Appendix 2
LTP3 Statement of Consultation

Appendix 2: Statement of Consultation

1. Background

1.1 There have been several stages of LTP3 consultations carried out in the preparation of the LTP3 Core Strategy:

Stage: 1.   Public consultation to establish the draft Local Objectives (Autumn 2009).
2.   Departmental leader consultation to establish Challenges and Measures (Spring/Summer 2010).
3.   Public consultation on the LTP3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft (Winter 2010/11).

1.2 A series of e-newsletters were also produced to inform interested parties on the progress throughout LTP3s production.

1.3 Details of all previous consultations on LTP3 are available online at: www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ltp3library, found in the Background Paper:

2. *Establishing Draft Objectives* (TL10) – consultation stage 1.
4. *Challenges and Measures* (TL12) – consultation – stage 2.

1.5 Bracknell Forest Council produced the LTP3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft for the third stage of consultation. It was published for public consultation from 9 November 2010 to 17 January 2011. This statement summarises how the consultation was conducted, who was consulted and how any issues raised have been addressed.

2. Consultation

2.1 In the preparation of LTP3, Bracknell Forest Council has comprehensively consulted with a range of stakeholders and statutory organisations to help assess the scope of the plan. Over 570 stakeholders were consulted, including:

•   Local groups
•   Businesses
•   Town and parish councils
•   Neighbouring authorities
•   Statutory bodies and organisations
•   Service providers
•   The general public.

2.2 In advance of the consultation, notification was placed on the LTP3 website alongside an e-newsletter, informing people how they could get involved. Hard copies of the LTP3 suite of documents were placed in all nine of the Council's libraries, six Town and Parish Council Offices, Time Square and Easthampstead House. Each venue received 1 copy of each of the following documents and a sample response form.

- LTP3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft
- Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment – Report and Appendices
- Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Background Paper 1: Context
- Background Paper 2: Establishing Local Objectives
- Background Paper 3: Bracknell Forest's Issues and Challenges
- Background Paper 4: Challenges and Measures
- Background Paper 5: Working In Partnership

2.3 A consultation letter, with a response form, was sent out to all LTP3 stakeholders, detailing how to access the LTP3 documents and respond to the consultation.

2.4 The consultation resulted in 27 responses from various sectors, including business, local and regional government, statutory bodies, local organisations, residents and internal officers, covering a broad range of issues.

2.5 Details of who were consulted on the LTP3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft and how, can be viewed in the LTP3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft Proforma (TL17) - available through the LTP3 Library link above.

2.6 Details of the responses received and how they have been taken account of in the LTP3 Core Strategy are detailed in Annex 1 of this statement.

Annex 1: **Local Transport Plan 3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft (Winter 2010/11)**
- Consultation representations and responses

Local Transport Plan 3 Core Strategy Consultation Draft was the subject of a public consultation in December and January 2010/11. This paper details feedback from the consultation process and highlights amendments that have been made to the document in light of comments received.

Consultee	Section	Comment	Officer Response
1. GOSE	*Core Strategy (CS) - General*	1.1 Consider a document/chapter summary at the beginning. 1.2 Improve link to the LDF Core Strategy (CS) and Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS).	1.1 Due to the conciseness of the LTP3 Core Strategy it is not considered necessary to insert a summary at the beginning of each section. A contents page will however be added. 1.2 Link to wider policy (LDF Core Strategy, Sustainable Communities Strategy) will be inserted under Section 8.3.
	CS - 8.0	1.3 Make clear how other policies, i.e. CS and SCS, are supported by LTP's policies/strategies. 1.4 Add the DfT Business Plan in policy context - will add more weight to the bidding process.	1.3 A supporting policy matrices will be inserted within Background Papers. 1.4 Reference to the DfT Business Plan containing government priorities will be inserted under Section 8.2.
	Background Paper (BP) 5	1.5 Make reference to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and changing nature of GOSE.	1.5 What is known of LEP's role and function at the time of writing will be referenced in Background Paper 5. It is however considered too premature to comment on the future of GOSE.
2. Rob Sexton (Bracknel	*Policy TP5*	2.1 Change the bullet point: "Continuing to ensure that Taxis are accessible for example, to accommodate wheelchair users"	2.1 Amend to read: **Continuing to ensure that Taxis are accessible; for example, to accommodate wheelchair users and ensure**

I Forest Council)		to: "Continuing to ensure that Taxis are accessible for example, to accommodate wheelchair users to and drivers meet with duties under Equality legislation". 2.2 Add another bullet point: "Ensuring adequate and relevant provision for Taxis within any redevelopment of the town centre".	**drivers meet with duties under equality legislation.** 2.2 Add a new bullet point to read: **Ensuring adequate and relevant provision for Taxis within any redevelopment of the town centre**.
	Policy TP15	2.3 Change bullet point: "The use of planning controls to bring about appropriate parking provision in all forms of new development and redevelopment" to: "The use of planning controls to bring about appropriate parking provision in all forms of new development and redevelopment within an overall Car Parking Strategy, see below". 2.4 Add another bullet point: "Car Parking Strategy which sets out council provision of on street parking within the borough, provision of public parking areas and the role of enforcement within those provisions".	2.3 Amend to read: **The use of Development Management to bring about appropriate parking provision in all forms of new development and redevelopment within an overall Parking Strategy**. 2.4 Add a new bullet point to read: **The Parking Strategy which sets out council provision of on street parking within the borough, provision of public parking areas and the role of enforcement within those provisions**.
3. Wokingh am Borough Council	*Gener al*	3.1 Generally supported, however a broader approach should be taken to the 8 key policies which would allow greater scope for partnership working.	3.1 Section 2.8 of the LTP3 Core Strategy has been amended to consider cross-boundary accessibility. It is considered this issue is captured within Policy TP1. A section on 'Strategic Access' will be added under Section 3.5 in Background Paper 3.

4. Reading Borough Council	*General*	4.1 Generally supported – pleased to see commitment to partnership working and ambition to work together. Seen as important to securing funding, sustainable transport and delivering value for money in light of structural changes.	4.1 Noted.
5. Easthampstead Park Community School	*General*	5.1 Supports goals - appropriate for the needs of the community that EPCS serves. 5.2 Request provision of a cycle path to the school so students no longer have to use the footpath and are able to comply with the law.	5.1 Noted. 5.2 This scheme is included in our safe routes to school programme for further investigation.
	Policy TP8 & TP9	5.3 Amend to include: "There will be the provision of reliable, safe and affordable alternatives to the use of the car through accessible public transport and safe cycle and walkways".	5.3 This is not necessary because the provision of reliable, safe and affordable alternatives is covered by Policies TP3, TP4, TP5, TP6, TP7, TP8 & TP9.
6. Bracknell Town Council	*Policy TP1*	6.1 Supported, in particular improvements to road capacity and cycling and walking infrastructure.	6.1 Noted.
	Policy TP2	6.2 Supported, in particular reducing street clutter, and designing appropriate landscaping with regard to character. 6.3 Important to ensure adequate parking space.	6.2 Noted. 6.3 The provision of adequate parking is covered by Policy TP15 and the Parking Standards SPD (2007) supports and delivers appropriate parking. However, where appropriate, the Council will continue to work with the community regarding parking issues such as problems in the neighbourhoods.
	Policy TP3	6.4 Supported, in particular quality buses with good connections, greater use and promotion of integrated	6.4 Noted.

		ticketing schemes such as PlusBus and ability to purchase multiple journeys at a discount, free bus passes for the over 60's and further improvements to make it more user friendly and further reduce congestion.	
	Policy TP4	6.5 Supported, in particular of promotion of Airtrack, accessibility improvements to railway stations to prevent parking in residential areas and improvements to connections between rail and bus services. 6.6 Consideration should be given to viability of bus link with Crossrail. 6.7 Consider bus route: Bracknell – Maidenhead – High Wycombe.	6.5 Noted. 6.6 Bracknell - Maidenhead (-Wexham Park Hospital) service 53 is part of the Council's existing supported bus network, in partnership with RBWM, Bucks and Slough Councils. Long term bus provision to the north of Bracknell, in light of proposed housing development, is under consideration, including links to Maidenhead. 6.7 A Bracknell - Maidenhead - High Wycombe service was considered by the Berkshire Strategic Transport Forum (BSTF) as part of a Thames Valley Express Coach network, but this would require initial capital and ongoing revenue funding which is currently unavailable.
	Policy TP5	6.8 Supported, in particular regulation to ensure compliance with law, maintaining driving and vehicle maintenance standards and preventing undesirable people from obtaining licences; and promotion of integrated ticketing to make public transport more flexible.	6.8 Noted.
	Policy TP6	6.9 Supported.	6.9 Noted.

	Policy TP7	6.10 Supported, in particular changing travel habits through greater ease of use of sustainable modes.	6.10 Noted.
	Policy TP8	6.11 Supported. Suggests a dedicated cycle lane through town centre with secure cycle storage, which could be trialled in existing centre, and a cycle hire scheme, similar to that in London.	6.11 Noted. To be investigated under Policy TP8.
	Policy TP9	6.12 Supported.	6.12 Noted.
	Policy TP10	6.13 Supported.	6.13 Noted.
	Policy TP11	6.14 Supported, in particular use of quiet road surfacing which is suggested should be used on all major routes through built up areas. Notes importance of securing developer contributions due to heavy-loading on Borough's transport network.	6.14 Noted. The promotion of quiet surfaces in built up areas is covered under Policies TP14 & TP19.
	Policy TP12	6.15 Supported, in particular securing developer contributions to increase capacity and functionality of junctions.	6.15 Noted.
	Policy TP13	6.16 Supported.	6.16 Noted.
	Policy TP14	6.17 Supported. Suggest greater sanctions for freight that drive off designated routes and put infrastructure at risk, e.g. bridges. Lorry drivers should show greater diligence in observing the Highway Code. Encouragement should be given to the transfer of more freight by rail.	6.17 Noted. Movement of freight in the Borough will be included under Policy TP14.

Whilst freight by rail is encouraged (covered under TP14 - point 4: "*Encouraging more environmentally friendly freight, including the use of alternative fuels and low emission vehicles*"), on and off loading of lorries at rail freight depots can present logistical issues, to such an extent that |

			makes this form of transportation unviable.
	Policy TP15	6.18 Supported. Suggests installation of specialised parking bays should not reduce number of standard bays, policy should be changed to allow more realistic levels of parking. Concern over parking of commercial vehicles on residential roads - a lorry park with facilities could help resolve this issue.	6.18 Noted. Consideration of these issues will be included within the Parking Strategy.
	Policy TP16	6.19 Supported.	6.19 Noted.
	Policy TP17	6.20 Supported.	6.20 Noted.
	Policy TP18	6.21 Supported - maintenance of PRoWs is necessary to encourage sustainable modes.	6.21 Noted.
	Policy TP19	6.22 Supported.	6.22 Noted.
	Policy TP20	6.23 Supported. Recent and future highway improvements are hoped to reverse decline in air quality. Re-routing of M3 – M4 link could help.	6.23 Noted. A key item included within Policy TP12- Congestion Management, along with the emergence of cleaner and more fuel efficient vehicles, specifically covered in Policy TP10 – Smarter Vehicle Use.
	Habitats Regulati ons Assess ment (HRA)	6.24 Supported.	6.24 Noted.
	Strategi c Environ	6.25 Supported.	6.25 Noted.

	mental Assessment (SEA)		
7. Warfield Parish Council	*Policy TP3*	7.1 Statement 13.4 acknowledges that the present provision is "a basic level of service" and statement 13.6 that "the Council has a role in procuring socially necessary services that are not provided by the free market, subject to external funding which is currently under significant pressure." If LTP3 is to be met such funding must be given a high priority and the words in bullet point 2 should be changed from: "Where feasible procuring services that are not provided by the free market" to: "Providing sufficient funds to procure services that are not provided by the free market".	7.1 Due to financial constraints it is not possible to commit to such a statement.
	Policy TP6	7.2 Suggest change from: "Financial support where feasible" to: "Financial support".	7.2 As above (7.1).
	Policy TP8	7.3 Agree that "where feasible" is appropriate in "Improving, where feasible, walking and cycling infrastructure", because it can mean physically not just financially feasible, however it is suggested that: "Ensuring the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are fully considered in new developments" be changed to:	7.3 Noted, although we feel that "fully considered" is suitable and covers our needs under Policy TP8.

		"Ensuring the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are addressed and solutions provided in new developments".	
	Policy TP10	7.4 An explanation of how "multiple-occupancy journeys" will be incentivised is required.	7.4 Examples of measures are included in Background Paper 4 e.g. under objective 1 & 3: "*Promote and implement multiple occupancy vehicle schemes – including promotion of car clubs, Taxi share, car share database, multiple occupancy vehicle lanes, dedicated car parking spaces for car sharers, business and residential travel plans*".
	Policy TP11	7.5 An explanation of how "reliability of journey times" will be improved is required.	7.5 Various measures are included in Background Paper 4 under Objective 1, e.g. providing Real Time Travel Information.
	CS - Para 26.5	7.6 An explanation of how "co-operative working with the police" will be achieved is required.	7.6 Thames Valley Police are a key interested party in Bracknell and previous partnership working will continue throughout LTP3, e.g. safer driving campaigns.
8. Hewlett Packard	*General*	8.1 The draft LTP3 should be consistent with the Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document which is adopted as part of the Core Strategy.	8.1 The potential for new railway stations, such as at Amen Corner should the opportunity arise, is generically provided for in the 2nd bullet point of Policy TP4. However, to make it more explicit, an additional sentence - Para 14.3, will be added to read: **The Council will support the provision of new railway stations in the Borough, if the opportunity arises, subject to partnership support from Network Rail and the train operators, and satisfactory technical and business cases**.

	CS - Section 14	8.2 The Amen Corner SPD includes the potential provision of a railway station at Amen Corner to assist in the sustainability of the area. Draft LTP3 does not include any reference to this adopted position.	8.2 The LTP3 Core Strategy is a strategic document and support for new railway stations is already provided for generically in Policy TP4. Amendments described above (8.1) will further address this.
	Para 14.5	8.3 Add: "A site for a potential new railway station has been identified at Amen Corner. The Council will continue to promote and support this project which will enhance accessibility to this part of the Borough and improve economic and employment prospects for the Town."	8.3 Subject to the amendment to Para 14.3, this addition is not considered necessary.
	Policy TP4	8.4 Include: "Continued support for a new railway station at Amen Corner".	8.4 For reasons explained above it is not necessary to be explicit about Amen Corner however, for clarity, the 2nd bullet point will be amended to read as: *Supporting and promoting strategic projects* **including the provision of new railway stations and facilities where appropriate,** *through partnership working with…*

9. Heathrow Airport Ltd.	*General*	9.1 Workers and travellers from Bracknell Forest are heavily reliant on the private car in accessing Heathrow. Keen to work closely with BFC to improve access and public transport connectivity to Heathrow. 9.2 Does not outline any new vision for the Borough or announce any major initiative or new approach. 9.3 Supports continued promotion of sustainable travel. 9.4 Would like to see Heathrow referenced more explicitly given the airport's importance to many of the borough's residents.	9.1 Noted. BFC support Airtrack and is a member of the Airtrack forum. 9.2 The plan period is 15 years and is designed to be able to be flexible with the development of new technology. 9.3 Noted. 9.4 A section on 'Strategic Access' will be added under Section 3.5 in Background Paper 3.
	Section 8.0	9.5 None of the 8 local objectives specifically look at improving connectivity beyond the borough to key local and regional hubs: Reading, Heathrow and central London. It is felt cross-boundary and more strategic travel is as important as local trips to making a successful travel plan. Suggest adding a specific local objective encouraging better linkages with key centres in the area.	9.5 Section 2.8 of the LTP3 Core Strategy has been amended to consider cross-boundary accessibility. It is considered this issue is captured within Policy TP1.
	Section 13.0	9.6 Currently no direct bus or coach access between Bracknell and Heathrow. Suggest including an aspiration for more strategic services from Bracknell.	9.6 Remains an aspiration. It was the subject of a Kick Start bid in 2004, also identified in BSTF Express Coach network report as Bracknell - Slough - Heathrow route. Unfortunately the scheme requires a large capital investment on priority measures and then continued revenue funding.
	Section 14.0	9.7 Supported – in particular BFC's support for Airtrack.	9.7 Noted.

	Section 15.0	9.8 Do not consider Taxis to be a coherent part of public transport. Although important for small – medium length journeys, they should not be viewed as 'sustainable' on a par with high occupancy vehicles such as buses, coaches and trains.	9.8 Noted. At a local level they can provide multiple occupancy trips and can 'fill the gaps' on the public transport network.
10. Winkfield Parish Council	*General*	10.1 Supported.	10.1 Noted.
11. Theatres Trust	*General*	11.1 No comment.	11.1 Noted.
12. Natural England	*General*	12.1 Supported.	12.1 Noted.
	General	12.2 Contains limited information on schemes. Without detail it is difficult to assess impact of individual schemes and LTP as a whole, or judge the SEA or HRA.	12.2 The screening assessment has been amended to state that, due to the lack of detailed information at the current time, it is not possible to be certain whether LTP3 will lead to a likely significant effect from air pollution on the SPA or not. As a result, relevant schemes and/or strategies relating to the following policies will be subject to Appropriate Assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives: TP1, TP3, TP4, TP11, TP12, TP13, TP14, TP17, TP20.
	General	12.3 Look forward to commenting on the Implementation Plan and detailed proposals.	12.3 As above, we will consult Natural England on relevant Appropriate Assessments.
	Policy TP2	12.4 Supported – however it only deals with specific change through the LTP. To complement BP3 Para 7.7.6, add a policy relating to the location and design of	12.4 Add a bullet point to TP2 that reads: **Seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment through street design, e.g. the**

		all transport schemes. This would protect the natural environment and capitalise on opportunities, in particular enhancement local landscape character, habitats and associated networks and access to natural green space and countryside.	**creation of green corridors and landscaping schemes that promote biodiversity**;
	Section 28.0	12.5 To deliver aspirations under Para 5.4.5 (BP3), it is unclear whether RoW are fit for purpose in meeting more trips and delivering physical and mental health benefits associated with exercise in a generally green environment.	12.5 The Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan, part of LTP3's suite of strategies, audited the borough's network to draw up an action plan to ensure that the network is effectively managed. It is accessible at: http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/public-rights-of-way-improvement-plan-2006.pdf Enhancement of the network over the LTP3 period will be sought. In recognition that PRoW can act as important green corridors, which have important benefits for human health, TP18 Para 1 will be amended to read: *…as key infrastructure in support of recreation, travel***, health and biodiversity***…* and a bullet point added to read: **Seeking opportunities to benefit biodiversity, e.g. through the creation of green corridors.**
	SEA	12.6 Suggest using more 'appropriate and meaningful' SEA Objective indicators, e.g.: Obj.1 (p31): Levels of walking and cycling (generally and associated with new provision or enhancements) will monitor change and consequent health benefits; Obj. 4 (p32): Access to countryside and accessible greenspace, rather than just open space.	12.6 Agreed. A new SEA Objective indicator will be added. This will only help with further monitoring of SEA objectives and therefore has no implications for the final LTP3 Core Strategies document. Agreed. This Objective indicator will be expanded to include the following wording 'Proportion of people within 30 minutes walk of open accessible greenspace, sports or leisure facilities'.

			Again this will only help with further monitoring of SEA objectives and therefore has no implications for the final LTP3 Core Strategies document.
	HRA	12.7 Concerns over Air Pollution conclusions. The HRA states that the current background levels of NO_x at Bracknell Road (B3348) and Crowthorne High Street are currently at 40 μm/m^3 (according to the SEA background information). These areas are within 200 metres of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. This is the distance that 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' highlights for adverse impacts on vegetation from traffic emissions. According to the Air Pollution Information System (APIS), the critical level of NO_x that would lead to likely significant effect on these sites is 30 μm/m^3. The background level here is already higher than that. Advise that if additional traffic movements cause the concentration within the emission footprint in any part of the SPA to increase by less than 1% of the relevant long-term benchmark (Environmental Assessment Level, Critical Level or Critical Load), the emission is not likely to have a significant effect alone or in combination irrespective of the background levels. Where the predicted contribution from the industrial process is greater than 1%, consideration needs also to be given to the predicted environmental contribution (PEC). Where the PEC (background + process contribution) is less than 70% of the critical load/level then a conclusion of no likely significant effect can be reached, even if the process contribution is greater than 1%. However, this guidance on 'likely significant effect' thresholds is	12.7 – 12.11 The screening assessment has been amended to state that, due to the lack of detailed information at the current time, it is not possible to be certain whether LTP3 will lead to a likely significant effect from air pollution on the SPA or not. As a result, relevant schemes and/or strategies relating to the following policies will be subject to Appropriate Assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives: TP1, TP3, TP4, TP11, TP12, TP13, TP14, TP17, TP20.

		currently under review.	
		12.8 Detailed information on the predicted environmental contribution is missing from this document. To be covered in the implementation plan?	
		12.9 Support the statement in Para 4.5.3 (BP3), however impacts may still be significant to individual designated sites and will need to be assessed through the HRA process. If pollution levels are already being exceeded in locations affecting European sites, this should be made clear so that the LTP3s, in conjunction with LDFs, can avoid facilitating road traffic in these areas and instead seek to reduce it. Additional clarification should be provided as to whether it is the LTP3 itself that is contributing to the generation of traffic, or whether this is attributable to other causes.	
		12.10 NE state impact of AQMAs on the environment should be considered, not just on human health.	
		12.11 NE cannot ascertain full impact of LTP3 on SPA – urge BFC to continue down the Appropriate Assessment process, or collate further information on air pollution for NE's consideration.	

13. British Horse Society	General	13.1 Needs of equestrians on the public highway are not always given a sufficiently high priority. Hazardous nature of roads has driven many equestrians away from using the PRoW network. Speeding traffic and vehicles too big for narrow lanes pose a threat on minor roads in the borough used to access PRoW. This is at a time when countryside access is being promoted for healthy outdoor recreation. 13.2 LTP should consider needs of equestrians – request BHS and local riding associations be consulted on any proposal involving highways where horse riders may be affected.	13.1 Noted. 13.2 All affected interest parties are consulted during the implementation of highway schemes.
	Policy TP18	Recommendations: 13.3 Reduce speed limits and/or introduce traffic-calming measures on rural roads, especially in the vicinity of equestrian establishments and where bridleways and byways meet or cross roads. 13.4 Upgrade footpaths to bridleways or restricted byways wherever possible. This would increase off-road opportunities for vulnerable users, including cyclists. 13.5 Allow equestrians to access cycleways, so that they can avoid the road. This would improve safety of horse and rider and could provide them with links to previously inaccessible rights of way. 13.6 In new developments, ensure highway plans include provision for the safety of vulnerable users, and incorporate new rights of way, preferably with multi-user status, linking with existing ways.	13.3 - 13.8 The purpose of Local Transport Plans is to ensure an effective and efficient transport network. Upgrading and altering existing facilities to accommodate the movement of horses does not fit in with the key national transport objectives. However there could be occasions where BFC would allow for such movement providing it did not impact on the safety of users. Where this situation arises all parties would be consulted.

		13.7 When improving the network for cyclists, the BHS is concerned that those rights of way which are legitimately used by equestrians could be adversely affected, for example by turning a bridleway into a commuting cycle route. It is imperative that any such initiative must not reduce the amenity value for equestrians and other user groups who have a right to use the network. 13.8 Provide safe grassed margins beside roads wherever this is feasible.	
14. Binfield Village Protection Society	*General*	*New development* 14.1 Need to consider cumulative effect of developments in Bracknell and Wokingham – SADPD Preferred Option has not taken account of the grouping of four urban extensions in one general locality. 14.2 The impact of Wokingham's plans to build 2,500 homes on Buckhurst Moors Farm has not been incorporated or documented in the Sustainability Appraisals for Warfield, Amen Corner North, Binfield and Crowthorne. 14.3 The IDP has identified areas of infrastructure with a high risk of not proceeding, e.g. SRN relating to Blue Mountain site, even though they are identified as necessary. Many improvements are dependent on developer funding – history says there is never enough for what is promised. 14.4 More sustainable to spread new housing across the borough to disperse impact on road network. 14.5 Proposed development will gridlock London Road in	14.1 This comment is relevant to the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD). Joint working has been undertaken in the past through for example the representations of Wokingham BC on the Council's LDF Core Strategy DPD. Further work is now being undertaken because the Council now has a transport model in which scenarios of development in both Borough's and transport improvements are being developed as part of the evidence base for the SADPD. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required. 14.2 This point is relevant to the SADPD and Warfield SPD sustainability appraisals. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required. 14.3 This comment is relevant to the SADPD and that the Council's IDP is a live document that is refined and developed through the SADPD process. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required. 14.4 This comment is relevant to the SADPD. No

			Binfield, A329/A329M and the M4.	changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required.
				14.5 This comment is relevant to the SADPD. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required. However the implementation of policies in LTP3 with other measures from development and proposals would seek to ensure that the network is as free running as possible.
	General		*Bus Transport* These obstacles to providing bus services, in particular from Temple Park to BTC, urgently need to be addressed: 14.6 Need to be regular and frequent, frequency of 20-30 mins, as opposed to one bus every 2 hours is not viable 14.7 Bus service timetable needs to be clearly published online and at the bus stop itself. Buses must stick to their schedule. To switch from cars, people need a service timetable and bus operator they can depend on. 14.8 Bus service needs to be available at the times people depart for work and return home from work or nights out - a regular service from 7am through to midnight. 14.9 Bus fares must be competitive with the cost of car usage and parking, remembering that it will often be a couple, or a family, travelling together into Bracknell.	14.6 Service is provided commercially by Courtney, not under contract to Council. We can encourage but not compel them to provide information, and can discuss possible enhancements, but decisions re route and timetable are for them not Council 14.7 Timetables at bus stops are also the responsibility of bus operators, and while we have made efforts to ensure that Courtney Coaches have access to timetable cases that belong either to the Council or to other operators, we cannot compel them to display timetables. 14.8 Additional revenue funding would be required for evening service. 14.9 As stated under 14.6 above, the service is provided commercially by Courtney, not under contract to Council.
	General		*Cycle and Footpaths* 14.10 Make cycle and footpaths safer by lighting up the 2	14.10 Such measures will be considered under Policy TP8.

		routes into Binfield from Temple Park alongside and through Blue Mountain golf course. The bus service does not run in the evening.	
15. Mr R. Mosses	*General*	*Bus services* 15.1 Regarding an experimental Sunday bus service serving Priestwood: The 175A – along Priestwood Avenue is often empty. There is no notice of service at bus stop or at bus station. Courtney Coach's website states it only goes one way. Return journey involves a half hour wait at Bracknell Bus Station. People must be told about service and it must operate both ways for people to use it.	15.1 Service is provided commercially by Courtney, not under contract to Council. We can encourage but not compel them to provide information, and can discuss possible enhancements, but decisions re route and timetable are for them not Council Timetables at bus stops are also the responsibility of bus operators, and while we have made efforts to ensure that Courtney Coaches have access to timetable cases that belong either to the Council or to other operators, we cannot compel them to display timetables.
16. RSPB	*Policy TP18*	16.1 Support – specifically reference to the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) Project which the RSPB actively support.	16.1 Noted.
17. CPRE Bracknell and Ascot District	*General*	17.1 It is essential BFC work with neighbouring authorities, namely Wokingham, to plan for infrastructure improvements in each authority to mitigate increase in traffic from development.	17.1 Modelling work is currently being undertaken.
	Policy TP2	17.2 Supports reduction in street clutter.	17.2 Noted.
	Policy TP3	17.3 Supports – however to materialise, buses must be reliable and be available at weekends and late evenings.	17.3 Noted.
	Policy TP4	17.4 Supports promotion of Airtrack.	17.4 Noted.
	Policy TP18	17.5 Supports extension of the PRoW network through new developments.	17.5 Noted.

18. Highways Agency	General	18.1 Look forward to continued involvement in LTP3s development – particularly the Implementation Plans.	18.1 Plan is currently being developed following the governments comprehensive spending review.
	Policy TP1	18.2 Support – in line with PPG13 Para 20. Look forward to working with BFC in developing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for emerging development. 18.3 Options should consider potential impacts on SRN, its users and road safety. Modelling work could be starting point in determining deliverability alongside early engagement with HA.	18.2 – 18.3 The Implementation Plan will focus on improving trips made within the authority and easing access to local services and not the Strategic Road Network.
	Policies TP3, TP4, TP7	18.4 Support. Efficient and sustainable movement of people and goods is overall objectives. Improvements to the SRN should be last resort.	18.4 Noted.
	TP9	18.5 Support – in line with PPG13 Pars 86-90.	18.5 Noted.
	TP12	18.6 Transport impacts of new development will be identified through development plans. Options should consider potential impacts on SRN. The management of traffic to maximise efficiency of network capacity and improving journey time reliability will be key challenges to support policies. 18.7 HA have identified a potential design solution for M4 J10 to accommodate growth in Wokingham, Reading and Bracknell Forest. HA expect proposal to be refined and developed through support of relevant stakeholders. HA have no plans to fund, design or construct area improvements. HA request options for M4 J10 are considered as BF and Wokingham's model develops and look forward to further engagement.	18.6 Our masterplan transport objectives are centred on improving transport to and from local centres and the town centre and reducing the need to travel outside of the Borough. 18.7 Noted.

	TP14	18.8 Suggest promotion of realistic opportunities for freight to be served by rail or waterways – in line with PPG13 Paras 45-47.	18.8 Noted. Movement of freight by rail or waterway is encouraged under TP14 - point 4: "*Encouraging more environmentally-friendly freight, including the use of alternative fuels and low emission vehicles*".
			However, on and off loading of lorries at rail and waterway freight depots can present logistical issues, to such an extent that unfortunately makes this form of transportation unviable.
	TP15	18.9 BFC should ensure levels of parking, location of development etc. promotes sustainable travel choices – in line with PPG13 Paras 49-50.	18.9 - 18.10 Noted.
		18.10 Supports concept of Park & Ride in principle however BFC should consider impact on SRN. Generally should be located where they can intercept existing traffic, not where they can generate additional trips. A transport assessment would be required for sites and consider reducing town centre parking to avoid a potential increase in car-based trips that might have previously been made on public transport – in line with PPG13 Para 60.	
	TP16	18.11 Consider adding: "Ensure that the traffic impacts from new development does not adversely affect safety on road networks".	18.11 Safety on road networks is covered within Policy TP16 - Road Safety.
	TP20	18.12 Where the SRN is identified as a significant contributor to air quality issues, the HA will work with BFC to identify how issue can be improved.	18.12 Noted.

	BP5	18.13 Support partnership work. The key issues for the HA refer to the worsening congestion and the need for mitigation on the SRN of planned growth.	18.13 Noted.
19. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	*General*	19.1 Difficult to provide detailed comments as there is little detail as to how and where policies will be applied. Recognises that much of detail will be in supporting strategies.	19.1 Noted.
	TP1	19.2 There is no mention of access to services outside Bracknell Forest. RBWM would welcome the opportunity for joint working to improve access to key facilities in neighbouring areas, such as employment and hospitals.	19.2 Section 2.8 of the LTP3 Core Strategy has been amended to consider cross-boundary accessibility. It is considered this issue is captured within Policy TP1.\n\nA section on 'Strategic Access' will be added under Section 3.5 in Background Paper 3.
	TP3	Welcomes:\n19.3 Joint working on the provision of public transport information, particularly for cross-boundary services;\n\n19.4 Commitment to Real-Time Passenger Information and would like to ensure that any systems introduced are compatible with those in neighbouring areas for cross-boundary services.	19.3 - 19.4 Noted.
	TP4	19.5 Welcome the opportunity for joint working on multi-operator smart / integrated ticketing to ensure that systems are compatible for cross-boundary services.	19.5 Noted.
	TP5	19.6 Welcomes the commitment to cross-boundary working on taxi / private hire issues.	19.6 Noted.

	TP6	19.7 Welcome the opportunity for joint working on community transport provision to cater for cross-boundary travel by people with mobility problems.	19.7 Noted.
	TP8	19.8 Welcome joint working on cross-boundary walking and cycling routes.	19.8 Noted.
	TP9	19.9 Welcome joint working to address cross-boundary issues affecting school and workplace travel plans.	19.9 Noted.
	TP10	19.10 Welcome the opportunity for joint working with Bracknell Forest, neighbouring local authorities and other partners to introduce an area-wide car club.	19.10 Noted.
	TP11	19.11 Requires additional clarification as to what is deemed "unsuitable" or "appropriate".	19.11 Noted.
	TP12	19.12 Welcome joint working on tackling congestion on inter-urban corridors.	19.12 Noted.
	TP13	19.13 Welcome the commitment to partnership working and data exchange with neighbouring authorities on ITS matters.	19.13 Noted.
	TP14	19.14 Welcome joint working to establish preferred routes for freight movements where these involve cross-boundary movements.	19.14 Noted.
	TP15	19.15 Welcome the opportunity for joint working to develop a network of electric vehicle charging points designed to common standards, taking advantage of discounts achievable through joint purchasing of	19.15 Noted.

		infrastructure and shared back office functions.	
	BP5 – Section 1.4	19.16 RBWM is not aware of any commitment by the six Berkshire authorities to contribute £20k per annum to BSTF over the next three years. This was proposed but was not agreed.	19.16 Nothing appears to have come of this proposal. Reference to this will be deleted.
20. Graham Pockett (Bracknell Forest Council)	*CS - Section 9.3: Obj. 6*	20.1 There are sometimes conflicts between soft landscape requirements including tree planting, and the maintenance implications for adopted highways. There can be a significant difference in attitude to trees from a highway operational point of view and a streetscene design point of view. In order to make this statement, the approach to landscaping and tree planting should be carried across service areas' guidance, and reflected in Streetscene SPD and Highway Guide for Development.	20.1 It is agreed that the content of this objective and Policy TP2 will need to be consistent with the emerging Streetscene SPD and Highways Guide for development.
	CS - Para 18.3	20.2 Could also be implemented through the Rights of Way Improvement Plan to some extent. This is also covered in section 28.0. 20.3 These two sections should be adjacent in the document, being closely related.	20.2 Agreed. The following text will be added to the end of Para 18.3: "…*the Walking and Cycling Strategy,* **the Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan,** *the Sustainable Modes of…"***.** 20.3 Agreed. The Public Rights of Way section will be slotted in after Section 18.0 Walking and Cycling. It will be amended to read as Policy TP9 - subsequent policies, and reference to them will be amended accordingly ready for Exec.
	BP4 - Obj. 5 (p6)	20.4 Summary: Replace: "...sustainable use of materials and impact mitigation of transport are essential…" with: "…sustainable use of materials, impact mitigation *and*	20.3 There might not always be the available resources, i.e. finance and land to make "compensation" feasible, therefore such a statement is considered too committing in a climate of uncertainty. There remains however a

		compensation of transport are essential…".	commitment to work closely in partnership, to deliver the best feasible "mitigation" solutions - including the protection and enhancement of biodiversity. The wording will remain the same.
21. Marlies Boydell (Bracknell Forest Council)	*CS - Para 3.2*	21.1 This sentence identifies that the environment is "distinctly green in character, with expanses of open space, forests and a significant part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA". This should be reflected in the streetscene policy and throughout the plan as a whole to protect the *existing* environment which it currently doesn't do.	21.1 Policy TP2 has been amended, notably the first 3 bullet points to read: • **Retain existing trees and vegetation where appropriate, that provide a valuable contribution to the landscape and ecology of the area.** • **Incorporating adequate space for soft landscaping and street trees within the design of new streets and development, as appropriate.** • **Seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment through street design, e.g. the creation of green corridors and landscaping schemes that promote biodiversity.**
	CS - Section 4.1	21.2 A list of background papers is given which according to the text "add detail to this document". This may be an error as the full detail of these background documents is not in the Core Strategy and if it were would be an unnecessary repetition. The role of the background papers needs to be clarified; do they provide supporting information and/or provide guidance as to how highways challenges will be approached? This should be the case as the background papers include a lot of important information which has not been translated in the Core Strategy.	21.2 The purpose of Background Papers will be clarified. Section 4.1 will be amended to read: **Supporting information in a document entitled 'LTP3 - Background Paper':**

	CS – *Section* *9.3*	Obj. 5) 21.3 It identifies the importance of protecting and enhancing the natural environment, which includes biodiversity. This is also identified by the national goal 5 and as a key challenge facing this LTP. However, it is only mentioned in terms of "impact mitigation" which is vague and a very negative approach to address the effects of highway projects on biodiversity (this comes from the Background Paper 4 which should also be amended). The SEA also covers the required change in approach from merely mitigating impacts to include avoidance and enhancement. Change wording to: "The LTP3 and following highways projects will seek to avoid harm to the natural environment by avoiding impacts on biodiversity and natural features of value, mitigating where this is not possible and use opportunities to enhance the natural environment by contributing to green infrastructure".	21.3 Section 9.3 - Obj. 5) and BP4 Obj. 5. Summary will be amended to read: **The Council will promote sustainable and cleaner modes of transport, consider more efficient and sustainable use of materials, avoid where possible harm to the natural environment - mitigate where this is not possible, and use opportunities to enhance the natural environment by contributing to green infrastructure, whilst coping with an increase in demand on the transport network**.
	Section *10.0*	21.4 There does not appear to be any policy which addresses the key objective 5 to protect and enhance the natural environment (also identified by the SEA). Some small elements have been covered by air quality and streetscene but does not cover water, climate change or biodiversity.	21.4 Whilst it is considered adequate attention has been given to air quality, directly through Policy TP20, and indirectly by other policies, e.g. TP8, it is agreed that more can be done to cover other aspects of Obj. 5 in LTP3 policies. Policy TP2 will be amended to explicitly support biodiversity. It will read: • **Retain existing trees and vegetation where appropriate, that provide a valuable**

			contribution to the landscape and ecology of the area. • **Seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment through street design, e.g. the creation of green corridors and landscaping schemes that promote biodiversity.** …and Policy TP18 will have another bullet point added to read: **Seeking opportunities to benefit biodiversity, e.g. through the creation of green corridors.** Water resources (now included in Section 7.7.7 – 7.7.11 of Background Paper 3) and other environmental considerations will be covered by Policy TP19, with the inclusion of another bullet point to read: **Considering the impact of highway maintenance and schemes on the natural environment, i.e. incorporating SUDS, using sustainable/recycled materials and biodiversity impact mitigation.**
	Policy TP2	21.5 Amend 1st bullet point to: "protecting existing notable trees and vegetation that provide valuable biodiversity, screening and landscape features". 21.6 Amend penultimate bullet point to: "Incorporating appropriate soft landscaping and street trees which contribute to the street environment and biodiversity".	21.5 Agreed. The 1st bullet point will be amended to read: **Retain existing trees and vegetation where appropriate, that provide a valuable contribution to the landscape and ecology of the area.** 21.6 Agreed, however rather than rewording an existing bullet point, a new one will be added to read: **Seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment through street design, e.g.**

			the creation of green corridors and landscaping schemes that promote biodiversity.
	Policy TP8	21.7 Add bullet point: "Improving green infrastructure to make walking and cycling more attractive".	21.7 Agreed. Bullet point will be added.
	BP3 – Para 7.2	21.8 Ref. last sentence: this is not translated through to the policies; a new policy for the natural environment is needed to address this.	21.8 A new transport policy for the natural environment is not considered necessary. It is considered the amendments stated above (21.1, 21.4 - 21.7) address this concern.
	BP3 – Para 7.5.1	21.9 The last sentence ends: "…better access to leisure activities and the natural environment". Add to the end: "…as part of Green Infrastructure".	21.9 Agreed. Amendment will be made.
	BP3 – Para 7.7.3	21.10 Penultimate bullet point uses the word "islandising"; this should be replaced with "isolating" or "fragmenting".	21.10 'Islandising' will be replaced with 'fragmenting'.
	BP3 – Para 7.7.4	21.11 In relation to the natural environment, first sentence says "reducing the negative impact of traffic and seeking appropriate traffic management solutions to reduce this impact is a major challenge" and yet this is not made clear in the LTP core strategy. A new natural environment policy is needed.	21.11 A new transport policy for the natural environment is not considered necessary. It is considered the amendments stated above (21.1, 21.4 - 21.7) address this concern.

'Traffic management solutions' is a broad term. It can mean anything from encouraging more sustainable modes of transport to reduce the number of cars on the road – reducing periods of traffic, to incorporating junction improvements or |

			Intelligent Transport Systems that can ease the flow of traffic, thereby helping reduce emissions to improve air quality. Such "solutions" are covered by several policies.
	BP4 - Obj. 5 (p6)	21.12 Add bullet point referring to Objective 3 Public/Street Lighting Strategy to reduce lighting as this would reduce impact on landscape and biodiversity. 21.13 Summary – alter wording to remove "impact mitigation" as this is a very negative approach to biodiversity and does not allow for avoidance of impacts and enhancement (ref. CS – Section 9.3 recommendation).	21.12 Agreed. A bullet point will be added to read: **Seek opportunities to reduce highway lighting in order to reduce energy consumption and the impact on landscape and biodiversity**. Additionally, the penultimate bullet point in Policy TP19 will be amended to read*: Reviewing and, where possible, reducing the use **and impact** of illuminated traffic signs and street lighting to contribute towards the Council's strategic carbon reduction agenda.* 21.13 This summary is to be amended, as stated in response 21.3.
	SEA – Table 5.7	Assessment of impacts against SEA Objective 7 may need to be reviewed as follows: 21.14 Public Transport Measures – improvements to bus routes could result in further construction to provide bus lanes, vegetation and tree works for double-decker clearance and provision of new routes through ecologically sensitive areas (e.g. possible route alongside SPA at Broadmoor). Therefore, impact should be +/-. 21.15 Smarter Choices – walking and cycling routes have had negative impacts as well as positive impacts on biodiversity (e.g. new cycle routes have resulted in	21.13 – 21.17 Agreed and the scoring will be altered to reflect this unless the Final LTP3 Core Strategies document addresses these concerns. [Overall the Final LTP3 Core Strategies document needs to reflect more on the potential biodiversity impacts and seek to retain areas of trees and landscaping where necessary.]

		habitat loss at Clinton's Hill). Therefore, impact should be +/-. 21.16 Road Safety and Asset Management – road safety schemes could have negative impacts during construction and could lead to vegetation and tree works for safety or sightlines. However, change in lighting and reduction in lighting may have a positive impact. Therefore, impact should be +/-. 21.17 Parking – increased provision of parking could result in loss of habitats e.g. parking schemes within residential areas have reduced landscaping spaces. Therefore, impact should be -.	
22. Environment Agency	*General*	22.1 No comment.	22.1 Noted.
23. Crowthorne Parish Council	*General*	23.1 Transport systems are fundamental to facilitating high quality of life and form the basis for what housing and development planning can be accepted to maintain this quality. 23.2 Comprehensive in LTP3's aims and noble objectives, however no clear methods are detailed as to how the objectives will be quantifiably defined and therefore measurable. 23.3 Majority of objectives are subjective and constitute a 'wish list' with no specific deliverable action plan and to achieve the desired outcomes. 23.4 Assertions that the application of new technologies	23.1 Noted. 23.2 This will be included in the Implementation Plan. 23.3 The Implementation Plan will act as an 'Action Plan' in 3 year cycles – stating what will be delivered and when. Schemes identified in this are tested, amongst other things (deliverability, public acceptability etc.), against their contribution towards the 'Local Objectives' and other national and local goals. Then, through the monitoring of Local Objective 'indicators', we are able to asses to what extent they are being achieved.

		can solve problems, such as traffic and pollution, when they have not even been piloted are wishful thinking.	23.4 It is accepted that technology cannot solve all transport issues – a lot relies on behavioural change and offering suitable alternatives to the private car, however there are many examples where it can help, for instance, real-time public transport information - which can improve user experience, Intelligent Transport Systems - that provide motorists with travel information can reduce congestion and pollution, and electrifying cars - that can also help combat air pollution.
	General	23.5 BFC need to work with Wokingham Borough and RBWM to model boundary traffic issues, in particular: 23.6 Travelling east-west on major roads (Nine Mile Ride, A329 and A322, including roads leading to proposed major developments and motorways; 23.7 North-south traffic flows from the Meadows/Sandhurst to Wokingham (A321) and along Crowthorne High Street.	23.5 – 23.7 This work is currently being undertaken.
	General	Economic slowdown is a good reason to: 23.8 Make more quantitative/predictive traffic flow measurements from *all* proposed developments in area; 23.9 Confirm pollution figures for Crowthorne and model environmental impact of proposed developments.	23.8 This work is currently underway jointly with Wokingham. It accounts for all development within BFC's emerging SADPD and Wokingham's development. 23.9 This is not specific to LTP3 Core Strategy consultation, however Officers will engage directly on this matter.
	General	23.10 Absolute priority to have a 'definitive and specific' Infrastructure Plan, based on facts, measures and	23.10 This comment is relevant to the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD). BFC are currently

		predictions *before* submission. Widespread development in short space of time demands a holistic approach.	working on this. LTP3 will consider transport infrastructure requirements for BF's development sites.
	BP3 – Fig.4	23.11 Include B3340 Nile Mile Ride corridor – including Old Wokingham/Nine Mile Ride junction as a hotspot. Equally, to be opened A329 Jennett's Park access will require monitoring as will B3340 mentioned above.	23.11 This junction is included within the IDP list linked to future growth.
	BP3 – Para 5.5	23.12 Air pollution monitoring in Crowthorne High Street should be a top priority.	23.13 Noted. The Council is currently monitoring and investigating air quality in the area as part of its due statutory process.
	BP4 – Obj.3 (p4)	23.13 Dismayed to read that the plan wished to "*Establish links with the Local Air Quality Management monitoring regime*"- CPC would expect this already to be in place, ongoing and a priority.	23.13 LTP3 is establishing the link between air quality and transport.
24. R. Gristwood	General	24.1 New homes planned could generate 25,000 more cars on local roads. Peak time traffic's already bad, in particular Bagshot Road, Downshire Way, Twin Bridges, Berkshire Way up to A329(M). Twin Bridges roundabout needs to be enlarged in light of new houses and regenerated town centre.	24.1 It is hoped that extra trips on the transport network as a result of future development is accounted for in mitigation measures along with sustainable transport improvements.
25. D. Edwards	General	*New development* 25.1 Need to consider cumulative effect of developments in Bracknell and Wokingham – SADPD Preferred Option has not taken account of the grouping of four urban extensions in one general locality. 25.2 The impact of Wokingham's plans to build 2,500 homes on Buckhurst Moors Farm has not been	25.1 This comment is relevant to the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD). Joint working has been undertaken in the past through for example the representations of Wokingham BC on the Council's LDF Core Strategy DPD. Further work is now being undertaken because the Council now has a transport model in which scenarios of development

| | | incorporated or documented in the Sustainability Appraisals for Warfield, Amen Corner North, Binfield and Crowthorne.

25.3 The IDP has identified areas of infrastructure with a high risk of not proceeding, e.g. SRN relating to Blue Mountain site, even though they are identified as necessary. Many improvements are dependent on developer funding – history says there is never enough for what is promised.

25.4 More sustainable to spread new housing across the borough to disperse impact on road network.

25.5 Proposed development will gridlock London Road in Binfield, A329/A329M and the M4. | in both Borough's and transport improvements are being developed as part of the evidence base for the SADPD. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required.

25.2 This point is relevant to the SADPD and Warfield SPD sustainability appraisals. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required.

25.3 This comment is relevant to the SADPD and that the Council's IDP is a live document that is refined and developed through the SADPD process. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required.

25.4 This comment is relevant to the SADPD. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required.

25.5 This comment is relevant to the SADPD. No changes to the LTP3 Core Strategy required. However the implementation of policies in LTP3 with other measures from development and proposals would seek to ensure that the network is as free running as possible. |
| | General | *Bus Transport*
These obstacles to providing bus services, in particular from Temple Park to BTC, urgently need to be addressed:

25.6 Need to be regular and frequent, frequency of 20-30 mins, as opposed to one bus every 2 hours is not viable | 25.6 Service is provided commercially by Courtney, not under contract to BFC. We can encourage but not compel them to provide information, and we can discuss possible enhancements, but decisions regarding routes and timetable are for them to determine, not the Council.

25.7 Timetables at bus stops are also the responsibility of bus operators, and while we have |

		25.7 Bus service timetable needs to be clearly published online and at the bus stop itself. Buses must stick to their schedule. To switch from cars, people need a service timetable and bus operator they can depend on. 25.8 Bus service needs to be available at the times people depart for work and return home from work or nights out - a regular service from 7am through to midnight. 25.9 Bus fares must be competitive with the cost of car usage and parking, remembering that it will often be a couple, or a family, travelling together into Bracknell.	made efforts to ensure that Courtney Coaches have access to timetable cases that belong either to the Council or to other operators, we cannot compel them to display timetables. 25.8 Additional revenue funding would be required for evening services. 25.9 As stated under 25.6, the service is provided commercially by Courtney, not under contract to Council.
	General	*Cycle and Footpaths* 25.10 Make cycle and footpaths safer by lighting up the 2 routes into Binfield from Temple Park alongside and through Blue Mountain golf course. The bus service does not run in the evening.	14.10 Such measures will be considered under Policy TP8.
26. Wokingh am Town Council	*General*	26.1 Concerns over the implications of development on the border with Wokingham. Request that the combined impact of traffic generated in both boroughs be taken into consideration when designing the transport system.	26.1 Joint work on this issue is currently being undertaken.
27. Simon Roskilly (Bracknel l Forest Council)	*General*	27.1 It is regarded that Local Objective 5 (Protect and enhance the quantity and quality of natural resources including water, air quality, and the natural environment) is not reflected in the LTP3 policies. This relates to issues such as heritage and biodiversity issues. 27.2 A related consideration is the need to enhance human health, which has not been considered fully in the	27.1 Whilst it is considered adequate attention has been given to air quality, directly through Policy TP20, and indirectly by other policies, e.g. TP8, it is agreed that more can be done to cover other aspects of Obj. 5 in LTP3 policies. Policy TP2 will be amended to explicitly support biodiversity. It will read:

objectives or LTP3 policies. This includes aspects such as air quality, transport related noise, and reducing the vulnerability of the network to terrorist attacks.

27.3 Measures could be incorporated that might include a green infrastructure network integrated into all infrastructure with a particular emphasis on walking and cycling routes.

27.4 It is suggested that the national goal to 'reduce CO_2 emissions' isn't fully reflected in the LTP3.

27.5 The introduction in particular reads that the main aim of the LTP3 is to support economic development (Section 5: The LTP Core Strategy and Implementation). Although 'equality of opportunity' and 'national goals for reduction(s) in carbon emissions' is mentioned, this is secondary to the need to support the local economy.

27.6 It is suggested that the overarching principle of the plan should be to reduce contributions to climate change through the measures included.

27.7 This should include a strategy that seeks to encourage a modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport for residual transport needs, with reducing the need to travel as the first priority in the hierarchy.

- **Retain existing trees and vegetation where appropriate, that provide a valuable contribution to the landscape and ecology of the area.**
- **Seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment through street design, e.g. the creation of green corridors and landscaping schemes that promote biodiversity.**

…and Policy TP18 will have another bullet point added to read:
Seeking opportunities to benefit biodiversity, e.g. through the creation of green corridors.

Heritage will be covered by an additional bullet point added to Policy TP2 that will read:
Ensuring the design of streets relate to their surroundings and are sympathetic to the heritage and character of the area.

Water resources (now included in Section 7.7.7 – 7.7.11 of BP3) and other environmental considerations will be covered by Policy TP19, with the inclusion of another bullet point to read:
Considering the impact of highway maintenance and schemes on the natural environment, i.e. incorporating SUDS, using sustainable/recycled materials and minimising impact on biodiversity.

27.2 The Objectives are overarching themes. Though none explicitly mention human health,

				several directly impact human health, e.g. Obj. 4. encourages healthier modes of transport, which is translated into numerous policies e.g. TP8 – Walking and Cycling.
				Impact of traffic noise on human health has been included in BP3 Section 7.6.1.
				Section 5.4 - BP3 covers health issues, whilst Section 5.7 shows how issues translate into policy.
				27.3 Agreed. A bullet point has been added to TP8 that reads: **<u>Improving green infrastructure to make walking and cycling more attractive.</u>**
				Amendments to TP2 and TP18 as outlined in 27.11 are considered to support the issue of Green Infrastructure.
				27.4 The challenge to reduce CO_2 emissions is explicitly flagged up in Section 4. - Background Paper 3. Section 4.7 shows how these issues have been translated into Policy. It is such a cross-cutting issue – relating to most policies, that it has not been considered necessary to explicitly mention each policy's contribution to reducing CO_2 in policy wording. It can be assumed, for instance under Policy TP8 - Walking and Cycling, the term 'sustainable' contributes towards reducing CO_2 emissions.
				27.5 The national goals are LTP3's main driver, and the regeneration of the town centre is considered to be a key to delivering schemes that

| | | | contribute towards the national goals. For instance, it will improve bus services in the borough, bring forward development and investment to fund schemes and deliver infrastructure.

27.6 Reducing the affect of transport on climate change is covered throughout the Core Strategy. It is often too abstract a topic to explicitly refer to in Policy terms, however Section 4.7 – Background Paper 3 shows how consideration of climate change cross-cuts many LTP3 policies.

27.7 It is considered more appropriate to have a policy: TP7 – Smarter Choices that encourages modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport, which supports a set strategies, e.g. the Walking and Cycling Strategy. 'Reducing the need to travel' is covered in Policy TP1- Accessibility. Sustainably located development is a prime consideration, both in LTP3, captured within our vision and under Policy CS1: Sustainable Development Principles in our LDF Core Strategy. |
|---|---|---|---|