

Appendix B

Design Supplementary Planning Document: Regulation 12 (a) Statement of Consultation

This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for the adoption of Bracknell Forest Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This statement is required to set out:

1. Who was consulted in the preparation of the SPD;
2. A summary of the main issues raised during the consultation; and
3. How the issues raised have been addressed in the SPD.

1. Purpose of the Design SPD

The Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out design principles and best practice to guide the design quality of development proposals within the Borough. The SPD provides guidance as a material consideration to planning applications in the Borough. The Design SPD sets out guidance relating to:

- Design and context;
- Built form and spaces;
- Householder extensions;
- Design and Access Statements.

2. Consultation

In the preparation of the Design SPD, officers throughout the Council, including those with a responsibility for planning, transport and green infrastructure were consulted in the preparation of the Draft and final SPD.

Following this, the draft Design SPD and its evidence was published for consultation for a 6 week period from Monday 17th October at 9 am until 5pm on Monday 27th November 2016. Bracknell Forest Council has comprehensively consulted with interested members of the public and range of key and statutory organisations to help assess the content of the Design SPD. The consultation included:

- Planning consultants/agents.
- Developers/architects.
- Statutory bodies and organisations.
- Members of the general public who have specified an interest in Local Plan issues.

Details of who has been consulted on the SPD and how they were consulted can be viewed below.

Details of the responses made to the consultation and how they have been taken account of in the adopted SPD are detailed below.

3. Consultation Responses

A total of 26 representations on the draft SPD were made. The 26 representations comprised of local residents, Crowthorne Parish Council, Statutory consultees and neighbouring boroughs and 4 developers. The main issues raised were:

- Additional emphasis needed on the positive contribution of green infrastructure and the need for more trees within new development.
- More reference to heritage assets, landscape character issues and maintaining views of historic assets.
- More consideration needed within new development to the existing character within neighbourhoods.

- The need to consider all within the community, particularly older people, people with dementia and young children when designing new places.
- Additional air quality, flood and Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) information needed.
- New development should be built to higher densities to meet ensure a 5 year land supply and meet local needs more quickly.
- Too much development is happening all at the same time
- The need to continue to secure additional infrastructure to support new development sites and provide for existing communities.
- Some clarity needed in relation to specific diagrams and photos used.

The following table provides a detailed summary of the responses and officer responses and actions which explain how the issues raised have been addressed in the final SPD.

Draft Design SPD Consultation Responses, BFC response and action
Consultation period: 17 October – 28 November 2016

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
Amy Steel – Natural England	1) Provision should be made for Green Infrastructure within development – this should be inline with the GI Strategy covering Bracknell Forest and the NPPF Urban green spaces provide multi-functional benefits Opportunities to provide and retrofit green roof systems, roof gardens, green walls and tree planting to provide shade and cooling. Issues relating to air quality, ground and surface water and soils should be considered within urban design plans.	Agree with comments made. Many of the issues raised (points 1 – 5) are discussed within the Council’s Sustainable Resources Management (SRM) SPD. An additional sentence has been added at 2.6.4 which further reiterates the issues covered in the SRM SPD and cross references to this document.	Sentence added at para 2.6.4
	2) Biodiversity enhancement – e.g. bat roost and bird box provision	As above	As above
	3) Landscape enhancement - landscape characterisation – avoid unacceptable impacts	As above	As above
	4) Impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity	As above	As above
	5) Climate change and sustainable development principles	As above	As above
Katie Newton - Environment Agency	No comments to make	No action required	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
D Rothwell	No comments to make	Comment: No action required	-
K Naylor	1) Reference to health and well being issues need to be included. Healthy lifestyles can be made easier through the pattern of development. Development should provide for all ages, from play for the young to adaptable homes and communities for the aging population, including the increasing occurrence of dementia. More reference to “people” needed, especially at page 5.	The NPPG covers this issue at Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 26-014-20140306: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/design#vibrant-neighborhoods It makes reference to the health and well being and quality of life of those living in an area and how this is influenced by its cohesion. Cohesion relies upon a neighbourhood having a robust structure and identity. The table on page 5 relates to site analysis and therefore reference to “people” is not relevant at this point. However, a paragraph is added at 2.4.3 within the placemaking section.	Additional paragraph added at 2.4.3
	2) Section 3 - better open spaces leads to better health outcomes. Local action needed on health inequality – access to open space can help with this. Para 3.9 needs to reference active lifestyles e.g. cycling, walking, good access to local services for all ages and abilities.	Access to open space and issues of connectivity are implied throughout the document but are detailed in part at section 2.3 and at 3.2.3. The scope of the document is limited and can only detail design issues. No additional text is therefore considered appropriate within this document.	-
	3) This document should underpin the Council’s commitment to becoming a Dementia Friendly Community.	The scope of the document is limited and can only detail design issues. It is felt that the principles contained within the SPD support access to new development for all members of the community	-
Alexandre Tissot Demidoff	If character and context is so important, why is the Blue Mountain development going ahead against community wishes? The Blue Mountain scheme is considered poorly planned, community were steam rolled and it	This response relates to an allocated site where planning permission has been granted and development is now taking place. The comments are therefore not relevant to this SPD.	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	is a shameful abuse of authority	No action required.	
R Bell	1) Agree with the need to consider context. Wider consultation with local steering groups would help in good integrated design which reflects the majority view and reflect Neighbourhood Plans.	Agreed – an additional paragraph has been added at 1.1.9 promoting Neighbourhood Plans and consultation with local residents’ groups.	Additional wording added at para. 1.1.9
	2) New buildings are too similar to reduce costs so character and identity is often lost. Tree planting needed to soften development visually.	Design and tree planting is promoted throughout the document as drafted. No action required.	-
	3) Home extensions are often poor quality – suggest a level of qualification is needed for all applications	An assessment of quality of design will be done at the planning stage in accordance with the Council’s policies. No action required.	-
	4) Development welcomed if it is in character with the settlement. In the past, design of development has been thrust upon community by builders, architects and developers. A more consultative approach is needed.	Implementation of policy and guidance through the SPD is seeking to achieve higher quality and consultation with local communities. No action required.	-
N Gilcrist	Agreement with all sections of the document	Welcomed. No Action required	-
T Usher	1) Agreement with all sections of the document.	Welcomed. No Action required	
	2) However, concern in relation to the timing of development in that there seems to be a sudden increase in development and concern that impact on local infrastructure is not given enough time – adversely affecting the living conditions of local people.	This response relates to the delivery of supporting community and social infrastructure. This is beyond the scope of this document. Specific guidance is set out within the Planning Obligations SPD on securing appropriate infrastructure delivery. No action required.	-
G Jewell	Agreement with all sections of the document	Welcomed. No action required.	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
J Norfolk	1) Streets, buildings and spaces need to consider the context of communities and historical land use, along with infrastructure needs	Agreed. This document, the Character Area Assessments SPD and CIL seeks to address this point. No action required.	-
	2) Design needs to consider flood risks, surface run off and fluvial	There is a section in chapter 2 that relates to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which is now a planning requirement in all new development. Wording has been added to the text to provide more information on SuDS in the document in line with this response and comments from the Senior Engineer responsible for SuDS provision.	Section 2.5 has been redrafted and additional information provided.
	3) Need to build in renewable energy	Section 2 of the document cross references to the Sustainable Resource Management SPD which includes design advice on this issue. No action required.	-
	4) Grey water reusable for gardens and needs to be built into the design of housing as achieved in Australia	As per point 3 above No Action required.	-
D Broomfield	Agreement with all sections of the document	Welcomed - no action required.	-
C Chesterton	1) Agreement with all sections of the document	Welcomed. No action required	-
	2) A glossary is needed detailing the abbreviations used. Section 4 should use less formal terminology.	A glossary has now been included at the back of the document and text has been reviewed for clarity.	Additional information including a glossary is now included at the back of the document
D Bingham	1) Agreement with all sections of the document	Welcomed. No action required	-
	2) Imperative that Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Council's communicate in relation to planning new homes, infrastructure, amenities etc..	This is done on a regular basis. No action required in relation to the SPD	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
M McLoughlin	1) Agreement with all sections of the document.	Welcomed. No action required	-
	2) Need to consider children in all development, good planning for schools, especially Secondary schools.	Provision for children and schools is addressed within planning policy and the Planning Obligations SPD. No Action required	-
	3) You are doing a great job in looking after the interests of us all.	Welcomed. No action required	-
H Guest – South Oxfordshire District Council	Consider there to be no impacts on South Oxfordshire so comment to make	No action required	-
Crowthorne Parish Council	1) Character Area Assessments SPD should be maintained and updated regularly to assist developers with responding to character and context and to include new development sites such as TRL and any development over 10 units.	This comment is noted and the need to respond to character and context is stated throughout this SPD No action required in relation to this SPD.	-
	2) Planning Officers should be area specific so they get to know the area and local councillors, both for Borough and Parish	This response has been forwarded to the Head of Planning for consideration No action required in relation to this SPD	-
	3) Key heritage and historical elements need to be preserved where practicable	The Council has a statutory duty by virtue of Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to pay special regard to the value of heritage assets for the current and future generations. The impact on the heritage assets will be reviewed as part of the development of the Comprehensive Local Plan. Additionally, minor amendments to the text have been made referencing heritage assets and views in line with Heritage England's consultation response. See below. No further action required	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	4) Document draws on development in Bracknell town, more is needed in relation to the parishes. Particularly when dealing with infill development or replacement buildings, need to echo form, landscape and spaces, both visually and physically.	The Borough as a whole was considered when drafting the Design SPD and it is not thought to have a specific focus in terms of area. No action required	-
	5) Air quality must be taken seriously	This is discussed in more detail in the Sustainable Resource Management SPD and cross references to this document have been included in chapter 2. No action required	-
	6) Section 4 is good but approval for extensions should only be given if the parking standards (2016) can be met and all other policies and SPDs.	The Parking Standards SPD is a document to guide provision, assist in the assessment of planning applications and seeks to ensure consistency in decision making. Each application is assessed on its own merits in the light of the SPD and other material considerations. No action required.	-
	7) Policy CS7 encourages “innovative architecture”. Who is competent to decide what is considered innovative and what is grossly out of keeping with the context?	With good design guidance in place assessment of design should be more transparent to the local community in terms of understanding what is meant by good design. Additionally, all Planning Officers have the appropriate qualifications and experience to assess design and to implement national and local planning policy and guidance. Innovative architecture is considered alongside a number of issues including sustainability, character and landscape context. No action required.	-
	8) In relation to Design and Access	Section 5.1.1 sets out when DASs are	Links to further information on

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	Statements (DASs), when are DASs required, what weight is to be given to DASs, would applications with DASs be examined more stringently?	required to be submitted. DASs are an information document explaining the proposals submitted and detailing why a specific design response has been chosen. They are an aid to understanding an application and therefore do not hold any “weight” as suggested. Further details may be requested as part of a DAS if applicants do not provide sufficient information.	DASs are included in the appendix.
	9) Generally the document is welcomed. Excellent and well thought out standards. However, the document should be a key tool for case officers and not disregarded as some SPDs are. The Character Area Assessments SPD is out of date and needs updating and the document is too focussed on Bracknell town.	Welcomed and noted No action required.	-
	10) Borough has a rich and varied context and one set of standards may not do justice in all cases. Planning is about judgement as well as consistency.	Noted and agreed No action required	-
L Bird – St. William Homes – Berkeley Group and National Grid Property Holdings	1) The intentions of the SPD are fully supported.	Welcomed and noted.	
	2) To meet the Council’s 5 year housing supply, optimising density is crucial. Higher densities on Brownfield sites will alleviate pressures on greenfield sites. Therefore a more flexible approach to density should be applied.	A reference to using land efficiently has been inserted at 2.4.1 in response to this comment. However, density is only one issue alongside a number of issues that will be considered when assessing the development of Brownfield sites.	Additional wording added at 2.4.1
	3) Approach to placemaking is fully supported	Welcomed. No action required	-
	4) Para 2.4.1 – reference to optimising brownfield sites should be made clear	Response as point 1)	Additional wording added at 2.4.1

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	5) Section 2.6 should reference the issue of viability for Brownfield sites as these are often more costly to develop.	The issue of the viability of a development falls outside the scope of this SPD. Viability is a consideration for the developer in bringing sites forward for development. Therefore they must have regard to the quantum of development and site development costs, including site preparation/ remediation and the delivery of physical and social infrastructure. The developer has the option to submit a viability assessments as set out within the Planning Obligations SPD (Feb: 2015) No action required.	-
	6) 3.9.13-14 – the back to back distances are considered too restrictive for Brownfield sites and the issue of viability and a more flexible approach should be adopted.	This point has been considered. However, in relation to achieving good design and quality of amenity space for future residents, the rule of thumb is considered reasonable. However, all guidance is considered on a case by case basis at the time of assessing an application. No action required.	-
C Bell - Savills on behalf of Thames Water Utilities Ltd	General support for section 2.5 on SuDS as SuDS can help to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve water quality - Provide opportunities for water efficiency - Enhance landscape and visual features - Support wildlife - Provide amenity and recreational benefits 	It is felt that these issues are stated at paragraph 2.5.1. However, some revisions to the text and diagrams in section 2.5 have been made to set out more clearly information on SuDS requirements as requested by BFC Senior Engineer for SuDS	Amendments made to 2.5
D Palmer - Turley on behalf of	General support for a Design SPD however important to remain a degree of flexibility is	Comment welcomed This response has been considered.	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
Bloor Homes (Southern) Ltd	<p>applied.</p> <p>1) Concern in relation to a tick box approach to the key principles and that this appears over simplified. Planning balance must be considered. Boxes should be removed.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>However, it is felt that the text within each section clearly states the complexity of issues and the balances that are needed within the planning system. The Critical Review boxes are intended solely as a prompt to ensure ALL the key issues are fully considered. Therefore, the Critical Review boxes are retained.</p> <p>No action required</p>	
D Palmer (cont.)	<p>2) The following are also considered simplistic and unduly restrictive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - para 3.5.5 existing landscape should be retained, incorporated and enhanced. - para 3.5.6 “ development should face outwards on existing and proposed open spaces and routes to create active frontages” - para 3.9.6 all gardens, terraces and balconies should receive direct sunlight for at least part of the day - para 3.9.9 residents of apartment should have access to communal garden areas, roof terraces or private balcony - section 3.8 - top diagram page 23 should be deleted – meaningful gaps between detached dwellings are considered unrealistic unless low density housing 	<p>All issues raised have been considered and amendments if appropriate made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - para 3.5.5 has been amended to include the words “wherever possible”. - para 3.5.6 is retained as drafted as this is considered good design which is supported in a number of national guidance documents - para 3.9.6 is retained as drafted as this is considered to be good practice and contributes to the health and well being of future residents - as above <p>- section 3.8 is retained as drafted as it is considered that the reasoning for the diagram is clearly set out at paras 3.8.3 and 3.8.4.</p>	Text inserted at para: 3.5.5
H Cook – Spelthorne Borough Council	No comments but look forward to further joint working on strategic issues.	Response noted - no action required	-
F Macdonald –	Pleased to see that archaeology is noted as	Response welcomed - no action required	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
Berkshire Archaeology	one of the range of site features that may influence design as it is important in terms of risk management to be flagged up early in the process.		
R Agnew – Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Whilst the introduction of a SPD can be helpful in guiding developers, suitable flexibility should also be given to applying this SPD. Its application should not become a burden, impose ridged restrictions or financial constraints upon development. Therefore the following is recommended</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) further wording is needed to explain how the SPD will be applied in the assessment of planning applications. 2) Para 1.2.3 add wording “The Council will work positively with applicants to secure good design solutions that will support the sustainability of the development proposal.” 3) Add an additional para at 1.2.4 re applying the SPD flexibly and not imposing architectural styles or tastes as set out in the NPPF. <p>Request details of committee meeting when document will be adopted and details of changes and subsequent decisions made.</p>	<p>As a SPD, the Design SPD seeks solely to build on and provide more detailed guidance on policies contained within the suite of Bracknell Forest Council’s local policy documents, as per the NPPF. It will therefore be a material consideration when assessing planning applications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No additional wording is considered necessary. 2) Para added as suggested with minor alteration to wording – see para 1.2.4. 3) This has been considered but is not felt to be necessary as compliance with the NPPF in all decision making is implicit. Noted. 	Inserted para 1.2.4
M Small – Historic England	<p>HE considers the SPD as “excellent” and “comprehensive”. Detailed comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Table on page 5 – reference should be made to “historic landscape character” as per the recent historic landscape characterisation for the East Berkshire authorities and to Historic England documents 	<p>Response is welcomed.</p> <p>The reference to landscape character would not preclude the impact on historic landscape character since the SPD would be read in the context of the Bracknell Forest Landscape Character Assessment xxxx and additional information on landscape character including the historic</p>	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
		significance. No additional information is considered necessary.	
	2) Reference to checking the significance of off site heritage assets and their setting. Views should include those into and across the site, as well as those within and out of a site. Cross reference to historic England documents.	Text amended in section 2.4.1 and 3.7.2 to address this point.	Additional bullet point inserted at 2.4.1 and 3.7.2
	3) Para 2.3 – should specify that Greenfield development should have regard to existing landscape character, framework and historic features even though an overlap with the Streetscene SPD. Suggest sub-section 3.5 should be moved to sub-section 2.3	This comment is noted. However, reference to countryside is thought to negate the need for reference to Greenfield sites. It is felt that this addition along with sections 2.1 and 2.2 as drafted sufficiently cover this point.	-
	4) Welcome the reference to conservations areas at para 2.2.6 but would like to see reference to heritage assets and their setting included.	Comment noted and additional sentence included at 2.2.6	Additional text inserted at 2.2.6
	5) Para 2.4 – second bullet – include the word “heritage”	This is not considered necessary	-
	6) Para 2.3 – should specify that Greenfield development should have regard to existing landscape character, framework and historic features even though an overlap with the Streetscene SPD. Suggest sub-section 3.5 should be moved to sub-section 2.3	This reference is not considered necessary as it is a wider point than simply heritage character. Sub section 3.5 relates to edge of settlement. Similar issues are discussed in relation to over development areas within the text. No action required	-
	7) Section 2.4 should include information on views and any historic significance.	An additional bullet point has been added at 2.4 and is amended as requested	An additional bullet at 2.4
	8) Para 3.2 could refer to historic street patterns	This is not considered necessary and no additional text is proposed.	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	9) Para 3.7.2 should also identify the setting of heritage assets and significant views	Amended as requested	Additional bullet at 3.7.2
	10)Section 4.9 could reference HE guidance on Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings.	Not considered necessary No action required.	-
M Owen – Barton Willmore on behalf of Willson Developments Ltd	Have the following comments 1) Building for Life 12 (BfL12) is a design tool to be used throughout the planning process and not necessarily to achieve 12 green lights.	1) Wording amended.- deleted “fully meeting”	Deleted words at 1.1.7
	2) Concur with table 5 but where not relevant, specific reference as part of a DAS will not be required	Not considered relevant	-
	3) Para 2.3.1 – responding to building heights, plot sizes, densities and degrees of variation in the local context should not preclude alternative or innovative approaches to development and that context is not necessarily a precedent.	This is noted and it is felt that the text within the document allows for variation if appropriate. Additionally, this is covered within policy CS 7 and therefore no need to repeat within the SPD	-
	4) Alternatives to perimeter blocks may be appropriate where a more organic approach is needed, e.g. edge of settlement – this issue should be carried forward into the critical review box on page 14.	The text is felt to detail the intent of perimeter blocks in terms of defining fronts and backs. Issues relating to character are detailed within the document elsewhere so not to preclude other patterns of development.	-
	5) Para 3.3 – 3.5 – overall, considers that respecting and responding to character is potentially restrictive and provide insufficient room for innovation. In some locations development could “seek to resolve” or “repair” the urban environment by adopting innovative and efficient approaches.	Two sentences have been added at 3.1.1 to address this issue.	Added wording at 3.1.1
	6) Sections 2.5, 3.4.16 and 3.4.20 should refer to swales as they have an impact on	The SuDS section of the document has been reworded. However, detailed	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	these areas. More information on “in parcel” SuDS solutions should be discussed due to its impact on the streetscene.	information on SuDS design is extensive and can be sources elsewhere as detailed in the appendix	
	7) Providing 3-dimensional information is not necessarily considered a requirement or critical component in all situations and therefore further clarification is needed.	This is noted, however, it is not felt that the wording needs changing.	-
	8) Images on page 23 – top image is considered inappropriate and suggest clarification is needed.	The Council does not consider this image is inappropriate but a useful guide to achieve to the right plot for the size of house. No action is required.	-
	9) Para 3.9.15 is considered to use ambiguous language	This para has now been deleted.	Deleted para 3.9.15
	10) Para 3.9.28 Disagree that basement parking is ideal solution.	To ensure parking does not dominate streetscenes and to avoid large parking courts, basement car parking is considered to be an ideal solution in many cases. No action required.	-
A L Davies	1) General agreement with section 2. Important to improve the existing road infrastructure.	Response welcomed No action required.	-
	2) General agreement – good DASs can aid quicker decisions from planning department.	Cars need to be parked on areas of hard standing however, different types of hard surfaces can be used in accordance with the Streetscene SPD. No action required	-
	3) Parking areas should use different surfaces to reduce the amount of hard standing.	Noted. This is something that the Council tries to ensure that it facilitates through design, but is ultimately the responsibility of residents. No action required	-

Name (and Organisation If Relevant)	Issue(s) raised	BFC response and comment	Action taken Para Reference/ Table Reference/Page No.
	4) General agreement with section 4 – including extensions should not interfere with light or shade of adjoining property	Welcomed. Guidance on light and shade issues are detailed in section, however, each case considered on its own merits No action required	-
	5) General agreement – good DASs can aid quicker decisions from planning department.	Noted, although suggest that a DAS can aid interpretation and understanding rather than lead to quicker decisions within the planning department as such. No action required	-

The consultation draft went to the Executive on 27th September 2016 (Item no.32) to agree the consultation draft Design SPD and consultation process.

The consultation period ran between Monday 17th October and Monday 28th November 2016. The document and a consultation questionnaire were available to view:

- On the Bracknell Forest Council website;
- At the Council offices at Time Square and Easthampstead House;
- At all 6 Parish and Town Council Offices; and
- All 9 libraries in the Borough.

Letters, as at appendix 1, were sent to the following organisations under the Council's duty to cooperate

Duty to Co-operate Organisations	Email Address
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	ldf@basingstoke.gov.uk
Berkshire Local Nature Partnership	info@BerkshireLNP.org
Bracknell and Ascot Clinical Commissioning Group	BACCG.BACCGenquiries@nhs.net
Buckinghamshire County Council	customerservices@buckscc.gov.uk
Chiltern District Council	planningpolicy@chiltern.gov.uk
Civil Aviation Authority	infoservices@caa.co.uk
Elmbridge Borough Council	tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk
Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise PartnershipEnter	info@enterprisem3.org.uk
Environment Agency	enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk
Greater London Authority	mayor@london.gov.uk
Guildford Borough Council	planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk
Hampshire County Council	ldfconsultation@hants.gov.uk
Hart District Council	planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk
Highways England	info@highwaysengland.co.uk
Historic England	southeast@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Homes and Communities Agency	mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk
Natural England	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
NHS England	england.contactus@nhs.net
NHS North and West Reading Clinical Commissioning Group	RCCG.NandWReadingCCG@nhs.net
NHS South Reading Clinical Commissioning Group	southreadingccg@nhs.net
Office of Rail Regulation	contact.cct@orr.gsi.gov.uk
Oxfordshire County Council	planning@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership	info@oxfordshirelep.com
Reading Borough Council	LDF@reading.gov.uk
Runnymede Borough Council	planning@runnymede.gov.uk
Rushmoor Borough Council	plan@rushmoor.gov.uk
Slough Borough Council	planningpolicy@slough.gov.uk
Slough Clinical Commissioning Group	SLOCCG.Info@nhs.net
South Buckinghamshire District Council	LDF@southbucks.gov.uk
South Oxfordshire District Council	planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk
Spelthorne Borough Council	planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk
Surrey County Council	planning.consultations@surreycc.gov.uk
Surrey Heath Borough Council	planning.policy@surreyheath.gov.uk
Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group	shccg.contactus@nhs.net
Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership	info@thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk
Waverley Borough Council	planningpolicy@waverley.gov.uk
West Berkshire Borough Council	planningpolicy@westberks.gov.uk
Royal Borough Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council	planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk

Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Clinical Commissioning Group	WAMCCG.Info@nhs.net
Woking Borough Council	planningpolicy@woking.gov.uk
Wokingham Borough Council	policyandplans@wokingham.gov.uk
Wycombe District Council	planning_policy@wycombe.gov.uk

An advertisement, as detailed at appendix 2, was placed in the Bracknell News local newspaper which is circulated to all households in the Borough. The advert appeared in the 19/10/16 edition.

An email, as detailed at appendix 3, was sent to all contacts on the Council's consultation portal http://mylimehouse.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/design_spd/design_spd_2016

Appendix 1 – Main Consultation Letter

17 October 2016

Dear

Consultation Draft Design Supplementary Planning Document

Bracknell Forest Council is publishing a Draft Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
The public consultation runs from Monday 17th October until Monday 28th November 2016.

The document sets out general advice on design principles and aims to assist with the implementation of current planning policies and provide prospective applicants with a clearer view of the Council's expectations for design when submitting planning applications.

The Consultation Draft Design SPD sets out:

- high level design principles relating to understanding a site and the context of the area including the existing character where the site is located.
- guidance on the basic principles of design to create places that will provide good communities and pleasant homes for residents in the future.
- guidance and key principles relating to householder extensions.
- advice relating to the content of Design and Access Statements.

Comments on the Consultation DRAFT Design SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: http://mylimehouse.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/design_spd/design_spd_2016
- Or by e-mail to development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
- or writing to: Head of Planning, Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD.

The documents are available to view online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/spds

Copies of the document are also available at Libraries and Parish and Town Councils across the Borough.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2017.

If you have any queries or require further copies of the documents, please get in touch with a member of the Strategic Sites and Design Team, call 01344 352000 or email development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Yours sincerely



Max Baker (Head of Planning)

Appendix 2 – Advert published 19/10/16 in the Bracknell News

Have your say to shape quality of development design

Residents are being invited to give their views on a new document which will guide the quality of new development in Bracknell Forest.

A consultation has been launched to help develop Bracknell Forest Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The document will provide general guidance on the key principles of design and assist prospective applicants in understanding Bracknell Forest Council's expectations for design when submitting planning applications.

The guidance within the SPD is far-reaching and will apply to everything from building an extension on a home to constructing a block of apartments. The overall aim is to create buildings that will provide good communities and pleasant homes for residents in the future.

The consultation, launched on Monday, 17 October, runs until 28 November.

Cllr Chris Turrell, Executive Member for Planning and Transport said: "This document will have an impact on all residents as it will be used to assess the design of future buildings in the Borough—the buildings we may live, work or shop in – but it will also guide decisions on applications at a more local level, such as planned extensions to existing homes.

"We all want attractive, well designed and well thought out buildings to make the Borough as pleasant a place to live as possible and this document will help with that"

"That is why I would urge residents to get involved and have their say during this consultation period."

Comments on the draft Design SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: http://mylimehouse.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/design_spd/design_spd_2016
- Or by e-mail to development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
- or writing to: Head of Planning, Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD.

The documents are available to view online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/spds

Copies of the document are also available for viewing at Council libraries and Parish Council offices across the Borough.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2017.

If you have any queries or require further copies of the documents, please contact the Council's development plan team, by calling 01344 352000 or emailing development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Appendix 3 Email to all contacts on the Council's consultation portal

Consultation Draft Design Supplementary Planning Document

Bracknell Forest Council is publishing a Draft Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
The public consultation runs from Monday 17th October until Monday 28th November 2016.

The document sets out general advice on design principles and aims to assist with the implementation of current planning policies and provide prospective applicants with a clearer view of the Council's expectations for design when submitting planning applications.

The Consultation Draft Design SPD sets out:

- high level design principles relating to understanding a site and the context of the area including the existing character where the site is located.
- guidance on the basic principles of design to create places that will provide good communities and pleasant homes for residents in the future.
- guidance and key principles relating to householder extensions.
- advice relating to the content of Design and Access Statements.

Comments on the Consultation DRAFT Design SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/design_spd/design_spd_2016
- Or by e-mail to development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
- or writing to: Head of Planning, Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD.

The documents are available to view online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/spds

Copies of the document are also available at Libraries and Parish and Town Councils across the Borough.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2017.

If you have any queries or require further copies of the documents, please get in touch with a member of the Strategic Sites and Design, call 01344 352000 or email development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Consultation Draft – Design Supplementary Planning Document

Bracknell Forest Council is publishing a **Draft Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**. **The public consultation runs from Monday 17th October until Monday 28th November 2016.**

The document sets out general advice on design principles and aims to assist with the implementation of current planning policies and provide prospective applicants with a clearer view of the Council's expectations for design when submitting planning applications.

The Consultation Draft Design SPD sets out:

- high level design principles relating to understanding a site and the context of the area including the existing character where the site is located.
- guidance on the basic principles of design to create places that will provide good communities and pleasant homes for residents in the future.
- guidance and key principles relating to householder extensions.
- advice relating to the content of Design and Access Statements.

Comments on the Consultation DRAFT Design SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/design_spd/design_spd_2016
- Or by e-mail to development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
- or writing to: Head of Planning, Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD.

Copies of the document are also available at Libraries and Parish and Town Councils across the Borough.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2017.

If you have any queries or require further copies of the documents, please get in touch with a member of the Strategic Sites and Design Team, call 01344 352000 or email development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk