

APPENDIX D

Regulation 18(4)(b) - Statement				
Reference	Name	Organisation	Comment Summary	Action
1	Rachael Bust	Coal Authority	No comment	
2	Ian Dunsford	GOSE	Document found to be informative, useful guidance to inform the quality of the public realm and streetscene in the Borough.	Noted
			Further work is required on the section on PPG13	Section on PPG13 has been inserted
			References to the South East Plan needs to be re-assessed	Done
3	Adele Swadling	Crowthorne Parish Council	Request that local Councillors and Parish and Town Councillors be included in pre-application discussions	Pre-application discussions are private. Many pre-applications do not result in an application actually being submitted.
			No differing requirements are specified for the Parish areas and that of Bracknell town	Section 3 discusses at length the issues of context and character and reference is made throughout the document about how to integrate new development with existing. This, alongside the Character Area Assessments SPD, is considered sufficient
			Should commercial and retail areas not be included in the scope of the document	Most new streets are created when housing development comes forward, hence this is the primary focus of the document. However amendments have been made throughout the document to make reference to the recent publication of 'Manual for Streets 2 - A Wider Application of the Principles' which does discuss how the accepted principles for designing residential streets can be applied where appropriate to other types of roads and locations.

			A glossary of abbreviations should be included	This is not considered necessary as abbreviations are explained in full when first mentioned.
			There should be reference to the Crowthorne Village Design Statement within the document	Reference is made within the Streetscene SPD to the Character Area Assessments SPD which raises many of the issues contained within the Village Design Statement
4	John Woodhouse	Environment Agency	Insufficient information is provided within the document on SUDS. Further information on the type of SUDS acceptable within the streetscene should be discussed	Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuSDs) is discussed within both documents. However, it is recognised that further information is required on this issue. The Council is currently awaiting national guidance
			Additional materials should be added to the list of surfaces such as pervious pavements, swales, filter drains, bio-retention devices etc..	
			The Highways Design Guide should also include additional materials, as suggested for the Streetscene SPD	This document has been amended
			<u>Sustainability Appraisal- SA2 and SA4</u> (page 3) are listed as the same objective.	This has been noted and amended as such.
			<u>Sustainability Appraisal- Tables 4, 14, 17 and 24.</u> Applying reference to SUDs could provide a more positive outcome.	The final SPD now incorporates a section on SUDs under section 11- Highway Drainage. Although this is considered to have a positive effect upon SA objectives SA2 (Flood Risk) and SA12 (Climate Change) the scores are to remain the same as national SUDS guidance is still to be published by DEFRA. Therefore further work in this area will need to take place and the final SPD acknowledges this.
			<u>Sustainability Appraisal Table 17 SA2</u> <u>Likelihood is uncertain-</u> The risk of flooding is likely to increase without reference to permeable surfaces. Therefore the likelihood of the effects should be changed to 'likely'.	This is correct and the appraisal will be amended as such. This change does not result in any significant implications.

			<u>Sustainability Appraisal Table 17 SA2 Spatial Scale-</u> The spatial scale should be referred to as Borough Wide rather than Local.	This is correct and the appraisal will be amended as such. This change does not result in any significant implications.
			<u>Sustainability Appraisal Table 17 SA2 Temporary/Permanent-</u> The effects would be permanent and not temporary.	This is correct and the appraisal will be amended as such. This change does not result in any significant implications.
			<u>Sustainability Appraisal-</u> The document concludes that the effects be it negative and/or positive, will depend on how the implementation of development occurs. Shouldn't any mitigation requirements be raised at the beginning.	This point is noted. However only a few minor negative scores have been awarded, all of which have been considered to be justifiable. Due to the inclusion of SUDs in section 11 (Highways Drainage) of the SPD, there is now no mitigation required.
5	Jacque Lovell	Chavey Down Residents Association	Overall, the document was considered constructive and was welcomed	Noted
			Successful communities are created by providing a mixture of housing for all ages, with adequate gardens, streetscenes with mature trees, trees and important views and identity	This is felt to be promoted adequately in the SPD within the scope of the document
			Further labelling of photos needed	Document amended
			Aditonal good examples of streetscenes in new development can be found in Lincolnshire	The developments quoted were considered. However, the document deliberately focusses on examples within Bracknell Forest where we are aware of history and context.
			Concern that developers will provide what they want, regardless of this document	The SPD and Highways Design Guide have been produced to set out a framework for developers to work within, in line with Bracknell Forest Council policy
			Reference should be made to pedestrian sightlines on footpaths	Reference is made in Appendix C in the Streetscene SPD to pedestrian visibility splays and discussed in the Highways Design Guide at paragraph XX

			Footpaths should be provided to all new housing	This is considered to be dependant on the proposed design of the street which is informed by the projected volume of vehicle movements. In some circumstances, in a small residential street or a mews or courtyard style street, shared streets are considered appropriate when designed correctly
			Signs and foliage should not conflict	A sentence has been inserted at paragraph 8.6 to cover this issue
			Drainage important to offset flooding	Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) is discussed within both documents. However, it is recognised that further information is required on this issue. The Council is currently awaiting national guidance (expected this year) when additions to this document can be made
			23 detailed specific comments relating to identified paragraphs and photographs	Assessed and amended where appropriate
6	Mrs E Morgan	Resident	All mobile phone and other communication networks should use underground links/cables to remove the need for microwave links and satellite dishes within the streetscene	Noted. This has been discussed with our highways team who are keen to encourage developers to follow this route.
7	Richard Hesketh	RPS - for L&G	General support for the consultation documents. However, the relationship between the Streetscene SPD and the Highway Design Guide appears confused and there is duplication. This relates to some of the guidance, acceptable materials and when commuted sums maybe required. It is therefore suggested that the scope of the documents is revisited and that the overlap is reduced	A further assessment of how the two documents sit together has been made. Any areas of confusion have been amended. However, the nature of the documents is such that there will always be some overlap as interlinking issues are discussed within both documents. What is important is that both documents are saying the same thing.
8	Janis Harding	Warfield Parish Council	Reference to the South East Plan should be deleted and the paragraph on PPG13 should be completed	Noted and amended

9	Anon		The highway should not be blocked by parked cars and alterations to parking arrangements should be done in consultation with residents.	Both documents are promoting that car parking is designed to be an integral part of the streetscene. It is Council policy to consult with residents should proposals come forward for change
			2m service strips should not be used for parking and planting should not obstruct vision	This is discussed within chapter 6, see 6.13
			residential streets should be limited to 20mph	This is stated within chapter 5, see 5.5
			Footpath/cycleways should not allow access for four wheeled vehicles as this may lead to the need for barriers which may be difficult for wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs to pass	This is discussed within chapter 5, see 5.13
			dropped kerbs should not be located where they facilitate cars parking on the pavements	This is a difficult balance with accessibility. However, the document is trying to promote the design of suitable parking to stop inconsiderate and inappropriate parking within the highway.
			Where cars park obstructing footpaths action should be taken by the Police or Council	The police have powers to take action against this.
			Where garages are not used for parking and the streets are congested with parked cars the Council should consider some form of penalty	Non use of garages is discussed in this document and alternative parking solutions are suggested for new development.
			Trees assist the streetscene but should not obstruct vision	This is discussed in chapter 5 within the visibility section
			Putting a tree in a 2m planting strip does not allow enough space for growth	Appropriate space for planting is discussed within chapter 8
			Wheelie bins should not be left within the streetscene	The design criteria discussed in chapter 9 is to encourage the removal of wheelie bins within the streetscene. Where this is an ongoing problem, the Environment, Culture and Communities department do follow this up with residents
			House numbers should be clearly signed on the roads within developments	Noted