 1,800 patients per GP.
- 6.111** The population of the Proposed Development is estimated at 980. Assuming that all of these will be net additional and will register with a local GP, this will increase the current number of patients per FTE GP within the local area from 2,348 to 2,374 (+1%). In reality, not all of these residents will be additional to the area and a proportion may already be registered with a local GP or may choose to register with a GP that is closest to the Site. As noted in the baseline, the GP's closest to the Site have an average patient list size that is below the HUDU benchmark. On this basis, the magnitude of change is assessed as low at the local level.
- 6.112** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as high, the scale of effect is assessed as **moderate adverse** (significant) at the local level.

Education

- 6.113** The overall child yield (0-15) of the proposed Development is estimated to be around 170<sup>26</sup> children. Table 6.17 below presents the break-down by age group. Each age group is then discussed in turn.

Table 6.17 Estimated Child Yield

|                  | 1 bed | 2 bed | 3 bed | Total |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Number of Units  | 256   | 152   | 49    | 457   |
| Yield Factor     |       |       |       |       |
| Early Years      | 0.07  | 0.4   | 0.53  |       |
| Primary School   | 0     | 0.15  | 0.58  |       |
| Secondary School | 0     | 0.05  | 0.17  |       |
| Yield            |       |       |       |       |
| Early Years      | 18    | 61    | 26    | 105   |
| Primary School   | 0     | 23    | 28    | 51    |
| Secondary School | 0     | 8     | 8     | 16    |
| Total            | 18    | 91    | 63    | 172   |

Early Years

- 6.114** The Proposed Development is expected to yield an early years population of up to 105 children. In reality, not all of these children will be net additional and / or not all will require an early years place as some may already be residing in the area and some may not attend an Early Years setting. Nonetheless, it is expected that the Proposed Development will generate an increase in demand for places.
- 6.115** The baseline indicates that the inner wards of Reading currently have limited available spaces. An additional 105 children aged 0-5 represents an increase of 8.5% of the existing early years population for the LIA. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as medium.
- 6.116** The sensitivity of the receptor is also assessed as medium and the scale of effect is therefore assessed as **moderate adverse** (significant) at the local level.

Primary Schools

- 6.117** The Proposed Development is expected to yield a primary school age population of up to 51 children. The additional demand generated represents 4.8% of the current estimated surplus in primary school places in the local area (see Table 6.10). It should be noted that not all of these children will be net additional and some may already be attending primary schools within the area. On this basis, the magnitude of change is assessed as low.
- 6.118** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of effect is assessed as **minor adverse** (not significant) at the **local** level.

Secondary Schools

- 6.119** The Proposed Development is expected to yield a secondary school age population of 16 children. The additional demand generated represents 1% of the current surplus capacity across the borough (see Table 6.10). The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as low.
- 6.120** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of effect is assessed as **minor adverse** (not significant) at the borough level.

Open Space

- 6.121** The Proposed Development proposes the provision of approximately 1,122 m<sup>2</sup> of communal amenity space, 607 m<sup>2</sup> of private amenity space, giving a total of 1,729 m<sup>2</sup>. Within the proposed amenity space there will be incidental play space. In a town centre location there are very limited opportunities to provide open and amenity space. As such, collectively the space provided as part of the Proposed Development will provide amenity to the benefit of local residents.
- 6.122** The local area in which the site is situated has been judged as deficient in open space. The provision of communal amenity space, including incidental children's play space will therefore provide new provision of open space to meet the needs of new residents associated with the Proposed Development. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as low.
- 6.123** With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as medium, the scale of the effect is assessed as **minor beneficial** (not significant).

MITIGATION AND MONITORING MEASURES

Demolition and Construction

- 6.124** Achieving vacant possession of the units prior to works commencing would result in a temporary loss of retail floorspace and employment potential / jobs for the during of the works programme, before new units / floorspace are provided as part of the completed Proposed Development. As a worst case scenario which assumes that not all existing employment can be relocated in the Borough, the loss of existing employment on site has been assessed as temporary and minor adverse (not significant). In the longer term it has been demonstrated that the Proposed Development would generate net additional employment opportunities and therefore no mitigation measures are required.
- 6.125** No long term adverse effects of the demolition and construction phase have been identified and therefore no mitigation is required.

26 For comparison purposes, applying the proportion of 0-15 year olds from the ONS Mid-Year Population Estimated of the LIA results in an overall child yield of around 160 and is therefore broadly consistent.

**Completed Development**

**6.126** The Proposed Development will result in the following adverse effects:

- Moderate adverse effect on GP Capacity;
- Moderate adverse effect on Early Years provision;
- Minor adverse effect on primary school capacity; and
- Minor adverse effect on secondary school capacity.

**6.127** The Proposed Development will result in Community Infrastructure Levy payments which will be used by the Council to support and manage the impacts of development by funding infrastructure such as new schools, open space improvements and health infrastructure. This will ensure that local facilities have sufficient capacity to service its expanding population.

**6.128** Following mitigation as set out above, it is expected that the residual effects of the aspects listed above will be negligible.

**RESIDUAL EFFECTS**

**6.129** The residual effects resulting from the Proposed Development are summarised in Table 6.18 below.

**Table 6.18 Summary of Residual Effects**

| Receptor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Receptor Sensitivity | Residual Effect (Nature and Scale) | Significance    | Geo | D<br>I | P<br>T | R<br>IR | St<br>Mt<br>Lt |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------|--------|---------|----------------|
| <b>Demolition and Construction</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                      |                                    |                 |     |        |        |         |                |
| Loss of Existing Employment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Low                  | Minor Adverse                      | Not Significant | L   | D      | T      | IR      | St             |
| Temporary Construction Employment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Low                  | Minor Beneficial                   | Not Significant | R   | D      | T      | IR      | St             |
| <b>Completed Development</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                      |                                    |                 |     |        |        |         |                |
| Population and Labour Market                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Low                  | Moderate Beneficial                | Significant     | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Low                  | Minor Beneficial                   | Not Significant | B   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Housing Supply                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Medium               | Moderate Beneficial                | Significant     | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Medium               | Minor Beneficial                   | Not Significant | B   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Local Economy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Low                  | Minor Beneficial                   | Not Significant | B   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Total Employment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Low                  | Negligible                         | Not Significant | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| GP Capacity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | High                 | Negligible                         | Not Significant | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Education: Early Years Provision                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Medium               | Negligible                         | Not Significant | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Education: Primary School Capacity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Low                  | Negligible                         | Not Significant | L   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Education: Secondary School Capacity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Low                  | Negligible                         | Not Significant | B   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| Open Space Provision                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Medium               | Minor Beneficial                   | Not Significant | B   | D      | P      | IR      | Lt             |
| <b>Notes:</b><br>Residual Effect<br>- Scale = Negligible / Minor / Moderate / Major<br>- Nature = Beneficial or Adverse<br>Geo (Geographic Extent) = Local (L), Borough (B), Regional (R), National (N)<br>D = Direct / I = Indirect<br>P = Permanent / T = Temporary<br>R = Reversible / IR= Irreversible<br>St = Short Term / Mt = Medium Term / Lt = Long Term<br>N/A = not applicable / not assessed |                      |                                    |                 |     |        |        |         |                |

**LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

**6.130** Only moderate and major effects are deemed to be significant. The significant effects are therefore:

- **Population and Labour Supply:** The estimated population of 980 persons will increase the LIA's population by 7% and will have a beneficial impact on the labour supply of the local area; and
- **Housing Supply:** The provision of 493 units will make a significant contribution to the scale and choice of housing in the LIA.

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

**6.131** In the context of socio-economics, climate change factors have been found to have little or no influence on any of the receptors assessed. Potential vulnerable receptors involve those associated with primary care provision.

**6.132** Under a moderate climate change scenario, it is expected that the health of the population may be adversely affected by increased risk of overheating and other heat-related illnesses, drought, and decreased water and food security. This is partially offset against a reduced risk of cold-weather related illness in the winter, particularly in vulnerable groups such as the elderly. Increased rainfall over short periods also leads to increased numbers of bacteria in surface water with detrimental effects on drinking water.

**6.133** Primary care provision in the local area is somewhat dependent on the current climate and could see an increased level of provision necessary with potentially increasing ill-health, along with an ageing population. It is judged to be of **moderate** vulnerability.

**6.134** It is likely that, in the absence of behavioural and medical change, the health of the population is likely to be affected in the period to 2080, increasing the burden on GPs. The changing climate will magnify the negative impacts of the Proposed Development on GP provision in the Local Area is thus assessed to have a minor adverse impact at a local level.

**ASSESSMENT OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT****Evolution of the Baseline Scenario**

**6.135** For the purposes of the following narrative, it is assumed that the existing onsite uses would remain were it not for the Proposed Development.

**6.136** The future baseline of the surrounding area will evolve, with a range of uses including residential, commercial, community and leisure floorspace coming forward, particularly from the consented cumulative schemes (see **ES Chapter 2 - EIA Methodology (Volume 1)** for a list of schemes). Taking into account these schemes, the future baseline of the surrounding area would experience increased job creation, housing provision and population growth.

**6.137** Collectively these changes in the baseline position may bring about increased demand for social infrastructure such as education, healthcare and open space. The extent to which the capacity of these facilities will evolve is not possible to quantify and will depend on mitigation measures of the those schemes assessed as part of the cumulative assessment (including built in mitigation) as well as the deployment of CIL by the Council.

**Cumulative Effects Assessment**

**6.138** This section identifies the effects of the Proposed Development in combination with the effects of other Committed Developments within the surrounding area (identified in **ES Chapter 2: EIA Methodology (Volume 1)**).

**6.139** In addition, RBC have adopted a detailed framework for the Hosier Street area (the '*Draft Hosier Street Area Development Framework*' (HSADF) (2018)) to guide and co-ordinate the future developments coming forward. Given the status of the HSADF and its strategic framework for development coming forward, it is considered qualitatively as an outline description, in addition to the list of other Committed Developments, on the assumption that the strategic development envisaged as part of the draft HSADF would be built and completed.

**Committed Developments****Demolition and Construction**

**6.140** The cumulative schemes will generate additional construction employment. Without access to data and information on construction spend and programmes of each individual scheme it is not possible to quantify these effects. The cumulative effects of the construction phase in relation to socio-economic impacts are therefore considered to be temporary, regional and minor to moderate beneficial overall.

### *Completed Development*

- 6.141** The cumulative schemes in combination with the Proposed Development are considered likely to result in an increase in the overall number of residents and employees expected to be accommodated in the local area on their completion. The effects expected to occur as a result are described below.

### *Population and Labour Market*

- 6.142** The overall population of the LIA is expected to increase by 31.5% (4,335 persons) with a similar proportional increase in the working age and economically active population. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as high. With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of effect is assessed as moderate beneficial (significant).

### *Housing Supply*

- 6.143** Cumulatively, the schemes will result in a 32% (2,173) increase in the dwelling supply in the LIA and 3.3% increase at the borough level. This represents 11% of the borough housing target and 22% of the central Reading housing target. A proportion of these dwellings will also be affordable and will help to increase the size and type of housing available in Reading. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as high. With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as medium the scale of effect is assessed as major beneficial (significant).

### *Local Economy*

- 6.144** Cumulatively, the schemes will result in an increase of household expenditure levels and may include expenditure of around £22 million on convenience and comparison goods. A proportion of this expenditure will be captured within the Borough and help to further support the vitality and viability of retail businesses. The magnitude of change is assessed as moderate. The sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of effect is assessed as minor beneficial (not significant).

### *Total Employment*

- 6.145** The cumulative schemes would bring forward a variety of floorspace including office, retail and leisure. Collectively these schemes will increase the current total employment levels in the LIA by 32% (13,600) and 13% at the borough level. In addition, the increase in household spending associated with new residents of the cumulative schemes (where residential units are provided) will also support additional employment. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as high. With the sensitivity of the receptor assessed as low, the scale of effect is assessed as moderate beneficial (significant).

### *GP Capacity*

- 6.146** The increase in population is likely to place added pressure on existing healthcare facilities and the capacity of GPs. Without mitigation through the provision of additional facilities or the expansion of existing facilities this could result in a long-term adverse effect. However, it is assumed that any mitigation required to meet the needs of additional demand arising from the cumulative schemes will have been subject to negotiations to provide adequate on or off-site provision or financial contributions secure for each development on an individual basis. The cumulative effect is therefore assessed as negligible.

### *Education*

- 6.147** The increase in population is also likely to place added pressure on existing education providers at all ages. Without mitigation through the provision of additional facilities or the expansion of existing facilities this could result in a long-term adverse effect. However, it is assumed that any mitigation required to meet the needs of additional demand arising from the cumulative schemes will have been subject to negotiations to provide adequate on or off-site provision or financial contributions secure for each development on an individual basis. The cumulative effect is therefore assessed as negligible.

### *Open Space*

- 6.148** The increase in population is likely to place added pressure on existing open space provision. Without mitigation through the provision of additional facilities or the expansion of existing facilities this could result in a long-term adverse effect. However, it is assumed that any mitigation required to meet the needs of additional demand arising from the cumulative schemes will have been subject to negotiations to provide adequate on or off-site provision or financial contributions secure for each development on an individual basis. The cumulative effect is therefore assessed as negligible.

### *Hosier Street Area Development Framework*

- 6.149** The impact of the HSAD will likely bring about a range of beneficial socio-economic impacts such as additional employment opportunities, both temporary and long term, as well as additional local expenditure and

improvements to local open space. Any additional population generated as part of the HSADF will likely increase demand for social infrastructure including education and health services. It is assumed any mitigation required to meet the needs of this additional demand will be subject to negotiations to provide adequate on or off-site provision or financial contributions.