



Examiner of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan

Xxxx February 2019

Dear Examiner,

BRACKNELL TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSION (REGULATION 16) CONSULTATION

The following relates to Bracknell Forest Council's response (as the Local Planning Authority) to the Regulation 16 consultation on the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan (7 January-18 February 2018). This response does not include any comments from the Council as a land owner.

Bracknell Forest Council is generally supportive of the Plan, and appreciates the work invested by those involved in the preparation of the Plan. The structure of each policy section with headings relating to 'policy background', 'policy context', 'policy intent', 'policy justification', followed by the Policy is supported.

Basic Conditions

It is considered that a number of policies as currently worded do not meet the Basic Conditions (further detail set out in Appendix 1 of this response), namely A (regard to national policy and guidance), D (contribution to achievement of sustainable development) and E (general conformity with strategic policies contained in the Development Plan):

- **Policies Map**
The Neighbourhood Plan needs a clear useable 'Policies Map' to show the boundaries of policies set out in the Plan which have spatial implications i.e. areas where specific policies apply, e.g. the Local Green Spaces (current maps and illustrations contained in the Plan are illegible as they are blurred).
- **EV1 (Active Open Space of Public Value)**
The Policy Intent conflicts with the aims of making efficient use of land, contrary to national policy and strategic policies in the Development Plan. Therefore, it does not meet the aims of sustainable development.
- **EV3 (Local Green Spaces)**
The Council considers that the wording could be modified to be consistent with national policy. It is considered that modification of the Policy could result in it meeting the Basic Conditions if it included references to 'new development being inappropriate', 'openness' and 'very special circumstances'. Furthermore, it is also not clear whether land owners have been informed of the potential designation of their land at an early stage. There are also other Policies within the Plan which relate to the sites identified as Local Green Spaces, so the justification is not clear. There could also be conflict with other Policies within the Plan, therefore, it does not meet the aims of sustainable development.

- EV11 (Air Quality)
It is unclear what development proposals the Policy relates to, and whether the Policy relates to impacts upon human health or vegetation and ecosystems (both are referred to in national policy). As written the policy would halt all development within the neighbourhood area, which does not accord with national policy.
- HE1 (Protection of Parks & of Parkland Features of Historic Parks and Gardens)
As currently worded, the Policy confuses terminology and provides detail for sites which are not Registered Parks and Gardens. The Policy does not take account of the tests in relation to heritage assets contained in national policy. There are also other Policies within the Plan which relate to the sites identified in the heritage policies, so the justification is not clear. There could also be conflict with other Policies within the Plan, therefore it does not meet the aims of sustainable development.
- HO4 (Managing the streetscape)
References to the Council's SPDs should be in the supporting text and not the main policy as they are guidance. It is not appropriate to examine them against the basic conditions. It is considered that this would be contrary to planning legislation, therefore contrary to Basic Condition A.
- HO6 (Safety in design of tall buildings)
The safety of buildings and internal design is covered by other legislation (such as Building Regulations), so this issue is not a land-use planning matter, therefore should be removed from the Plan, and does not conform with Basic Condition A.
- HO8 (Buildings: Local Character)
The Policy conflicts with the aims of making efficient use of land, contrary to national policy and strategic policies in the Development Plan. Therefore, it does not meet the aims of sustainable development. Concerns could be addressed through removal of references to such things as being in keeping with existing densities.
- EC1 (Employment and Enterprise: Small Business & Retail Units)
It is not clear where the Policy specifically relates to, and therefore it is unclear whether the Policy relates to an area which was allocated for residential development in the Site Allocations Local Plan, 2013 (land north of Eastern Road, Policy SA1 refers). Therefore, the Policy may not be in conformity with strategic policies contained in the Development Plan. Clarification on where the Policy applies could address these concerns.
- EC2 (Micro and Small Businesses)
It is unclear where the Policy relates to, if it is the whole neighbourhood plan area, or specific locations. This could be in conflict with national policy if this resulted in the loss of residential units (as national policy seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes), which would not achieve the aims of sustainable development. Clarification on where the Policy applies could address these concerns.
- EC5 (Bracknell Town Centre Development Sites)
As currently worded, the mix of uses referred to within the Policy is very narrow, and is contrary to national policy and strategic policies within the Development Plan relating to the vitality of town centres, and therefore would not achieve the

aims of sustainable development. The Council would like to see mixed development in the Town Centre that extends beyond retail and residential, including for example leisure, health and employment uses etc. Reference to a wider variety of uses such as 'main town centre uses' (in line with national policy) would address these concerns.

Other suggested changes/comments

Whilst recognising that a number of the comments set out in Appendix 2 of this response are not specific to the Basic Conditions, the Council considers that the suggested changes to the structure and presentation of the document will improve the usability and readability of the Plan. Suggested changes to policies/supporting text (for the purposes of the correcting factual errors or seeking clarity) will help to ensure consistency and robust decision making. Please note, these comments only relate to policies and associated supporting text, and not the Actions (since only the land-use policies will form part of the Development Plan, and be used in decision making when the Plan is made). Comments made at the Regulation 14 stage have been reiterated where it is not considered they have been adequately addressed. Technical comments broadly relate to the following matters:

- Formatting of the document could be improved through the use of paragraph, page, and figure numbering throughout the whole document.
- The terminology used in the Plan needs to be more clearly defined to ensure that policies are implemented in a consistent way. To assist this, the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from having a glossary that defines terms used.
- The supporting text needs to focus more on providing supplementary information to the policies, and the link between the policies and the evidence base needs to be made clearer – much of the supporting information could be contained in a separate supporting document.
- There are instances where the underlying objectives of policies overlap; it is suggested that such policies would benefit from being merged/consolidated (e.g. overlap between some housing and character policies; heritage and environment policies, and environment and transport policies relating to air quality).
- The Neighbourhood Plan should have a section that covers implementation and monitoring which is specific to the Policies contained in the Plan.
- The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be clear how Chapter 6 'The Character of Bracknell Town Neighbourhoods' links to the policies and how it would be used in decision making (if this is the intention).

Basic Conditions Statement

It is noted that assessment against National Policy has been undertaken against the 2012 NPPF. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was issued on 24 July 2018 during the preparation of the Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged that under the transitional arrangements (para. 214 of the 2018 NPPF) this Plan will be examined against the previous 2012 NPPF (as it was submitted prior to 24 January 2018), references to the 2018 NPPF, and an assessment of general conformity with policies would help to ensure the longevity of the Plan over the plan period to 2036. It is also noted that the assessment of the Plan against the Development Plan is wider than the 'strategic policies'. (See Appendix 3 of this response for a list of relevant Strategic Policies).

Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening

Information provided as part of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Submission relates to the draft report that was issued for consultation. The final decision, incorporating the comments of the statutory consultees, is the 'Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Opinion, July 2018', which is available to view on the Council's website: <https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/bracknell-town-neighbourhood-plan-screening-decision.pdf>

Please do not hesitate to contact the Development Plans Team if you require any clarification on the points raised (email: development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk).

Yours faithfully

Max Baker
(Head of Planning)

Appendix 1 – BFC comments in relation to Basic Conditions
Appendix 2 – BFC detailed comments on the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan
Appendix 3 – List of BFC Strategic Planning Policies

Appendix 1 – BFC comments in relation to Basic Conditions

Where comments relate to the ‘basic conditions’ these are referred to as:

- A) regard to national policy and guidance
- D) contribution to the achievement of sustainable development
- E) general conformity with strategic policies contained in the Development Plan
- F) does not breach EU obligations
- G) meets prescribed conditions (significant effect on a European Site as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012

B) & C) are not referred to as these only apply to Neighbourhood Development Orders.

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|---|--|
| Comments on the Submission version of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan | | |
| Policies Map | Basic Condition A Amendment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, a Policies Map is required to illustrate graphically the application of policies in a Plan. The maps provided in the Neighbourhood Plan are not of a sufficient scale and clarity to enable users of the Plan to determine the precise boundaries that the Policies apply to. Therefore, the Plan is contrary to Basic Condition A in relation to regard to national policy and guidance. • Where the Plan includes illustrations relating to Policies Maps, these would be better placed with the relevant policies, and cross referenced within the text. Many of these are at the start of a section so are out of context. |
| Policy EV1 | Suggested amendments Basic Conditions A, D & E | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Policy Intent - The current evidence is contained in the Bracknell Forest Play Open Space and Sports Study. Using the standard based on historical New Town development is contrary to both national and local policy which requires the efficient use of land (NPPF (2018) para. 122). • Therefore, the policy is not considered to be fully in conformity with national policy (NPPF 2012, para 17, & NPPF 2018, section 11) or local policy (strategic policy CS1(i) of the Core Strategy in relation to efficient use of land and buildings, and does not meet the aims of sustainable development. Therefore the Policy Intent, as worded, it is not considered to be fully in accordance with Basic Conditions A, D and E. • Web link on bottom of page does not work. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Policy EV3 Pg 18 of 82 | Basic Conditions A and D Amendment to text and consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is generally supportive of the policy being included within the Plan, but does not consider it currently meets the Basic Conditions A & D. These comments do not relate to the Council as a land owner. • The Council notes that there is evidence to support designation of the proposed Local Green Spaces contained in Appendix 2. However, it is not clear whether all the land owners are aware of the proposals (for example Easthampstead Park is no longer owned by BFC). BFC as the Local Planning Authority has sent notification of the Regulation 16 consultation to the Agent acting on behalf of Easthampstead Park, and also the BFC Property services (as BFC owns a number of the sites referred to). Therefore at present, it is not considered that the justification of the sites meets the tests set out in Planning Practice Guidance (para. 37-019-20140306) as it is not clear if land owners have been contacted at an early stage. Therefore the Policy does not meet Basic Condition A (regard to national policy and guidance). • Whilst it is correct that the restrictive nature of this policy is akin to that of Green Belt, the policy wording itself does not need to refer to Green Belt. It is considered that the second part of the policy referring to demonstrating that it is required to enhance the role and function of that Local Green Space, is not consistent with national policy (para. 101 of the NPPF 2018/para. 78 of the NPPF 2012) and therefore would not meet the Basic Condition A (regard to national policy and guidance) as currently worded. There could be reference to new development being inappropriate except in very special circumstances, and reference to land being kept open, which would be consistent with national Green Belt policy. • It would appear from other policies within the Plan that some of the sites referred to would be protected/safeguarded by other policy designations (for example South Hill Park as a site with a listed Building, and registered Park and Garden is also covered by Policies HE1, HE2 & HE3, Easthampstead Park is a site with a Listed Building so also covered by HE1-HE3). • In some cases there would be conflict within the Plan and other Policies. For example A: South Hill Park conflicts with the ambitions of Policy EV12 in this regard, since one seeks protection of the area, whereas the other strongly supports development proposals in this designated area that help retain the existing use. Therefore it is not clear whether the designations are justified for all the sites within the Policy, and this is considered to not meet the aims of Sustainable Development, therefore does not meet Basic Condition D. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Policy EV11 Pg 51 of 82 | Basic Condition A Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is generally supportive of the ambitions of the policy, but consider application of the policy as currently worded is severely limited. • The policy intent states that the policy seeks to limit and mitigate adverse effects on human health. The legislative limits for air pollution include limit and target values for both human health and vegetation and ecosystems, as such the policy goes beyond the policy intent (which only covers human health). Overall, the policy needs to be clear if it is considering the impact of air pollution on human health or biodiversity or both. Air quality in relation to European Sites (the SPA and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)) is a significant issue. • Unclear what development proposals this would relate to. This Policy could lead to the need for an air quality assessment for every application (for example small scale applications such as extensions). • Limits are likely to be breached already in some instances (for both human health and vegetation and ecosystems) in AQMAs. 'Maintained below the limit' will not be possible where such limits are already exceeded. As such all development proposals (including small scale developments) will need to 'mitigate this impact' and reduce existing air pollution levels (both in terms of human health and vegetation and ecosystems) to be able to proceed. Applied as it is written, this would halt all development in the neighbourhood area. This does not accord with national policy and as such does not fulfil the Basic Condition A. • Para. 1 refers to European Union limits for air pollution. Consideration should be given to referencing the relevant UK legislation instead since the Plan period extends to 2036. Use of the word 'or' may result in a breach of applicable legislation in the future: UK legislation limit values could vary from the EU limit values in the future; the use of the term 'or' would allow either to apply. This could result in the policy not meeting basic conditions in the future. • Para. 2 refers to a breach of limits – it is unclear how this applies in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) where limits are already breached? Developments would be expected to reduce the existing air pollution in order to be able to proceed. • There is overlap with this Policy and TR8 – there needs to be a consistent approach. • As worded, it is not considered that EV11 is in conformity with the 2018 NPPF (para 181) and 2012 NPPF (para 124). The Policy could refer to developments in AQMAs being consistent with the Bracknell Forest Air Quality Action Plan. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Policy HE1 Pg 13 of 18 | Basic Condition A Suggested amendments | <p>As currently worded, the policy confuses terms and provides detail on a site that is not a Historic Park and Garden. It should also avoid duplication with other policies in the Plan (EV3). The policy should take into account the tests and balance that must be considered when proposals affect heritage assets as set out in the NPPF (including the significance of the asset, the level of harm and potential impacts), in order to meet the basic conditions (Basic Condition A: regard to National Policy and Guidance). See Chapter 16 of the NPPF 2018.</p> <p>Two options for this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the policy to ‘Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens’, and refer to avoiding harm to existing historic parks and gardens and their settings including landscape features. In the supporting text explain how this would be applied to South Hill Park. • ‘Protection of Parkland Features of Important Parks and Gardens’ so as to widen the scope to include unlisted sites. Identify important elements that make up the parkland features in the supporting text, e.g. historic park and garden (South Hill Park), listed building and setting including trees (Easthampstead Park) and trees (Lily Hill Park). The detail currently included in the last sentence of the policy should be moved to the supporting text. |
| Policy HO4 Pg 24 of 50 | Basic Condition A Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to the Council’s SPDs should be in the supporting text and not the main policy as they are guidance. It is not appropriate to examine them against the basic conditions. It is considered that this would be contrary to planning legislation, therefore contrary to Basic Condition A. • The policy justification could also refer to the Council’s adopted Design and Street Scene SPDs. • Unclear what is meant by the term ‘integrated’. Does this mean waste storage, cycle parking etc is integrated into the built form, or does this mean integral to the design and layout of a scheme (as the policy does refer to external amenity space)? • How does this policy relate to Policy HO3 which refers to front gardens? |
| Policy HO6 Pg 30 of 50 | Basic Condition A | <p>The safety of buildings and internal design is covered by other legislation (such as Building Regulations), so this issue is not a land-use planning matter, therefore should be removed from the Plan, as it does not conform with Basic Condition A. As it is not a land-use policy, no specific comments are made. It could be replaced as an aspiration/action within the Plan instead.</p> |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Policy HO8 Pg 50 of 50 | Basic Conditions A, D & E Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council considers this policy should be merged with Policy HO9, since they cover the same topic. Also this in part duplicates Policy HO1 (infill and backland development). • The policy is not considered to be fully in conformity with national policy (NPPF 2012, para 17, & NPPF 2018, section 11) or local policy (strategic policy CS1(i) of the Core Strategy in relation to efficient use of land and buildings). Parts of Bracknell Town were built at a low density, whereas modern policy requires land to be used efficiently, therefore compliance with this Policy may not achieve sustainable development. Density is considered to be a crude measure in any case; grain of development is a better term. Therefore it is not considered that this Policy as worded is fully in accordance with Basic Conditions A, D and E. Although it is noted that under the policy a higher density may be achieved if it could be demonstrated that it would not harm the local character. Removal of reference to density would address these concerns. • Suggested amendments: “..of the buildings to the density, footprint, separation, scale and bulk of buildings in the particular Bracknell Town neighbourhoods...” |
| Policy EC1 Pg 14 of 40 | Basic Condition E Amendments required /clarification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the Council is generally supportive of the aims of the policy to support small businesses, it has some concerns over the elements of the wording of the policy. • There needs to be consistency between Policies EC1 and EC2. These policies could be merged. • It is not clear what the difference is between a ‘small’ and ‘micro’ business. These terms should be defined in a glossary. There is reference to the Core Strategy definition of small business on page 13 of 40, but it is not clear whether this definition applies to Policy EC1. During the lifetime of this Neighbourhood Plan, it is hoped that the ‘Bracknell Forest Local Plan’ will be adopted which will replace employment policies currently contained in the Core Strategy. The footnote on page 20 of 40 relates to micro business, but this itself refers to ‘small businesses’. Therefore relevant definitions and distinctions between terms should be set out in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. • Inclusion of a map to show areas where this policy relates is required. For example does this apply to the whole of Market Street? What part of the Eastern Road Employment area is referred to? When the ‘Site Allocations Local Plan’ was adopted in 2013, this removed the employment designation on land north of Eastern Road and it was allocated for residential development (formerly part of the Eastern Road Employment Area). If the Policy is intended to apply to land north of Eastern Road, this would be in conflict with Policy SA1 of the Site Allocations Local Plan, (and therefore not accord with Basic Condition E). |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear what development proposals the Policy relates to, redevelopment, or change of use? • The policy is not considered to be fully consistent with BFC's vision and policies for Bracknell Town Centre. It is also considered that this would conflict with Policy EC5, as Market Street is located within the defined Town Centre boundary. |
| Policy EC2 Pg 20 of 40 | Basic Condition A & E Amendments required/ clarification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be consistency between Policies EC1 and EC2. These policies could be merged. • It is not clear what the difference is between a 'small' and 'micro' business. These terms should be defined in a glossary. There is reference to the Core Strategy definition of small business on page 13 of 40, but it is not clear whether this definition applies to Policy EC1. During the lifetime of this Neighbourhood Plan, it is hoped that the 'Bracknell Forest Local Plan' will be adopted which will replace employment policies currently contained in the Core Strategy. The footnote on page 20 of 40 relates to micro business, but this itself refers to 'small businesses'. Therefore relevant definitions and distinctions between terms should be set out in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. • Policy refers to 'small' business, but small business is not referred to in the Policy text. • The policy is not specific in terms of where it applies. It is unclear if it only certain areas, or the whole of the neighbourhood area? If the latter, there could be a potential conflict with national policy (which seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes) if for example this resulted in the loss of residential units. As worded, the Policy could also result in conflict with other policies in the Plan (for example if a proposal for office space were within a community facility, which the Plan seeks to retain). Clarification is needed on the extent of which the policy applies and shown on a Policies Map to avoid being in breach of Basic Condition A (regard to national policy and guidance), and achievement of sustainable development (Basic Condition E), or additional clauses within the policy such as supported unless it involves the loss of residential units etc. |
| Policy EC5 Pg 35 of 40 | Basic Conditions A, D & E Amendments required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As worded the mix of uses referred to is very narrow. The Council would like to see mixed development in the Town Centre that extends beyond retail and residential, including for example leisure, health and employment uses etc. As worded this would not meet Basic Conditions A, D and E. It does not have regard to national policy (2012 NPPF Chapter 2, and 2018 NPPF Chapter 7: in relation to ensuring vitality of town centres); and does not conform with Strategic Local Policies (Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and Policy SA11 of the Site Allocations Local Plan), therefore would not achieve sustainable development. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|-----------------------------|------------|--|
| | | <p>Reference to a wider variety of uses such as 'main town centre uses' would address these concerns. A definition of 'main town centre' uses (in line with the NPPF) should be included in a glossary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how this Policy relates to Policy EC1 which refers to Market Street? |

Appendix 2 – BFC other suggested changes/detailed comments on the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|------------|---|
| Comments on the Submission version of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan | | |
| General comment - whole document | | Consistent page (and illustration) numbering is needed from the start of the document to the end; page numbers by section is not useable, particularly since when viewed electronically as a combined PDF page numbers run differently from 1 to 305 (not including the separate appendices). Consistent page numbering will aid legibility of the document, together with continuous numbering of maps and figures (to avoid two illustration 3s etc). |
| General comment - whole document | | The document requires paragraph numbering throughout to ensure relevant sections of the supporting text can be referred to precisely and consistently. This will aid legibility of the document, and useability in decision making. |
| General comment – whole document | | There are formatting variances throughout the document; some sections are in columns, some span the whole width of the page. In some instances it is unclear where the next paragraph is because there is a diagram in the middle of the page. For consistency, and to assist users of the Plan, this would be resolved by paragraph numbering as above. There are also a mix of fonts, font colours and font sizes used. Again, these should be consistent throughout the document to make it clear when text is being deliberately highlighted. |
| General comment – whole document | | Many of the illustrations contained in the Plan are illegible (blurred text and images). |
| General comment – whole document | | It is not clear how many of the illustrations and background information relate to the Policies which follow. Much of the information provided is not referred to in the supporting text, so its purpose and context are unclear. (Specific examples are set in relevant sections below). |
| General comment – whole document | | There is extensive background, viewpoints, quotes, history etc. in many sections of the Plan. This prevents the user being able to readily find the key information informing and justifying the policy, and interrupts the flow of the document. The historical information would be better placed into a supporting evidence document, since the Plan will be a planning document used in decision making. The supporting text should link to the policies, providing additional detailed information. |
| General comment – whole document | | Several of the web links provided do not work, either because the link is wrong or the content they linked to has been deleted/ moved. (Specific examples are set in relevant sections below). |
| General comment – whole document | | The Plan refers to “BFBC”, the Council is now Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) and should be referred to as such. It is only relevant to state BFBC when using the title of a document from that era. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|------------|---|
| General comment – whole document | | <p>There are several references in the document to BFC or other individuals/organisations having suggested an edit and then text follows. It is not necessary to specifically refer to an organisation or individual having suggested an edit, for example:</p> <p>Environment and Community Section: pages 42 & 49 Housing and Character: page 43 Economy and Employment: page 35 Transport and Infrastructure: page 10</p> <p>There are also references to certain dated emails or meetings, but it is unclear what these are as they are not provided. It is not considered necessary to refer to emails of specific dates (and therefore provide the emails) as sometimes it is a general point being made, for example: Heritage: page 7 Economy and Employment: page 35</p> <p>(The above are an example, not a list of every occurrence within the Plan).</p> |
| General comment – evidence | | <p>Some of the evidence relied upon is quite dated or no longer the most up-to-date information available. In several places the Plan references studies/ evidence that it is not 'local', but produced by other Local Authorities, e.g. Hillingdon's SuDS evidence, West Berkshire Core Strategy. All evidence should either be locally collected or commissioned by the Town Council (i.e. specifically relate to Bracknell Town), or utilise Bracknell Forest Council studies. The evidence base supporting the emerging Bracknell Forest Local Plan can be found here: https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/draft-bracknell-forest-local-plan/evidence-base (Specific examples are set in relevant sections below).</p> |
| Policies Map | | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| General comment – footnotes | | It would help the flow of the document if the sources of information were put in footnotes rather than being written out in full in the text, and the full reference (i.e. the Title of the book and publication information etc.) just provided in the reference list (Appendix 11). Those looking for the sources of such background information would then also know clearly where to look. |
| General comment – reference to specific individuals | | There are several points in the document where specific individuals are referred to. It is not necessary or appropriate to refer to individuals, organisations would be preferred. For example: |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|-------------|---|
| | | <p>Environment and Community: pages 20 and 39 Housing and Character: page 23 Employment and Economy: page 33</p> <p>(The above are an example, not a list of every occurrence within the Plan).</p> |
| General comment – NPPF | | <p>A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was issued on 24 July 2018 during the preparation of the Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged under the transitional arrangements (para. 214 of the 2018 NPPF) that this Plan will be examined against the previous 2012 NPPF (as it was submitted prior to 24 January 2018), references to the 2018 NPPF, and an assessment of general conformity with policies would help to ensure the longevity of the Plan over the plan period to 2036.</p> <p>There is not a consistent approach to the NPPF within the document, in some cases the 2012 version is referenced and others the 2018 version (for example page 29 of the environment and community section, and page 11 of the Heritage section refer to the 2018 version).</p> |
| General comment – section relating to actions | | <p>At the end of each Chapter there are lengthy action sections relating to points for a future review of the Plan. As these do not relate to Policies in the Plan, it is considered that they would be better placed in a combined separate chapter relating to future aspirations, as they detract from and interrupt the flow of the document. As these sections do not relate to proposed policies and supporting text, no specific comments are provided on the content of these sections.</p> |
| General comment – policies referencing to ‘all development’ | | <p>It is not always clear what proposals a Policy will apply to as there is no definition of types of development. For example it is not clear whether certain policies only apply to larger strategic scale proposals (otherwise they could be onerous if applied to residential extensions). (Specific examples set out below).</p> |
| General comment – policy intent | | <p>The policy intent does not always match the text contained within a policy (specific example set out below).</p> |
| Contents (Pg. 1 of 5 to 5 of 5) | Observation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contents should include page numbers for each policy to aid legibility. See comment above. • Extra (unnecessary text) appears to be included under chapter headings (such as under section 3 “olive green accent 3 lighter 40%) • Under ‘Heritage’ the word “Parks” appears as a heading but this is not a policy or a sub-section of this Chapter. • Under ‘Character’ there is a section of text starting “The building of Bracknell Town...” |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | <p>through to "... (CIL)" that appear as headings but are not a policy or sub-section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 'Economy and Employment' the words "Bracknell's Place in the South East of England" through to "...and Employment Sites" appear as headings but are not a policy or sub-section. • Under 'Transport and Infrastructure' the word "Transport Infrastructure" appears as a heading but this is not a policy or a key sub-section of this Chapter. |
| Introduction Pg. 2 of 12 | Amendment to text | After "...Regulations 2012.." add " <u>(as amended)</u> ." |
| Introduction Pg. 2 of 12 | Factual update required | An amendment to the Local Development Scheme is due to be considered at the 12 February 2019 Executive, which will cover the period 2019-2022. The most up to date version of the LDS should be referred to in the text. |
| Illustrations 2 & 3; Introduction Pg. 3 & 4 of 12 | Amendment required | Maps are illegible, and are not cross referenced within main text, so unclear on full intention of what the maps are intended to show (particularly in relation to Illustration 3), as maps do not relate to text which follows. |
| Introduction Pg. 10 of 12 | Amendment to text | Third bullet - Unclear how the Town Council intends to 'ensure' a strong economy. Fifth bullet - Suggest rewording "is provided to cope with <u>facilitate</u> growth" |
| Environment & Community Pg 1 of 82 | Amendment to text | Key Objective 6 (maintain and improve the quality of the environment for its residents) is also relevant to this section. |
| Environment & Community Pg 1 of 82 | Clarification | Reference to the 5ha per 1,000 population 'public park' figure from the West of Berkshire Spatial Planning Framework may be misleading. This relates to a high level infrastructure delivery plan, and covers aspects such as allotments, pitches, play areas etc. It would be preferable to refer to the standard currently set out in the BFC Development Plan (4.3ha per 1,000 population which includes both active and passive space). |
| Environment & Community Pg 1 of 82 | Consistency | There is reference to the definition of Green Infrastructure as contained in the 2012 NPPF. However, elsewhere in the document (pages 41 and 44 of Environment and Community section), different definitions are referred to. A consistent single definition is needed to avoid any ambiguity. This is where a glossary of terms would be beneficial. |
| Environment and | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended the Plan includes a glossary of terms – add definition of public realm and parks there instead. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| Community Pg. 3 of 82 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to 'Great Ayclifee Town Council' should be removed. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 4 of 82 | Suggested amendments Basic Conditions A, D & E | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 5-8 & 10-11 | Suggestion | Place information tables in a separate evidence base document, they are not cross referenced in the text, and source of data is not referred to. |
| Policy EV1 Pg 9 of 82 | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest merging this policy with EV2 since the wording is almost identical for both passive and active open space. |
| Policy EV2 Pg 12 of 82 | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest merging this policy with EV1 since the wording is almost identical for both passive and active open space. Policy not consistent with the approach taken in EV1 as there is no reference to 'This Policy excludes OSPV that is designated as Local Green Space in Policy EV3'. |
| Policy EV3 Pg 18 of 82 | Amendment to text and consistency Basic Conditions A and D | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Environment and Community Pg 23 of 82 | Observation | Web link on bottom of page does not work. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Policy EV4 Pg 24 of 82 | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the ambition of the policy to recognise the heritage value of existing avenues of trees. • The examples given are either on public land and/or protected by TPOs. • However, whilst regrettable, it is considered that the aim of the policy to create new avenues of trees is of an era and unlikely to be compatible with modern developments. Their longevity is also a future issue, owing to species being vulnerable to disease, taking a while to establish and issues surrounding ongoing maintenance, including if trees in the avenue need to be removed (i.e. due to death or decay). As noted in the supporting text, sometimes access to the highway verge is required for sewers etc., and they could impact on visibility splays. • ‘Avenues’ can only be a realistic proposition if there is sufficient space and control of that space to plant two rows of trees that by the very intent are to form a single landscape feature with the aim of focussing the view onto the horizon or another feature. • ‘Tree-lined corridors’ are a better proposition, but even they are subject to potential alteration and disruption if they are planted on Highway land or private roads in close proximity to services. • If there are specific routes within the Borough where tree lined corridors, avenues of trees etc are envisaged, these need to be identified on a Plan and cross referred to. • In the glossary and supporting text explain difference between ‘avenue of trees’ and ‘tree lined corridors’. • This Policy links to EV6, and could be merged. |
| Environment and Community Pg 24 of 82 | Amendment to text | <p>Note on definition of sites. The current definitions are incorrect, and were amended in the 2016/2017 monitoring year, and are now as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large sites are sites of 1 hectare or more. • Medium sites are sites of less than 1 hectare but with 5 (net) or more dwellings. • Small sites are sites of less than 1 hectare with under 5 (net) dwellings. <p>(See March 2018 Housing Commitments, published November 2018: https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/planning-commitments-for-housing.pdf)</p> <p>In addition, it is not clear why these definitions are included?</p> |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Environment and Community Pg. 26-27 | Information | <p>Move TPO content to an evidence base document. It is also important to note that because this was a snapshot from a live database, the data is now no longer up-to-date.</p> <p>Similar issue re. third para in EV5 page 25; Policy Justification.</p> |
| EV5, EV6 and EV7 | Merge policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan to protect and encourage planting of new trees. • However it is considered that these policies could all be merged into one succinct tree policy about tree protection and planting, since the policy intent and the implementation of these policies is very similar. • More detailed comments are provided against each policy number. • It would also be beneficial if the Policies were clear as to what development proposals they relate to. • For example would these be applicable to household extensions, or are they intended to relate to larger scale/strategic sites? |
| Policy EV5 Pg 25 | Information | <p>Unclear what the intent is of including reference to Bromley TPO'ing Network Rail trees? If trees are within Network Rail's 'operational land' then a TPO is not enforceable.</p> |
| Policy EV5 Pg 27 of 82 | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy uses different terms to define the spatial extent to which it applies. It is unclear what extent 'Bracknell New Town' covers (this should be shown on the Policies Map so the policy can be applied consistently and precisely). (Also see comments on Basic Conditions in relation to Policies Map). • The two policies combine 'character' and 'canopy cover' without defining either anywhere in the document (or giving existing examples or proposed methodology to measure performance). <p>The Policy could usefully include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Development proposals should include landscaping plans that enhance the landscape character of the area by providing sufficient open space in which newly planted trees have the ability to reach full maturity and their natural size. • Where new tree planting is provided, it should support the existing, naturalistic wooded landscape of Bracknell . |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Policy EV6 Pg 30 of 82 | Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an opportunity for this policy to be expanded to include reference to ‘veteran trees’ and ‘ancient woodland’, which would reflect the NPPF. Whilst this is not considered to be a basic condition matter, it would align the policy with national context. The NPPF sets out circumstances when applications involving the loss or deterioration of such habitats may be granted permission, but says such permission should not be granted “unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists” (para. 175(c) of the 2018 NPPF). • Suggest amending the first sentence to: “...or result in the loss of ancient trees or woodland trees of good arboricultural and amenity value”. • Suggest amending the next sentence to... ‘Proposals should be designed to retain ancient trees and or trees of arboricultural and amenity value’. • Suggest amending the last sentence to: “... arboricultural survey and methodology that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees identifies and demonstrates that the development will retain and not harm any important trees.” |
| Policy EV7 Pg 30 of 82 | Amendment to text | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on views are not planning policy considerations; there is no right to a view. It is also considered that seeking highly visible locations contradicts with the requirement that they do not have a detrimental impact on views. The element of the policy needs further consideration. • The policy could also look at potential highway impact, or the cumulative impacts on trees that development can have. • It would be helpful if the “gateways” referred to in the Policy were defined. |
| Environment and Community Pages 34-35 | Observation/ Consistency | Table on page 34 and text on page 35 (under Policy Intent) refer to 239 allotments, yet text on page 34 (under Policy Context) refers to 241 allotments. |
| Policy EV8 Pg 36 of 82 | Opportunity to expand scope/ Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the aspirations of this policy, however, consider this is also covered by Policy EV1 as allotments are a form of active open space. If increased provision is covered by policy EV1, links between the policies would benefit from being clearer. This policy could be merged with EV1 an EV2. • The last paragraph states “where there is sufficient existing provision contributions will be sought towards their improvement.” If there is sufficient existing provision, it is not lawful to seek contributions. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| Environment & Community Pg 39, 42, 46, 48, 50, of 82 | Observation | Web links do not work. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 41 of 82 | Observation | The text refers to 'Bracknell Forest Local Development Framework pack, September 2006'. This document is now 12 years old and information contained within it is likely to have been superseded; it should not be referred to. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 41 & 44 of 82 | Suggested amendment | A consistent single definition of Green Infrastructure is needed to avoid any ambiguity. This is where a glossary of terms would be beneficial. There is reference to the definition of Green Infrastructure as contained in the 2012 NPPF (page 1 of the Environment and Community Section). However, elsewhere in the document (pages 1, 41 and 44 of Environment and Community sections), different definitions are referred to, which draw on West Berkshire's Core Strategy. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 46 of 82 | Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'policy intent' section identifies several areas to target improved access to watercourses - it would add value to map these locations, since reference to enhance the character and the function of 'the watercourses' is vague. • 'Within the Policy Intent the text: 'To open the watercourses up further as recreation routes for walking and cycling. This policy applies to land where public access has been intermittent, both inside and outside the current settlement boundaries, especially to the west, for instance, westwards of Easthampstead Park Cemetery, in the Designated Neighbourhood Plan Area'. However the area 'Westwards from Easthampstead Park Cemetery' does not contain watercourses within the neighbourhood plan area; hence this policy intent is not clear. • Under Policy justification, it implies that BFC is the author of the River Basin Management Plan, which it is not. The correct reference is BFC Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2017-2020, which then references the RBMP. • The web link provided in the reference section does not work. |
| Policy EV10 | Opportunity to expand | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of the policy to enhance the character and function of watercourses and to improve public access to them is welcomed. It is considered to fit well with Green |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|---|--|
| Pg 46 of 82 | scope/ suggested amendments | <p>Infrastructure within the draft Bracknell Forest Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy focusses on access to watercourses and river corridors; it does not go on to address the important 'hidden rivers' theme identified within the Policy Context section. It would add value to extend the policy to support opportunities to open up culverts/ deculverting/ naturalising the watercourses where practical to do so, particularly given the extent of mapped culverts through the Neighbourhood Area. The policy could maximise opportunities to reinstate the lost Rivers. This would increase the availability of watercourses in the area available for recreation, as well as support improvements to water quality/biodiversity. It is recommended the policy makes specific reference to SUDS that improve water quality, which would support the watercourses and enhance the environment and align with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. |
| Policy EV11 Pg 51 of 82 | Suggested amendments Basic Condition A | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Environment and Community Pg 53-55 | Observation | The figures and maps on pages 53-55 do not appear to relate to the policies that follow. They are not cross referred in the supporting text, so it unclear what their context is. |
| Policy EV12 Pg 59 of 82 | Consistency | This policy conflicts with the ambitions of EV3; please see comments on EV3 for further information. |
| Environment and Community Pg. 62 of 82 | Factual amendment required | The supporting text on this page refers to the "two local authorities, (BFBC and BTC)". Bracknell Town Council is not a local authority. BFBC should also be amended to BFC. |
| Policy EV13 Pg 63 of 82 | Observation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council is supportive of improvements to community facilities. It is also unclear whether the policy for co-location of facilities applies to other uses being located within an existing community facility, or a community facility being located with other existing uses, or both. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A definition of what is meant by ‘community facilities’ would be useful. • There are a number of other terms defined in supporting text would could be usefully included in a glossary. |
| Policy EV14 Pg 66 of 82 | Observation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy refers to ‘protection of’ community facilities. However the policy does not include any criteria relating to when losses will be permitted (for example, loss would be replaced by better facilities, there is already adequate provision in the locality etc), it only seeks to support facilities which are retained. (If a proposal were submitted which resulted in the loss of a community facility, it would not be contrary to the policy as currently worded). • A definition of what is meant by ‘community facilities’ would be useful, so that the Policy can be applied in decision making. |
| Heritage Pg. 2 to 17 | Observation/ Suggested amendments/ Factual updates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section seems to focus primarily on parks and trees rather than heritage assets. It is therefore recommended that these policies are relocated to the section relating to trees/ landscape - the supporting text implies some degree of overlap. • Much of the supporting text for the heritage policies should be included in a supporting document, as this detracts from the policy intent and justification • Page 1 - There are references to the Great Acycliffe, Milton Keynes etc, unclear on relevance of areas outside the Borough, as they are not local. • Page 2 refers to National Parks commission, this would not apply to the open spaces/parks in the Bracknell Town neighbourhood area. • Page 3 and Policy HE1 – the “country park” at Jennetts Park is called “Peacock Meadows”. • Page 5 - For clarity, Easthampstead Park is no longer owned by BFC, and is now in private ownership. • There are many references to Easthampstead Park being within a draft version of the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), site ref BRA2 from 2016. The site was not included in the final SHELAA as it was confirmed it was not available for development, therefore it is misleading and confusing to keep referring to it in this context together with associated mapping etc. References to this old version of the SHELAA and BRA should therefore be removed. • Page 6 - There is reference to Mill Park and the Elms Park, but these are not referred to again in the policies and maps, so unclear whether the policies apply to these sites also, if not why are they referenced? • Page 6 - The policy context states that the historic parks and houses include Easthampstead |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>Park, Lily Hill Park and South Hill Park. However these are not the same as registered historic parks and gardens in the normal planning sense. The change in definition is therefore confusing to the user. For clarity, the only Registered Historic Park and Garden within the neighbourhood plan area relates to South Hill Park. Saved Policy EN12 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (2002) does not refer to Lily Hill Park and Easthampstead Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6 - It is unclear what is meant by 'parkland features' i.e. whether this is landscape features within existing parklands or parks within Bracknell Town. The text seems to suggest that the intention is to seek to protect existing parks given their significance in the evolution of the New Town. However, in policy HE1 – reference is made to 'parkland features'. • The three key sites listed in this section (South Hill Park, Lily Hill Park and Easthampstead Park) are covered by several policies (EV3 – local green spaces, and HE1-3.) As various 'protection' policies could apply, need to be clear how/if the policies are justified (particularly where there may be conflicts, such as how to this align with EV12 – promotion of arts uses as South Hill Park), and whether any conflicts can achieve the aims of sustainable development. |
| <p>Policy HE1 Pg 13 of 18</p> | <p>Suggested amendments Basic Condition A</p> | <p>See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions.</p> |
| <p>Policy HE2 Pg 18 of 18</p> | <p>Suggested amendments</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that HE2 and HE3 could be merged as they are very similar. These policies could apply to both designated and non-designated heritage assets, which should be acknowledged in the supporting text. • The Council is supportive of the objective of the policy, but reference needs to be made to the significance of the heritage asset and need to ensure that steps are taken to ensure that a development avoids harm to the heritage asset and where possible enhance the asset. • Since the second part of the policy may not be a comprehensive list, it is recommended that this is put into the supporting text to explain what this will mean in practice. Reference should be made to designated and non-designated heritage assets within the supporting text to include locally listed buildings (as in Appendix 15) having regard to the call for nominations to the BFC local list. • As with Policy HE1, the policy should take into account the tests and balance that must be considered when proposals affect heritage assets as set out in the NPPF. • Suggest amending the policy as follows: "Development proposals will be expected to: |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Have regard to the significance of the heritage asset and to demonstrate the impact of the development on the heritage asset; ii) Demonstrate how the proposal will avoid harm to the asset and where possible enhance the asset.” |
| Policy HE3 Pg 18 of 18 | Suggested amendment | It is suggested that HE2 and HE3 could be merged as they are very similar. These policies could apply to both designated and non-designated heritage assets, which should be acknowledged in the supporting text. Redrafting of HE2 can relate to all heritage assets whether designated or non-designated, and so will cover the content of HE3. Any specific buildings/ assets should be referred to in the supporting text. |
| Housing and Character Pg 1 of 50 | Suggested amendment | <p>Key Objective 6 (maintain and improve the quality of the environment for its residents) is also relevant to this section.</p> <p>There is reference to “functional city planning”. Current terminology is “walkable communities” if that is what is meant.</p> |
| Housing and Character Pg 1-14 of 50 | Suggested amendment/ Factual update | <p>A lot of the introductory background text could be placed in a supporting document. There is information about property prices, tenure etc which does not relate to the policies that follow. (This text was included in the Reg 14 version, together with two policies relating to ‘matching supply to demand’ and ‘housing mix’, which have subsequently been deleted from the Plan. This supporting text is now out of context).</p> <p>It also includes information which needs updating. For example, there are tables on page 3 referring to current allocations. Some of these sites have now been built out or are under construction. As with comments on the heritage section, there are also references to Easthampstead House and site BRA2 which is no longer included in the SHELAA.</p> |
| Housing and Character Pg 15 of 50 | Suggested amendment | A definition of ‘windfall site’ is provided, since this does not form part of the policy, it is unclear why this definition is included. It should also be noted that windfall sites can be greenfield sites as well as previously developed land (see NPPF for relevant definition which refers to: “They normally comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available”). |
| Policy HO1 | Suggested amendment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the Council acknowledges the intent of the policy, the policy requires clarity and is also considered to have overlap with policies HO8 and HO9. • Unclear what ‘protect the amenity’ means; this should be defined (for example avoid overlooking and overshadowing?). The Council’s Design SPD has back to back distances. • The second part of the policy effectively repeats the first; recommend it is removed, or does |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>this relate to larger scale developments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy could result in a conflict in terms of its application with reference to reflecting the form of neighbouring properties/similar form to development in the surrounding area. There may be some instances where it would not be desirable to replicate surrounding development, or where something not in keeping may not harm local character. Amendments to text to include reference to being ‘appropriate to the character of the area’ would address this point. • This policy would benefit from being merged with HO8 and HO9 to create a comprehensive local character and design policy. • Unclear if this policy is meant to link to the ward character profiles at the end of Section 6, and if so, how. |
| <p>Housing and Character</p> <p>Pg. 20-22 of 50</p> | <p>Observations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is reference to Barnet Design guidance and Hillingdon guidance. This is not relevant to Bracknell Town area. The Council has an adopted Design SPD which includes a section on front gardens, which could be referred to. • The text in the 5th paragraph could be clearer, unsure what ‘roads with more traffic than the cul-de-sac roads accessed off them’ means. • 7th para: Hardstanding and crossovers are mainly covered by permitted development. |
| <p>Policy HO3</p> <p>Pg 22 of 50</p> | <p>Suggested amendments/ opportunity to amend scope</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the intentions of this policy. • It is unclear why C is only ‘where possible’. Permeable surfacing is covered by permitted development. • There could be a conflict within this Policy between criteria A and D. Provision of additional parking, and changes to frontage boundary treatment could by default affect the character of the street scene. |
| <p>Policy HO4</p> <p>Pg 24 of 50</p> | <p>Basic Condition A</p> <p>Suggested Amendments</p> <p>Information/ observation</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Policy HO5 Pg 26 of 50 | Clarification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council generally supports this policy. • Not clear what development proposals this would apply to. |
| Policy HO6 Pg 30 of 50 | Information/ remove policy | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Policy HO7 Pg 33 of 50 | Observation/ suggested amendment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is not specific and therefore will be hard to enforce. • Use of the term 'encourage' may reduce the effectiveness of the policy. • It is unclear what the term 'recycling facilities' refers to - waste, water, energy etc. A glossary would be useful in this instance. • It is not clear if the policy is seeking a proportion of energy needs to be met through decentralised renewable/low carbon energy generation. • Part G of the Building Regulations covers water consumption. All new homes already have to meet the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations (of 125 litres/person/day). For residential development the Council cannot insist on rainwater harvesting if the consumption can be demonstrated to be less than the mandatory standard of 125l/pp/d. Where there is a development plan policy the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day can be required. • The supporting text makes reference to the Government's zero carbon building policy which the government has decided not to proceed with. • Wind cowls should only be used in locations where it is appropriate to the character of an area. In some locations they may be visually intrusive. |
| Housing and Character Pg 48 of 50 | Observation | There appears to be some text missing from the bold heading near the bottom of the page. |
| Policy HO8 Pg 50 of 50 | Suggested amendments Basic Conditions A, D & E | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Policy HO9 Pg 50 of 50 | Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council considers this policy should be merged with Policy HO8, since they cover the same topic. Also this does in part duplicate Policy HO1 (infill and backland development). • The Council is generally supportive of this. • Internal inconsistency within Policy. It refers to the need for proposal to demonstrate distinctive design, but also respect the form of immediate surroundings. Also something could be distinctive because it is poorly designed, or stands out in a negative way. The term “high quality landmark” or “high quality gateway design” should be used. |
| Chapter 6 Character of Bracknell Town Neighbourhoods | Amendments required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst it is understood that this section provides an audit (descriptions and photos) of existing development in Bracknell Town, it is unclear as to the exact purpose of this. Is this section intended to provide additional information over and above the Character Area Assessments SPD, or form the basis of a future update? • Is the intention of this section that development proposals in these ‘neighbourhoods’ should mirror the descriptions for any given road? If so, has consideration been given as to the types of developments/elements within neighbourhoods the Plan would support in these areas (in the context of the aspirations of the Plan which seeks to address issues in Bracknell Town. • The link to policies in the Plan is also unclear. The connection between this section and any policies needs to be clear and unambiguous. It also needs to be made clear how this section is to be used when determining planning applications (if that is the intention)? i.e. how does this section relate to Policies HO1, HO3, HO4, HO8 & HO9, as there is not any obvious cross-referencing. |
| Economy and Employment Pages 1-14 | Information/ suggested amendment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance of much of the introductory text is unclear, such as references to cross-rail as this does not relate to the policies that follow. • Page 4: The most up to date on Gross Value Added (GVA) as discussed in the Plan on page 4, and more up-to-date economic information for Bracknell Forest should be used. • Page 9: there are references to ‘Bracknell’ – it is unclear whether this is reference to the Bracknell Forest Borough or Bracknell Town neighbourhood area. • Page 10: An out of date map is provided (illustration 10), and link to an updated version of a map is provided. An up to date map should be included. |
| Policy EC1 Pg 14 of 40 | Amendments Basic Condition E | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Economy and Employment Pages 15-19 | Suggested amendment | It is not clear on the relevance of employment commitment data preceding Policy EC2 as not clearly explained why this is included. Inclusion of data is a snap shot in time, as it is updated on an annual basis, so should not be in the Plan itself, and would better sit in a supporting document. |
| Policy EC2 Pg 20 of 40 | Amendments required/ clarification Basic Condition A & E | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Employment and Economy Pg 23 of 40 | Factual update | The local shop within the Jennetts Park development is now open. |
| Policy EC3 Pg 25 of 40 | Suggested amendments/ observations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the aims of the policy to ensure the continued vitality of neighbourhood shopping centres, however there are elements of the policy that are unclear and require redrafting. • The Policy does not reflect the policy intent. The policy intent refers to the NPPF which relates to new development, not existing (para. 38 of the 2012 NPPF). Therefore, it is unclear if this policy is only applicable to just original 'New Town' shopping areas, or new centres which have since been built (such as Jennetts Park), or whether this Policy would apply to future allocations also. The policy should be clear on this point, and if relating to all existing neighbourhoods (including those not relating to the original New Town development), this should be shown on the Policies Map so it is clear which area the policy applies to. • Whilst the policy sets out what proposals will be "strongly supported", this does not give a clear steer on what development would be considered acceptable in order that it can be used effectively in determining planning applications. • The Policy, by not being criteria based, is silent on what the position would be on loss of facilities and in what circumstances this would be acceptable (similar points made on EV14). • The policy background should provide definitions for policy wording (such as day-to day requirements, for example does this include community facilities (or this covered by Policy EV14) and be specific in terms of what development would be considered acceptable and what would not be. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|---|--|
| Policy EC4 Pg 29 of 40 | Clarification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear what is meant by 'life long learning'. This term should be defined in a glossary. A map is needed to define the site which the Policy refers to. |
| Economy and Employment Pg 30 of 40 | Amendment | The map at the start of the section is out of context, and should be cross-referenced in the text, and would be better placed with the relevant Policy. |
| Economy and Employment Pg. 34 of 40 | Information/ Clarification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan refers to SHELAA site BRA7; this is a proposed allocation in Policy LP3 of the draft Bracknell Forest Local Plan. Unclear why there is reference to other new towns around Bracknell. The Policy intent should be locally specific. |
| Policy EC5 Pg 35 of 40 | Amendments required Basic Conditions A, D & E | See comments contained in Appendix 1 of this response as relates to Basic Conditions. |
| Transport and Infrastructure Pages 1-10 | Clarification/ Amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is reference to highway matters both pre- and post- town centre redevelopment, which is confusing. There are references to other new town locations – unclear why they are being referred to. Any evidence and examples should be locally specific. |
| Policy TR1 Pg 11 of 39 | Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific routes referred to in the Policy should be clearly identified on a Plan to avoid ambiguity over the extent and location that are being referred to (illustration 6 on page 7 is not clear). If this policy allocates specific routes these should be shown on the policies map; if it does not and provides general support, consider merging with Policy TC2. |
| Policy TR2 Pg 11 of 39 | Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider merging with TR1. Unclear what is meant by 'development proposals' as this could apply to small scale developments. |
| Policy TR3 Pg 11 of 39 | Suggested amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy intent on page 10 refers to the 'station' needing more cycle racks. Unclear if this refers to the bus or train station or both, as the Policy only refers to the bus station. A plan showing where the Policy applies to should be provided to avoid any ambiguity. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Transport & Infrastructure Pg. 18 of 39 | Observation | The text refers to inserting a land registry map; this is not available in the Plan. |
| Policy TR4 Pg 18 of 39 | Suggested amendments/ consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is supportive of the policy and replacing garages with parking spaces or parking courts. • The policy intent is not reflected in the Policy text. The intent refers to efficient use of land (and elsewhere in the supporting text such as flats over garages on page 14, and the text box on page 15 refers to building housing on parts of larger garage block areas). However, the Policy only refers to replacement of garages with other spaces/parking courts, not other uses. |
| Policy TR5 Pg 20 of 39 | Information | The provision of drop-off and pick-up areas in schools must achieve a balance of providing for car trips whilst not encouraging them. The management of school drop-off and pick-up areas can only be achieved with the cooperation of the school. Equal consideration should be given to the promotion of sustainable transport modes and supporting and implementing School Travel Plans. |
| Policy TR6 Pg 23 of 39 | Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regeneration of the town centre and associated developer contributions has enabled the Council to support additional evening and Sunday services. Operators have also extended commercial services - up to midnight on some services. • Further developments need to be of a significant size if they are to justify and fund new bus services. • The ambitions of this policy are covered by CIL. |
| Policy TR7 Pg 25 of 39 | Information | The Council supports the intent to provide increased provision of public toilets. The Council has received requests to extend the opening hours of the toilets at the bus station later into the evening now The Lexicon is open, but this requires additional funding and can attract anti-social behaviour. |
| Transport and Infrastructure Pg 26 of 39 | Amendment | The map at the start of the section is out of context, and should be cross-referenced in the text, and would be better placed with the relevant Policy. |
| Policy TR8 | Information/ Suggested Amendments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy intent refers to traffic impacts upon roads, residential amenity, particularly safety, noise and air quality. This is not reflected in the Policy. • The scope of this policy has overlap with EV11 Air Quality. Consider merging these policies. • Unclear why there is only reference to the A322 and A329 and not all roads (unless this is linked the AQMAs?) • It is not clear what development proposal this would apply to. |

| Policy/ Section Page No. | Suggestion | Comment |
|--|------------|---|
| Section on Monitoring & Implementation | | <p>The Council will be required to monitor the effectiveness of Policies contained in the Plan (if it is made), through its Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>As currently drafted there are no indicators as to what should be monitored in terms of each Policy within the Plan.</p> <p>There is no objection to a separate section on monitoring (rather than integrated with each Policy), but as worded it is unclear what information in relation to planning applications is needed, this needs to be specific for relevant policies.</p> <p>For example, in relation to Policy EV14 (protection of community facilities), monitoring could relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net losses/gains of community facilities and services. • Amount of floorspace in community use lost each year. |
| Appendices – general comment | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendices should be limited to essential additional information linked to policies, i.e. the Policies Map, Local Green Spaces maps A-K, Maps of Bracknell Town (Appendix 3), a Glossary of terms, reference list. • Background information and evidence should be in a separate evidence base document, e.g. justification for Local Green Spaces (Appendix 2), history of Bracknell, newspaper articles, etc. Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made a decision maker would need to look at maps containing key information that would inform their decision, but not the justification underpinning designations or background history of the area. |

Appendix 3 – List of BFC Strategic Planning Policies

Strategic Policies of the Bracknell Forest Development Plan for Neighbourhood Planning purposes

Background context

Paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that: “Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area...”

Paragraph 156 of the NPPF sets out certain strategic policies should be included in *Local Plans* to deliver development. These therefore form the basis for considering what the ‘strategic policies’ are, which includes policies, which among others, deal with development such as the homes and jobs needed in the area, commercial development, waste management, infrastructure for transport.

Basic conditions

Only a draft Neighbourhood Plan that meets each of the set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The basic conditions for *Neighbourhood Development Plans* are:

- having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
- the making of the plan contributes to sustainable development;
- the making of the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area);
- the making of the plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations;
- prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or neighbourhood plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).

National planning policies are contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which can be found here:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

National planning policies for traveller sites are contained in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) which should be read in conjunction with the NPPF, and can be found here:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6078/2113371.pdf

National planning guidance is contained in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which can be found here: <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/>

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (Reference ID: 41-074-20140306) advises that the basic condition relating to ‘general conformity’ with strategic policies contained in the Development Plan should consider the following:

- whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with;

- the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy;
- whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy;
- the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach.

The Development Plan in Bracknell Forest

In Bracknell Forest a number of policy documents are used to guide the location and other aspects of future development. The policies in these documents are important in deciding planning applications. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that decisions are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Regional Policy

The South East Plan was partially revoked on 25th March 2013. Policy NRM6 that deals with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area remains in place.

Local Policy

This comprises the following plans:

- **Core Strategy (adopted February 2008)** - A high level document containing the Council's long-term aspirations for the Borough, and policies to guide and manage development in Bracknell Forest until 2026.
- **Site Allocations Local Plan (adopted July 2013)** - Helps implement the adopted Core Strategy. It identifies sites for future housing development, ensures that appropriate infrastructure is identified and delivered alongside new development and also revises some designations on the Policies Map.
- **Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (adopted January 2002)** - Although some of these policies have been dropped, many were 'saved' by the Secretary of State beyond 27 September 2007 and remain in effect. Some have been subsequently replaced by new policies in the adopted Core Strategy and adopted Site Allocations Local Plan.
- **Bracknell Forest Borough Policies Map (adopted July 2013)** - Shows designations relating to 'saved' policies in the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan, Core Strategy designations, and sites proposed for development in the Site Allocations Local Plan.
- **Replacement Minerals Local Plan (adopted May 2001)** - The Plan was intended to ensure that minerals were extracted at the right pace throughout the period to the end of 2006, and that there are enough planning permissions for mineral extraction at the end of that period for a further seven years of extraction (to the end of 2013). The Plan also contains a number of Development Management policies.
- **Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (adopted December 1998)** - This covered the period to 2006. Its policies control different types of waste management development and ensure that waste development is in the least environmentally sensitive locations. They also secure waste minimisation and recycling in new development.

Further information on the Development Plan is available at: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/developmentplan>

The Strategic Policies of the Development Plan for Bracknell Forest (for Neighbourhood Planning purposes)

South East Plan

Policy

| | |
|--------------|---|
| 'Saved' NRM6 | Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area |
|--------------|---|

Core Strategy

Policy

| | |
|------|--|
| CS1 | Sustainable Development Principles |
| CS2 | Locational Principles |
| CS3 | Bracknell Town Centre |
| CS4 | Land at Amen Corner (Parish of Binfield) |
| CS5 | Land north of Whitegrove and Quelm Park (Parish of Warfield) |
| CS6 | Limiting the Impacts of Development |
| CS8 | Recreation and Leisure |
| CS9 | Development on land Outside Settlements |
| CS13 | Sustainable Waste Management |
| CS14 | Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area |
| CS15 | Overall Housing Provision |
| CS16 | Housing Needs of the Community |
| CS17 | Affordable Housing |
| CS19 | Location of Employment Development |
| CS21 | Retail Development in Town Centres |
| CS23 | Transport |

Site Allocations Local Plan

Policy

| | |
|------|---|
| CP1 | Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development |
| SA1 | Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements |
| SA2 | Other Land within Defined Settlements |
| SA3 | Edge of Settlement Sites |
| SA4 | Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne |
| SA5 | Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne |
| SA6 | Land at Amen Corner (North), Binfield |
| SA7 | Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield |
| SA8 | Land at Amen Corner (South), Binfield |
| SA9 | Land at Warfield |
| SA10 | Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst |
| SA11 | Bracknell Town Centre |
| SA12 | The Peel Centre |
| SA13 | Policies Map Changes |

Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan

'Saved' Policy

| | |
|----------------|--|
| EN3 | Nature conservation |
| EN4 | Local Nature Reserves, Wildlife Heritage Sites and Regionally Important Geological Sites |
| EN6 | Ancient monuments and archaeological remains of national importance |
| EN10 | Areas of landscape importance |
| EN12 | Historic parks and gardens |
| E5 | Hierarchy of shopping centres |
| H11 | Retention of housing stock |
| M2 | Safeguard road line – Extension of the northern distributor road |
| M3 | Protected road lines – Sandhurst – Crowthorne by pass |
| R4 | Provision of open space of public value |
| SC3 | No reduction in existing community facilities |
| Proposal PE1i | Land in the northern sector of Bracknell Town Centre |
| Proposal PE1ii | Land at the south of Bracknell Town Centre |
| Proposal PH1.1 | The Staff College, Bracknell |
| Proposal PH1.2 | New housing development proposal at Peacock Farm, west of Bracknell Town |
| Proposal PM1.1 | Road junction and highway works |
| Proposal PM1.3 | Land protected for dualling |
| Proposal PM5 | Service road schemes |
| Proposal PR10 | Blackwater Valley |

Replacement Minerals Local Plan (adopted May 2001) and Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (adopted December 1998). By law Neighbourhood Development Plans cannot deal with minerals or waste issues.

It should also be noted that Green Belt boundaries are a strategic issue; Green Belt boundaries cannot be amended by a Neighbourhood Plan. Regard must be had to national planning policy - see chapter 9 'Protecting Green Belt land' of the National Planning Policy Framework for further policy information:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf#page=25

Other matters

A Neighbourhood Plan cannot require a Local Authority to make designations or exercise particular powers. Such examples include: serving a compulsory purchase order (CPO), listing an asset of community value, designating or extending a conservation area, putting a building on the local list, serving a tree preservation order (TPO).

Neighbourhood planning has its own set of Regulations which set out the legal matters relating to the neighbourhood planning process. These are 'The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015' and can be viewed here: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/pdfs/uksi_20120637_en.pdf and http://offlinehbpl.hbpl.co.uk/NewsAttachments/RLP/uksi_20150020_en1.pdf

There are separate Neighbourhood Planning Regulations regarding the referendum.