

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Respondent	Comment
Binfield Protection Society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Support the modest change to the settlement boundary 2) Look forward to the full review of the area under the Local Development Framework
Bracknell and Wokingham College	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Borough Council should not abandon the concept of a major centre for the College at Amen Corner
Strategic Rail Authority	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The SRA would not object to this recommendation as it would presumably remove the prospect of a rail station at Amen Corner in the immediate future. Options 2 & 3 would allow time for the SRA's requirements to be examined further by developers, the Council and the rail industry.
Wokingham District Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Welcomes the new settlement boundary in the proposed location and accords with representations made on the local plan 2) Welcome the resolution to look at unauthorised development in the area particularly with regard to structures which are visible from vantage points such as the A329M 3) It remains a concern to WDC that the Council has an aspiration for promoting a significant level of development at Amen Corner. Some development may be appropriate subject to caveats we have identified previously.
King Sturge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preferred approach to continue with the Framework and Local Plan Proposal 2) Little to be gained by deferring major development to the Local Development Framework 3) Believe that that it would be perfectly reasonable to reach a different conclusion on the issue of conformity (discussed in detail at meeting with King Sturge) 4) If you wish to promote option 2 then it is suggested that the urban boundary be amended to include the existing employment area at Buckhurst Moors, this would enable improvements to this area which could be promoted through planning applications.
Local resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Residents in North View and South View have been looking for a proper solution in this area and moving a settlement boundary will not help achieve this. 2) The issue of conformity with the Structure Plan should have been picked up earlier 3) Would welcome a timetable for dealing with the enforcement related issues at Buckhurst Moors
Nike Group of Companies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The present recommendation is disappointing in that it reflects a retrenchment to a position before the modifications were proposed to the local plan

APPENDIX 2

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) An option to place a settlement boundary running north to south across the site is included with the submission (including part of Buckhurst Moors, the area to Rose Farm and the Garden Centre Site to the North) 3) Although this above proposal is not to the liking of all developers, it would keep the developers and landowners on side, and allow a first phase of a more comprehensive development
Binfield Parish Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The needs of the area are not addressed by any of the three options offered 2) The Committee is concerned that the plan promoted was not in line with the Berkshire Structure Plan and other strategic planning organisations 3) Committee is dissatisfied with the waste of time and money 4) The Committee is unhappy that it is now unlikely that the development will be able to access major developers for the area and therefore the benefits which could have been gained in terms of improved infrastructure
J.C. Associates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposal to include North View and South View in the settlement area in general terms is welcomed 2) Regrettable that the opportunity for a comprehensive development cannot proceed at the present time 3) Whilst understanding the Structure Plan and National Planning Policies in relation to the south east, this site bounded by the motorway can fulfil an important role for new housing, leisure and a limited amount of B1. 4) Development of this site would take pressure of other sites which genuinely have a greenbelt function
Resident –South View	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The failure of the last consultation draft is disappointing 2) The boundary change will not bring certainty as there is no accompanying policy for development within the extended settlement boundary 3) Effects of the enforcement action and further ideas for an indoor tennis court will have an impact on how residents see their future at Amen Corner 4) The boundary change should go ahead if and only if it includes safeguards for local residents at least as strong as those contained in the December 2003 Consultation draft
Highways Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The HA's comments on the previous Planning Framework would equally apply to the altered proposals. The reduced footprint would lessen on site traffic impacts, but without the additional rail station the potential for modal shift is lower than originally anticipated. 2) Rather than leaving the detailed considerations on transportation assessments prepared at the planning stage, any framework for Amen Corner should be

	informed by a transportation model of the locality
Joint Strategic Planning Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) For the purposes of Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the 'development plan' is the Berkshire Structure Plan 1991-2006 Adopted 1997. However, given the advanced stage of the replacement Berkshire Structure Plan 2001-2016, this should also be a key factor in considering the contents of the amendment to the Local Plan. 2) In terms of both plans, the approach to settlement boundary definition is the same. Both the adopted plan and the emerging plan state (in paragraph 5.11 and within the body of Policy DP1 respectively) that settlement boundaries, including any extensions on the edge of settlements where necessary to meet the provisions of the structure plan, are for local plans to define. Thus, the Local Plan Alteration will conform to both versions of the Structure Plan as long as the boundaries meet the provisions of the Structure Plan. 3) The purpose for drawing the settlement boundary proposed in the Local Plan Alteration is to fill a policy void within the current Local Plan, as regards the extent of the settlement. The definition of a settlement boundary is a key component of implementing key structure plan policies such as C2 in the adopted plan (which strictly controls development outside settlement boundaries) and DP1 in the emerging plan (which directs development to settlements). Therefore, the Local Plan Alteration seeks to meet the provisions of the Structure Plan, and, as a result, is in conformity with both the adopted Berkshire Structure Plan 1991-2006 and the emerging Berkshire Structure Plan 2001-2016."