

Summary of Responses to Site Allocations DPD Preferred Option Nov 2010-Jan 2011

Introduction

Introduction	4
1 Responses to 'How to get involved'	1
2 Responses to 'SADPD Participation (Issues and Options Consultation) Feb - April 2010'	7
3 Responses to 'Preferred Options Background Paper'	9
4 Responses to 'Strategic Flood Risk Assessment'	21
5 Responses to ' Employment Land Review'	22
6 Responses to 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Monitoring Report 2010'	24
7 Responses to 'Landscape Capacity Study'	26
8 Responses to ' Draft Housing Market Assessment'	30
9 Responses to 'Phase 1 Ecological Surveys'	32
10 Responses to 'Master Planning Support'	33
11 Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan'	34
12 Responses to 'Retail Study'	62
13 Responses to 'Transport Accessibility Assessment'	63
14 Responses to ' Archaeological Site Assessment'	65
15 Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'	66
16 Responses to Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (Incorporating SEA)	72
17 Specific Consultee Comments	137
1 Responses to 'Introduction'	277
2 Responses to 'Housing'	282
3 Responses to 'Employment'	576
4 Responses to 'Retail'	583
5 Responses to 'Other Considerations'	590

Appendices

1 Responses to 'Appendix 1: Stages and timetable for Site Allocations'	1
2 Responses to 'Appendix 2: Housing'	2

3	Responses to 'Appendix 3: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on previously developed land with defined settlements'	10
4	Responses to 'Appendix 4: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on other land within defined settlements'	11
5	Responses to 'Appendix 5: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on edge of settlements'	12
6	Responses to 'Appendix 6: New urban extension Proposals Map extracts'	13
7	Responses to 'Appendix 7: Employment area Proposals Map extracts'	14
8	Responses to 'Appendix 8: Retail area maps'	15
9	Responses to 'Appendix 9: Housing site settlement boundary changes Proposals Map extracts'	16
10	Responses to 'Appendix 10: Education sites settlement boundary changes Proposals Map extracts'	17
11	Responses to 'Appendix 11: Existing Development Plan policies to be replaced'	18
12	Summary of issues raised at Preferred Option exhibitions	19

Introduction

Background

Bracknell Forest Council is currently preparing a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) as part of the preparation of its Local Development Framework (LDF). Once adopted, the SADPD will allocate sites for future development and ensure that the Council meets the requirement identified in Policy CS15 the Core Strategy for 10,780 new homes in the period to 2026. The SADPD is based on the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy, and therefore prioritises development at Bracknell Town Centre and on land within existing settlements. However the capacity of these sites is not sufficient to meet the overall requirement of the Core Strategy and so edge of settlement sites have been identified, as well as urban extensions to Bracknell and Crowthorne. As such, the SADPD amends the boundaries to settlements where this is required as a result of edge of settlement sites for housing, and also proposes revisions to the defined boundaries of employment and retail areas in the Borough.

In the course of preparing the document, the Council published an Issues and Options document for consultation (the Participation Document), which took place between February and April 2010, and a Preferred Options consultation which took place between November 2010 and January 2011. A summary of the issues raised by respondents to the Participation Document was produced by the Council in November 2010 and is available to view on the Council's consultation portal (<http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/siteallocations/>).

Purpose of this document

This document provides a summary of the main issues that were raised by respondents to the Preferred Options consultation and indicates the Council's response to those issues. Some of the issues raised are addressed in more depth in the Background Paper which accompanies the Draft Submission SADPD (including responses to omission sites). This Summary of Responses document does not identify or provide a summary of every representation raised; rather, individual responses can be viewed on the Council's planning consultation portal pages at <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/siteallocations/>.

A number of exhibitions were also held during the Preferred Option consultation. A summary of the issues raised is attached at 12 'Summary of issues raised at Preferred Option exhibitions' this document.

Over 750 responses were received on the SADPD Preferred Option document, from individuals, landowners and organisations, and these have been collated and considered by the Council following the formal consultation period. This document records the main issues raised by respondents, and follows the same format as the Preferred Options document itself. Each section begins by summarising any general issues raised and then addresses comments made on the specific Policies. Where more general responses incorporated comments on a number of issues these have been attributed to the most appropriate policy/issue. Where more than one respondent raised the same issue, it is only listed once. Issues are grouped where appropriate to avoid repetition of the Council's response.

What happens next?

The comments received at this stage of the consultation were used, alongside other evidence, to inform the development of the SADPD. Consultation on the Draft Submission SADPD will provide a further opportunity for comment although at this stage representations must relate only to the soundness of the document.

Contacts

If you have any queries regarding this document or any other aspect of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework then please contact a member of the Spatial Policy section on 01344 352000 or email development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk.

Further details on the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and other documents that are adopted or being prepared as part of the LDF can be found on the Council's website at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ldf.

1 Responses to 'How to get involved'

Table 1.1

Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Online Consultation Portal</p> <p>The online system should be much more user friendly.</p> <p>Location of consultation information on BFB website was not immediately obvious.</p> <p>Technical problems were often encountered when attempting to comment online</p>	<p>The Council uses Objective Software which is used by many Councils to consult internal and external stakeholders. A number of problems encountered during the consultation were reported to Objective. It is hoped that some of these will be addressed before the next consultation.</p> <p>The Council is in the process of carrying out a comprehensive review of the public website which hopefully will result in it being easier to use.</p>
<p>Consultation put members of the public without computer access at a disadvantage.</p> <p>A number of different consultation approaches should have been used, not just the BF website.</p> <p>The Council relied too heavily on people being able to use the internet, by not providing hard copies of the documents</p> <p>Documents not accessible unless have a computer or willing to spend hours at a library to access and read them.</p>	<p>The Council endeavours to use a variety of means of communication. The Preferred Option was not wholly reliant on the Internet or other electronic means of communication. Paper copies of documents and questionnaires were made available at the exhibitions, Parish Council Offices, the Council's Offices and in libraries around the Borough. An explanatory letter was supplied with the documents. A number of planning officers were available at the exhibitions to talk through issues and answer questions.</p> <p>Consultation responses were accepted if they were not made online and this was made clear in the consultation material.</p> <p>The number of documents printed for a consultation is always a consideration. Additional copies of SADPD Preferred Option documents were provided on request.</p>
<p>Procedure for submitting comments on-line too complicated and deterred people from responding - meant in some instances that people did not respond at all</p>	<p>The SADPD PO response form requested comments on any paragraph of the SADPD documents, including supporting documents.</p>

Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Response form is difficult to fill in and discourages people from making comments. Therefore many people responded in writing or by e-mail.</p> <p>Comment form only provided as a PDF, which few private individuals have the ability to amend.</p> <p>Previous format for SADPD Participation Document with specific questions was easier to respond to.</p> <p>The on-line comment boxes could not be formatted (underline etc) only plain text.</p>	<p>The on-line response form provided a comments box against every paragraph of the Preferred Options Document, and one comment box for every supporting document. It was not mandatory to fill in every box. Respondents needed only to comment on the paragraphs that were of interest to them. This may not have been made completely clear. In future consultations, every attempt will be made to indicate clearly how to respond.</p> <p>For future consultations, consideration will be given to preparing a word version of the response form that can be downloaded, completed and then submitted electronically.</p> <p>For future consultations, consideration will be given to the use of formatted text boxes to allow individuals to format the text in their answers.</p>
Document	
<p>SADPD and the numerous supporting documents were too long and technical. This made commenting more difficult.</p>	<p>The Council is sympathetic to the number of documents that were published for the SADPD Preferred Option. However, the process in which the Council must work requires the production of technical documents as background evidence to support the DPDs policies and proposals.</p>
<p>Complex and highly cross referenced documents only accessible to those with a computer and time and ability to go through them. Moving between documents on-line was particularly difficult</p>	
<p>Did not understand the terminology used. No overview/summary documents available to help respondents grasp the issues</p>	<p>The Council prepared a 'Growing Places' leaflet in an attempt to summarise the main issues in a simpler manner. The Preferred Option Document and associated Background Paper also included a glossary and list of abbreviations referred to in the document.</p>
Advertisement/Awareness	
<p>The Council should have first informed residents about their intention to open a formal consultation.</p> <p>Insufficient publicity given to SADPD Consultation.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to review the consultation methods used to publicise planning documents. Whilst the cost of sending a letter to every resident is prohibitive, the Council will continue to liaise with Town and Parish Councils and other groups with regard to improving communications.</p>

Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Many members of the public only aware of consultation through word and mouth and information distributed by local action groups. Every resident should have been informed of consultation.</p>	
<p>Timing of consultation in the run up to Christmas intended to discourage responses. Consultation extension very short notice. Publicity had to compete with 'seasonal' stories in local press.</p>	<p>There is no statutory period for consultation at this stage of the process. The timing of the consultation was approved at the meeting of the Council's Executive on 19th October 2010. A press release was issued to publicise the extension to the consultation period. Unfortunately, the Council has no control over whether the information is published.</p>
<p>Significant failures in Councils delivery of Town & Country</p>	<p>The Council is aware of issues surrounding the delivery of Town & Country and has passed the information to the relevant Department. Town & Country is also available at Council Offices, Bracknell Library, Council sports centres, Coral Reef and the Look Out.</p>
<p>Public exhibitions</p>	
<p>The number of exhibitions insufficient e.g. no exhibitions held in Bracknell (close to TRL) or Warfield. Further exhibitions requested</p> <p>Location of exhibitions inappropriate</p> <p>Timing of exhibitions prohibited working population attending</p> <p>Areas for exhibitions were poor and cramped</p>	<p>The public exhibitions were held at a variety of locations across the Borough focusing on areas located near to the proposed sites. People were able to discuss any of the sites in the Preferred Option at any of the exhibitions. The location and timing of exhibitions were dependent upon venue availability at the time of booking.</p>
<p>Feeling from consultation exhibitions was that BFC is telling, rather than consulting, local residents about the plans</p>	<p>The format of the exhibitions were designed to be along the lines of an informal 'drop in' session. All the SADPD documentation was made available for inspection and planning officers were on hand to answer questions.</p>
<p>Do not find that feedback from previous consultation exercises (at meetings, and work done by Crowthorne Parish Council) has been incorporated into the preferred option</p>	<p>The Council published a summary of the main issues raised by respondents to the SADPD Issues and Options Consultation which took place between 26th February - 9th April 2010. As well as a summary of the main issues</p>

Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Residents views were not recorded/published following the public exhibitions</p> <p>No feedback forms were available at the public exhibitions</p>	<p>raised by respondents, the document included the Council's response to these. The document was one of a number of documents produced as supporting evidence to the SADPD Preferred Option Consultation. Copies of individual responses were available to view on the planning consultation portal pages.</p> <p>Urban Initiatives were employed by the Council to provide Urban Design and master planning support. Their final report was published as a supporting document to the SADPD PO and included feed back from a series of design workshops held during May 2010.</p> <p>The comments received form these consultations were used alongside other evidence to inform the preparation of the SADPD PO.</p> <p>A summary of the main issues raised at the exhibitions was prepared which will be used to inform the next stage of the SA DPD. In the future, the Council will ensure that this summary is published on the Councils website as soon as possible after the exhibition has taken place. Consideration will also be given to providing feedback forms at future exhibitions.</p>
<p>Attended a public exhibition in Crowthorne; found the information provided to be comprehensive and the Planning Officer helpful in answering questions</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Insufficient information available on developments at public exhibitions</p>	<p>The Council endeavoured to provide as much information as possible about the development sites under consideration. This included publication of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identified current an planned infrastructure provision and assessed the requirements arising from the development proposed in the Preferred Option consultation. Illustrative concept plans were also provided in the consultation documents. Further detail will be provided on</p>

Summary of main issues raised	Response
	the form and nature of the proposed development on sites when it is clearer which sites are likely to be allocated for development.
General	
The Council has made insufficient efforts to involve and engage with the local community regarding these proposed developments	There are no prescriptive requirements for consultation at the Preferred Option stage of DPD preparation. Regulation 25 of The Town & Country Planning (Local Development)(England)(Amendment) Regulations 2008 (Para. 3 & 4) only requires LA's to consider whether it is appropriate to invite representations from residents, and individuals carrying out a business in the area. It is left to the LA to decide what arrangements they consider to be appropriate. The Council considers that it has far exceeded the minimum statutory requirements for consultation.
<p>The Council is not being transparent: the strong impression is left that decisions have already been made but not within formal decision making meetings which are open to public scrutiny.</p> <p>Concerned at the speed with which proposals are progressing without giving people appropriate consultation</p>	<p>The process for the preparation of the SADPD is set down set by Government Legislation and advice contained in planning policy statements.</p> <p>The document must pass through the Council's Executive Committee process before being published for public consultation.</p> <p>In addition, the SADPD Executive Decision was called in by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Panel, prior to publication.</p> <p>Before being adopted as Council Policy, the SADPD will be subject to independent examination. The examination will test whether the SADPD meets all necessary legal requirements and whether the plan is sound i.e. Whether it is, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p>
The £1m spent on the planning process to date would be better spent on ensuring the regeneration of the town centre	Preparation of the Bracknell Forest Local Development Framework is a specialised process that is underpinned by an up-to-date evidence base. The technical and professional input into this evidence base is

Summary of main issues raised	Response
	normally provided by independent experts in a particular subject area e.g. landscape assessment. It is expensive and is required through out the LDF process.
3 consultations at once an unreasonable burden to members of the public	Noted
<p>The new Government is promoting the Localism Bill which includes more local involvement and accountability. Local communities should be able to shape their areas.</p> <p>What has happened to the Tory pledge of giving power back to the grass roots.</p>	<p>The Council is considering the implications of the Localism Bill in respect of neighbourhood planning. The draft Bill was published in December 2010 and is currently progressing through Parliament. Royal Assent is anticipated to be late 2011. The Government is currently consulting widely on the Bill and so there is likely to be significant changes made before the measures become law.</p>
<p>Wokingham BC has agreed to develop 2,500 houses within a few miles of TRL. There has been little consultation between Bracknell and Wokingham regarding the combined effect of both developments in terms of infrastructure, social and environmental.</p>	<p>The Council consults and engages in discussions with adjoining local authorities regarding development proposals. The development proposals in the SADPD have been developed with knowledge of the planned developments in neighbouring Boroughs – particularly the major development sites around Wokingham. Meetings have been held with Wokingham planning officers, and officers of other adjoining Boroughs to ensure that proper account is taken of relevant plans.</p>

2 Responses to 'SADPD Participation (Issues and Options Consultation) Feb - April 2010

Table 2.1 Responses to 'Summary of Responses to SADPD Participation (Options consultation) Feb-April 2010'

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
SHLAA sites 243, 246 and 247	
For comments on the Warfield Park Mobile Home site please refer to responses to comments on the Background Paper as the same comments were made in response to both documents.	See responses to Policy SA3.
Responses Document for SADPD participation Document	
Question 3 of the participation document how much land should be allocated for housing 1) sufficient to 2031 2) sufficient to 2026 and a reserve or 3) sufficient to 2026. The most favourable option was 3) with 61% in favour. The option 4) of allocating less than this was not put directly leaving only the option of responding via comment which does not provide the council with robust statistical evidence of the public view.	The Council is preparing a Site Allocations Document. In order for this to be found sound it must comply with the adopted Core Strategy (and the South East Plan as long as it remains in place). The Council is now basing its figures on the Core Strategy figure which is 2,000 lower than that in the South East Plan on the assumption that regional strategies will have been abolished by the time the Site Allocations document comes to examination. The overall housing target for the Borough to 2026 cannot be changed through a Site Allocations document, the consultation question was therefore asking about different ways of achieving the target. Any adjustment to the level of development required can be made through the planned review of the Core Strategy.
In other cases, where a wider option of answers was permitted, the preferred choice was not dismissed as impractical. For example Question 32: How many houses in the town centre? The favoured preference (by	The Site Allocations needs to be based on a realistic assessment of what land is actually available and likely to come forward for development during the plan period. On current evidence there is little prospect of achieving more than 1,000. However, the

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
73% of respondents) of Option 1 (more than 1000) has been dismissed out of hand.	Council will continue to seek sustainable town centre sites for housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 and the results of the consultation.

3 Responses to 'Preferred Options Background Paper'

Table 3.1 Responses to 'Preferred Option Background Paper'.

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
There is no consistency as to how sites have been put forward, some sites which achieved low scores in the initial assessment have been put forward whilst other more suitable sites have been removed.	The site which scored best overall has had to be withdrawn from consideration as the landowner decided that it would not be available for housing development during the period of the plan.
Binfield is no more sustainable than the other, rejected, locations until the infrastructure is provided, so why have the other locations not been chosen?	The rationale for the selection or rejection of the sites is set out in the document. The major sites proposed around Binfield fit with the Council's strategy of providing required housing through extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements, Bracknell and Crowthorne.
Paragraph 1.2.1 (supporting documents)	
Character Areas Assessment SPD does not cover TRL site.	There are many parts of the Borough not covered by the Character Areas Assessment SPD, including the TRL site.
Evidence is based on out of date information.	See responses to the individual evidence base documents, and to Section 2 'Housing'.
Too many documents to read/confusing.	See responses to 'How to get involved'.
Documents do not have numbered pages.	Noted.
The same criteria has not been used to assess all of the Broad Areas.	Without the identification of any specific instances of this it is hard to respond. The sites in this document are all analysed according to the same set of considerations.
Paragraphs 2.1.21 - 2.1.26	
Would like to know whether the assumptions regarding household size/ make up, employment growth etc have been reviewed following the economic downturn and weakened housing market	The amount of growth planned for in the SA DPD accords with that in the adopted Core Strategy (which was found to be soundly based and fully justified at Examination). Further, much of the evidence which supports the housing requirement is not affected by

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	economic conditions and therefore the housing requirement that the Council is planning for is considered robust
More up to date household projections should be used.	In order to be sound the site allocations work has to be in conformity with the Core Strategy (taking account of the intention to abolish the regional strategy). There will be an opportunity to review the housing target through the review of the Core Strategy which is programmed to commence next year. The most recent CLG household projections do not indicate a significantly different rate of growth than that envisaged in the Core Strategy.
Paragraph 2.2.16	
Object to minimum density - in light of revisions to PPS3 this paragraph restricts the Borough's ability to make decisions on a case by case basis	While acknowledging that the national indicative minimum density of 30dph has now been removed from PPS3, there remains a national and local policy requirement to use land efficiently. This policy objective must be balanced against the need to respect the character of existing, neighbouring development. With this in mind, the indicative capacities of the sites in the SADPD are considered to be appropriate.
Densities of 30dph are too high - these should not be applied now that the national indicative minimum density has been removed from PPS3	
Section 2.4	
Pleased to see clarification on the current position on Gypsy and Traveller provision	Noted.
Section 2.5	
Object to the removal of a number of sites from the SADPD without a clear explanation of reasons	The rationale for exclusion of sites from the SADPD is set out in the Preferred Options Background Paper and follows the Council's consideration of all submitted sites through the SHLAA process, through sustainability appraisal and given the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2.
Decisions were not based on sound judgements	Without specific references it is not possible to respond to this comment.

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Pleased to see recognition of the importance of the land surrounding Warfield Park for biodiversity and settlement separation	Noted.
Section 2.1.26	
During the recession and economic slowdown the employment growth predictions are unrealistic.	Bracknell Forest continues to have relatively low levels of unemployment and correspondingly high levels of economic activity within its population. It should also be noted that the plan period lasts to 2026 and it is considered inappropriate to plan for the current economic downturn to last for that period based on experience of the timescale of previous economic cycles.
Section 4	
There has been minimal progress on the Town Centre Regeneration scheme, and the dissatisfaction with the Town centre and the lack of a night time economy need to be addressed.	The site allocations DPD has been progressed against the backdrop of the Council's key objective of securing the regeneration of the town centre, including a mix of uses that will stimulate the night-time economy. There are now some concrete signs of progress, particularly with commencement of the new foodstore at the northern end of the town centre.
SHLAA site 125: Land east of Longhill Road, Winkfield	
Would wish to see the potential presence of the rare green flowered helleborines noted in connection with this site	This comment has been added to the site survey proforma
SHLAA site 246: Land east of Warfield Park (land at Chavey Down Farm), Warfield	
Pleased to see preservation of the Chavey Down Farm House	Noted.
SHLAA site 251: White Gates, Mushroom Castle Lane, Winkfield	
Factual corrections to historical commentary	Noted.
SHLAA site 285: HFC Bank, North Street, Winkfield	

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Have no objection to the housing proposed at this site (application ref 10/00801/OUT) and presume this will help towards the target of homes within the Core Strategy; but wish to know what will happen to the 1.6ha strip of land adjacent to it which is not included in the housing development?	This application for 22 dwellings with access on to North Street, was approved with a legal agreement on the 8/7/11. The land referred to in the adjacent response is excluded from the application. It is currently ancillary open space used for recreational purposes by HFC Bank. The implementation of planning permission 10/000801/OUT would cause this land to revert to 'nil' use in planning terms which means that planning permission would be required to use it for any purpose.
SHLAA sites 251, 262, 292, and 125 (general)	
Welcome the recognition that Chavey Down is not a sustainable settlement; recent developments have taken their toll on local facilities and services	Noted.
Paragraph 2.8.1 and 2.8.2	
Concern expressed at the process of site selection since the Participation consultation and note that there are no Executive Members who represent the parish of Binfield, which is bearing the brunt of the development plans	The views of the community have been sought throughout preparation of the document and have been taken into consideration in selecting the preferred sites. Sustainability appraisal of the potential sites has been undertaken, and an extensive and robust evidence base has been gathered. These various inputs have been used to inform the Council's selection of the most appropriate sites for development.
Given that the Core Strategy identified sites in Warfield and Binfield, a 'southern or eastern arc' should be considered to spread more evenly development in the Borough	Despite the two sites identified in the Core Strategy, additional strategic urban extensions need to be identified to meet the Borough's housing needs. The rationale for selection of these sites is set out in the Preferred Options Background Paper. It should be noted that two strategic sites are proposed in Crowthorne, in the south of the Borough.
If it is the case that development must be concentrated in order to support the improvements to infrastructure, then it should be concentrated in the 'Northern Arc' where the basis for infrastructure improvements exists - not in Crowthorne.	See responses to Section 2 'Housing'. The rationale for selection of the SADPD sites is set out in the Preferred Options Background Paper, and has been informed by the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2, the SHLAA process and through

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Bracknell already extends further to the south than it does to the north, therefore new developments should be provided to the north so that they are closer to the town centre and further away from the SPA</p> <p>It is unfair that Binfield and Warfield will have to accommodate the bulk of new development - why have areas to the south of the Borough been removed from the SADPD?</p>	<p>sustainability assessment. The Council have identified two strategic sites in the south of the Borough, at Crowthorne.</p>
<p>Wonder why the Council excluded development on the other 4 sites previously consulted on, as would have given a more equal spread of development across the Borough</p> <p>There should be a fair and even distribution of development, spread across the wards in the Borough, as opposed to saturation of one or two areas</p>	<p>The previous consultation included 8 'Broad Areas' for growth, development of all of which would have far exceeded the housing requirements of the Borough. From these Broad Areas, 4 sites have been selected and the justification for this is set out in the Preferred Options Background Paper.</p>
Broad Area 1	
<p>Do not understand why BFBC have ignored the farm land south of Sandhurst - it seems counter intuitive to choose an existing social amenity (the Blue Mountain golf course) rather than farm land</p>	<p>The reasoning is set out in the Background Paper. In summary the Sandhurst site was in a significantly less accessible and sustainable location and would have been an extension to a less sustainable settlement than Blue Mountain which is an extension of the existing built up area of Bracknell.</p>
Thankful that this site not selected	Noted
Broad Area 2	
<p>Sites outside Crowthorne were found to be more suitable yet have not been allocated - object to this</p>	<p>Justification for the inclusion of land at Broadmoor as a new urban extension is given in the Section of this document that considers responses to Policy SA4 (Section 2.4; Tables 2.11 & 2.12). The rationale for this site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>The Broadmoor and TRL sites (Policies SA4 and SA5) were previously low on the list of preferred options; it is not clear why this has now changed.</p>	

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Not clear why Broadmoor site is preferred - if you apply the appropriate weightings then other sites should be ranked higher	
It is noted that there are small streams and ponds within the area which have an associated flood risk - therefore object to the development proposed on this site	
When assessing the accessibility of this area, the requirement to locate properties within 400m of a bus stop should not be used as bus services are run by a private company and cannot be guaranteed, plus for this reason they cannot be guaranteed at an affordable price by the Council	
Object to identification of this area as a preferred site, as it drains to Sandhurst STW (in contrast to advice from Thames Water which prefers development sites in the Borough to drain to either Bracknell or Ascot STW)	
Object to identification of this area due to the need to upgrade the retained fire station at Crowthorne, and given that developers are unlikely to contribute towards this in the current financial climate	
Broad Area 3	
The Broadmoor and TRL sites (Policies SA4 and SA5) were previously low on the list of preferred options; it is not clear why this has now changed.	Justification for the inclusion of land at TRL as a new urban extension is given in the Section of this document that considers responses to Policy SA5 (Section 2.4; Tables 2.13 & 2.14). The rationale for this site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Assurances should be given that the preference for the TRL site is not connected to Legal and General's role with the town centre redevelopment	
Support identification of TRL site as a preferred option, as it is brownfield, but with reservations regarding roads, schools and hospitals	

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The preference for the TRL site conflicts with the draft Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy which seek to preserve the gap between, and the separate identity of, Crowthorne and Bracknell	
When assessing the accessibility of this area, the requirement to locate properties within 400m of a bus stop should not be used as bus services are run by a private company and cannot be guaranteed, plus for this reason they cannot be guaranteed at an affordable price by the Council	
Object to identification of this area as a preferred site, as it drains to Sandhurst STW (in contrast to advice from Thames Water which prefers development sites in the Borough to drain to either Bracknell or Ascot STW)	
The Background Paper notes the findings of the SFRA that this site is situated on the lowest permeability soils in the Borough	
Object to identification of this area due to the need to upgrade the retained fire station at Crowthorne, and given that developers are unlikely to contribute towards this in the current financial climate	
Sites outside Crowthorne were found to be more suitable yet have not been allocated - object to this	
Broad Area 4	
Why is the presence of the SPA in the south of the Borough any more important than the wildlife, flora and fauna in and surrounding Binfield?	The SPA contains the nesting areas for ground nesting birds protected under a European nature conservation designation. This does not apply to the nature conservation interests of sites around Binfield.
Broad Area 5	

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Why is the presence of the SPA in the south of the Borough any more important than the wildlife, flora and fauna in and surrounding Binfield?	The SPA contains the nesting areas for ground nesting birds protected under a European nature conservation designation. This does not apply to the nature conservation interests of sites around Binfield.
Broad Area 7	
Support recognition for Chavey Down Pond, the Wildlife Heritage Site and the Ancient Woodland buffer in the 'impact on biodiversity' section	Noted
Broad Area 8	
Full contamination and land studies should be undertaken; it is likely that the remediation costs associated with making the land suitable for housing will render the site unviable	The majority of this broad area has had to be withdrawn from consideration as the landowner has decided that it will not be available for residential development during the plan period.
It is imperative that the vulnerable views from Long Hill Road and London Road together with the woodland character are protected to maintain separation between settlements	

Table 3.2

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General Comments	
The Secretary of State acted unlawful in revoking the South East Plan, therefore this plan should be working to the SEP housing target of 12,780 dwellings for 2006-2026.	See responses to Section 2 'Housing'.
SHLAA site 70: The Rough, New Road, Ascot	
Object to omission of this site as it would represent a logical 'rounding off' of the settlement boundary and is in a highly sustainable location with access to a wide range of facilities.	Justification for the exclusion of SHLAA site 70 is contained within the responses to Policy SA3.
SHLAA site 165: Land south of The Limes, Forest Road, Warfield	

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to omission of land at The Limes, Forest Road, Warfield - this site should be an additional site or a replacement for any other which is considered unsuitable. The site is well contained, forms a natural extension to the settlement, and is reasonably located in terms of facilities and transport</p>	<p>Justification for the exclusion of SHLAA site 165 is contained within the responses to Policy SA3.</p>
<p>SHLAA site 251: White Gates, Mushroom Castle Lane, Winkfield</p>	
<p>Access would be via land owned by the landowner to Carnation Drive and not via Mushroom Castle Lane. The Landowner are in control of the Covenant referred to in the Councils Response. The access arrangements are therefore achievable.</p>	<p>Justification for the exclusion of SHLAA site 251 is contained within the responses to Policy SA3.</p>
<p>Facilities in this part of Winkfield - The site directly adjoins a well equipped community centre, is within walking distance of two schools, playing fields, a restaurant, a number of small businesses with employment opportunities. There is a bus connecting Winkfield Row with the Tesco superstore at Warfield, Ascot and Bracknell.</p>	
<p>The size of the site offers an opportunity to expand the community facilities serving the village.</p>	
<p>The size of the site would also enable the introduction of affordable housing to the village.</p>	
<p>Object that a significant feature of the area is the contrast between ribbon development and open landscape.</p>	
<p>Site 251 does not contribute to notably to the physical separation between Winkfield Row and Bracknell. In addition the site would only be partially apparent when viewed from view points within the vicinity.</p>	
<p>In addition the site benefits from a strong woodland boundary to its west helping to ensure development will not appear to intrude into the countryside.</p>	

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
SHLAA sites 243, 246 and 247	
<p>The Warfield Park Mobile Home site is an established, sustainable settlement which, by dint of its low cost nature, cannot be located inside the settlement boundary. Therefore it should not be assessed in the same way as the other 'edge of settlement' sites. However if one, reasonably, views Warfield Park as a residential settlement, all the sites put forward (243, 246, 247) meet the criteria in paragraph 2.7.2 for edge of settlement sites - either as rounding off sites or limited extensions</p>	<p>Justification for the exclusion of SHLAA sites 243, 246 and 247 (Warfield Park Mobile Home site) is contained within the responses to Policy SA3.</p>
<p>Sites 243, 264 and 247 should be allocated to meet the need and demand for low cost market housing, in order to accord with PPS3 and Policy CS16 which plan for an appropriate mix of housing (including low cost market housing) in the Borough</p>	
<p>The Core Strategy Inspector's report acknowledges that CS9 can be applied flexibly when considering established mobile home parks</p>	
<p>Do not accept, as a reason for exclusion of the site, that it would form an encroachment into the countryside - as all edge of settlement allocations will do this, by their very nature</p>	
<p>Query where the criterion for determining edge of settlement sites (paragraph 2.7.2) has come from, as it is not contained within the adopted Core Strategy</p>	
<p>Interpreting this criteria in relation to Warfield Park, the western fringes would accord with No.3 Limited extension of the settlement boundary</p>	
<p>If Warfield Park was to be accepted as a residential settlement then sites 243, 246 & 247 would meet 2.7 criteria (246 rounding off, 243 & 247 limited extensions</p>	

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Park homes provide low cost market housing in accordance with PPS3 and are popular with low paid and key workers, and the elderly (which in turn frees up family housing in the mainstream market).</p>	
<p>In not identifying the need for new park home development in the SADPD, the document is unsound in relation to the requirements of PPS3 and of the Core Strategy</p>	
<p>The park can only deliver a relatively small number of pitches from within the park, without affecting the intrinsic character of the park. In line with the new localism agenda, the Warfield Park (Neighbourhood) Assembly has expressed support for extension to, rather than intensification of, the Park to accommodate demand</p>	
<p>Our preferred site for extension, 246, would result in a net gain in woodland, rather than a loss, as a result of the proposed screen planting</p>	
<p>Tree loss would be minimised through the development of sites 243 and 247 (as park homes can more sensitively be accommodated in a woodland setting) and replacement trees would be planted. Furthermore, extension of the Park would allow for implementation of a Woodland Management Plan for the remainder of the Park to maximise the benefits of future management</p>	
<p>There is an urgent need to upgrade the Park with utilities infrastructure, which could be funded by the income generated by expansion of the Park. This would accord with the principles set out in the LID SPD</p>	
<p>Sites 246 and 247 are excluded, in part, for their designation within Policies EN4 and EN14. Neither of these policies preclude development and ecological surveys would</p>	

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>be undertaken to establish the ecological value of each site and how this might be protected and/or mitigated</p>	
<p>The Council should give proper consideration of the merits of park home development. Not to do so would put park home developers at a competitive disadvantage compared to other house builders because they can't afford the sites within defined settlements.</p>	

4 Responses to 'Strategic Flood Risk Assessment'

No responses to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment were made.

5 Responses to ' Employment Land Review'

Table 5.1 Responses to 'Employment Land Review'.

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The growth forecasts in the report are difficult to comprehend given that Bracknell has a weak office identity due to the lack of shopping and leisure facilities. The Council is relying on regeneration of the town centre to provide the infrastructure to support this "necessary" development, but there has been minimal progress on this since 2002 and so the result will be a Borough of commuters (putting the road system under severe pressure) or a Borough of benefit claimants as there are no jobs locally</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring it forward despite the difficult economic climate.</p> <p>In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration.</p> <p>The past few months have seen significant steps forward in realising plans to regenerate the town centre. Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site, work has already started on site. Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases</p>
<p>The Borough cannot support this number of new houses as the employment opportunities are not sufficient and the office buildings are not of sufficient quality.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Review shows that there is currently an over supply of employment land in the Borough and that there is not significant problem in terms of quality of the existing office stock.</p> <p>Latest estimates show that the number of jobs still exceeds the number of workers living in the Borough (see Bracknell Forest HMA).</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Employment growth may not occur and then Bracknell will become a town of commuters which will add to the transport problems in the area.</p>	<p>The plan covers the plan period (up to 2026) economic circumstance will change throughout this time and the Site Allocations Development Plan document supports growth over the plan period.</p>

6 Responses to 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Monitoring Report 2010'

Table 6.1 Responses to 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Monitoring Report 2010'.

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
SLHLAA site 285: HFC Bank, North Street, Winkfield	
Object to the site having a suitability rating of C - it is not clear how this has been reached. Whilst the site is within the Green Belt it is also previously developed land and adjacent to an existing village.	The criteria used by the Council to assess site suitability is based on guidance in the Government's Strategic Housing Land Availability Practice Guide 2007. The Guide suggests a set of factors that should be considered to assess a site's suitability for housing. The factors include planning policy restrictions, physical problems/limitations such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions and flood risk. In terms of policy restrictions the Council has taken a policies off approach. The only exceptions are whether or not land is inside or outside defined settlement boundaries and whether the site is inside or outside the Green Belt. With regards to physical problems/limitations, potential impacts and environmental conditions, the Council used a variety of resources including 'Local View' data and the Council's Geographical Information System.
Object to the designation of Winkfield as an unsustainable settlement and to the methodology for assessing sites which is very crude.	<p>The Council has classified existing settlements in the Borough as sustainable or unsustainable using the definition in paragraph 4.5 of the SHLAA 2008. This defines a sustainable settlement as a neighbourhood that contains at least five of the following facilities:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convenience store • Community hall • primary school • library

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public house • post office/banking facility • doctors surgery • dental practice
Object to the site not being allocated for housing.	The site was not considered for allocation in the SADPD as it is in the Green Belt and SHLAA indicated that there was sufficient land to meet the Borough's development needs without looking at sites in the Green Belt.

7 Responses to 'Landscape Capacity Study'

Table 7.1 Responses to 'Landscape Capacity Study'

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The southern part of Area 4A2, which forms the Amen Corner North site, contains woodlands and private gardens which provide a physical and visual separation between the northern and southern areas of Area 4A2. As such the intervisibility between this part of Area 4A2 and Binfield is insignificant.	Agreed. This visual separation is however very important and should not be eroded.
The study states that there are long distance views to Wokingham from Murrell Hill Lane, but these are across countryside and of scattered farmsteads, rather than the built up area of Wokingham itself (which is not visible from within the southern part of Area 4A2)	Agreed. This visual separation is however very important and should not be eroded.
The overall capacity of Area 4A2 is described as moderate although the capacity of the area south of Blackman's Copse is acknowledged as being in poorer condition. This part therefore has more capacity to accept development	Agreed.
Broadmoor (on behalf of owners of site, West London Mental Health Trust)	
A methodology should be included so that it can be assessed if the conclusion of landscape sensitivity and capacity have been appropriately assessed.	The methodology is set out in the Introduction and Methodology April 2010 accompanying the Landscape Capacity Study
This area is dominated by the existing hospital including historic buildings, gardens and significant modern built development which is not reflected in the summary analysis.	This section - Initial analysis - is extracted from the Preliminary Report January 2010 which sought to identify the following, as a precursor to the more detailed work:
The text summary under Area 2A should be revised to record some landscape constraints as opposed to significant landscape constraints as currently drafted.	1. Identification of each cluster study area boundary – based on submissions to the SHLAA; indicative mapping form BFC; and boundary features on the ground (from aerial photographs)

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>2. Summary of key landscape characteristics based on local knowledge, the BLCA and Entec Study, the BCAA and aerial photographs</p> <p>3. The landscape value attached to the area – Entec Study</p> <p>4. The contribution of the landscape to the open rural character of the local gaps and to forming the separate identity of the adjacent towns and villages</p> <p>5. The role of the landscape in contributing to the character of the settlement as identified in the BCAA</p> <p>6. Any known or readily identifiable historic landscape value.</p> <p>More detailed analysis followed in the Main Report.</p>
<p>The text at point 3 also omits reference to the existing hospital as a "key feature" and should also acknowledge that the planned gardens only partially remain.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the existing hospital is a key feature of the area. Point 3 highlights the most important landscape feature contributing to a moderate landscape sensitivity</p>
<p>There is no strategic gap in the Core Strategy and point 4 should be deleted. The Inspectors report following the Examination of the draft Core Strategy confirmed there was no need for a strategic gap designation in the vicinity of Braodmoor Hospital. This is recognised in the adopted Core Strategy. This also applies to Area 2 B and Area 2 C item 4.</p>	<p>Agreed. However the LCS did not factor in the role of Areas A and C as part of a gap in reaching an assessment of their landscape capacity. The LCS recognises that the land within the gap lies in the most southerly part of Area B which falls outside of the SA4 area.</p>
<p>(Third page of Broadmoor text) Area 2A The reference to key landscape characteristics prior to the bullet points in the second paragraph should be revised to read "Key landscape characteristics which would be vulnerable to inappropriate development are" The same point also applies to key visual features.</p>	<p>Development will be 'inappropriate' if it gives rise to unacceptable harm to these key characteristics. The sentence does not preclude development – only provides a test.</p> <p>Action: Retain existing wording.</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>In the recommendations section to the detailed assessment of Area 2A the second sentence should be revised to reflect the significance of the built environment and be reworded to say "However, it is a largely built up area as part of the operational hospital and provided the heritage features of the area are respected, some new development may be possible."</p>	<p>Much of the area is not built up at present and in the interests of accuracy 'partly' should be retained. Agree to inclusion of 'as part of the operational hospital'. Retain existing wording from 'provided' to the end. As important historic features they should 'enhanced' as well as 'respected'. This need not be inconsistent with development.</p> <p>Action: Retain existing wording.</p>
<p>The reference to key landscape characteristics prior to the bullet points in the second paragraph should be revised to read " Key landscape characteristics which would be vulnerable to inappropriate development are". This reflects the conclusion that his area has some capacity for development. Similarly under key visual features, this should be revised to read "Key visual features and views which would be vulnerable to inappropriate development are."</p>	<p>Development will be 'inappropriate' if it gives rise to unacceptable harm to these key characteristics. The sentence does not preclude development – only provides a test.</p> <p>Action: Retain existing wording.</p>
<p>Under "scope for mitigation" text should be revised to reflect the fact that there is already some development and infrastructure and that some additional development could be accommodated provided this is carefully sited and designed.</p>	<p>Agree to proposed change to wording with the addition of 'Any proposals development must also maintain the current open heathland and parkland character of the area and meet the objectives of policy CS9.</p>
<p>We suggest the following amendments to bullet 1 " Although it is recognised that the extensive tree cover will screen development, the introduction of additional built form could erode the landscape value of the area and significantly affect the landscape character unless carefully sited and designed.</p>	
<p>The conclusion in bullet point 2 that planting and land modelling would adversely affect the landscape character of this area is not supported by any evidence. This area already contains numerous woodland blocks,</p>	<p>This bullet point is concerned with controlling the inappropriate use of screening as a mitigation measure. Any proposals for development should demonstrate that they respect and enhance the landscape and</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>vegetation belts and is topographically varied and provided that these characteristics are understood, there is no reason why new planting and localised variations in topography would significantly change the existing landscape character. We suggest this point is omitted or revised as follows "Screen planting, land modelling and other forms of screening should be appropriate to the scale and character of the area and avoid the loss of important views."</p>	<p>historic character in their own right. Suggest change 'would' to 'could' and add: 'Landscape proposals should demonstrate that they will conserve and enhance the landscape and historic features of the area'.</p>
<p>The conclusions are not supported by the detailed assessment which makes no reference to the areas significant contribution to the rural setting of the Blackwater Valley or that the area is an important local landmark. We suggest these conclusions are revised to reflect the character and context of the area as described and suggest the following alternative wording:</p> <p>"This area is sensitive to significant built development and the priority should be to retain the existing character of open pasture with woodland enclosure and long distance views. The landscape has a low capacity for development but could accommodate some additional development and land use change provided this is sensitively sited and designed. The landscape capacity is therefore low to moderate."</p>	<p>Agree to omit reference to Blackwater Valley. Revise text to: 'the rural wider setting of the forests and heaths'. No change to 'local landscape' which is borne out in the assessment.</p> <p>The purposes of the landscape capacity study is to identify the landscape capacity to accommodate strategic housing. On this basis the character of the area and its importance and sensitivity the landscape capacity has been correctly assessed as low. However low capacity does not preclude development proposals for individual small scale developments which are appropriate in their use, scale, siting and design.</p>

8 Responses to ' Draft Housing Market Assessment'

Table 8.1 Responses to 'Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment'.

Residents Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The percentage of affordable homes and homes for the elderly should be increased to 40-42% as there is a big demand from people who are unable to buy a home.</p>	<p>The Council's affordable housing policy is not being reviewed through this document. It currently draws upon PPS3 (site threshold) and saved Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan Policy H8. Para 5.61 of the BFBLP suggests that a minimum of 20% of dwellings should be affordable. The Council's Housing Strategy refers to a maximum of 25%. The amount provided is subject to viability testing.</p> <p>Whilst affordable housing can include housing for elderly people, a proportion will also be provided by the private sector.</p>
<p>In proposing to provide so many 2+ bedroom homes for single person households, the Council's thinking is flawed because these households won't be able to afford mortgages for properties of this size/price.</p>	<p>It is accepted that, in common with many other areas in the locality, more housing need is evident than can be addressed through the delivery of new affordable housing. The Council therefore has to prioritise those who are to be assisted. For the remainder who are unable to access home ownership on the basis of their household incomes, the private rented sector plays an important role. There is evidence that there will be further growth of this sector over the next few years.</p>
<p>Conflict between data in SHMA which states that of the 13,000 houses required 9,000 are needed for lone households. However the council plans are based on building 6,000 new properties of 2 or more bedrooms. The information in SHMA shows that it would be difficult for a lone household to buy anything bigger than a 2 bedroom unit.</p>	<p>Household size and dwelling size do not have a direct relationship. Patterns of occupancy and demand for different sized homes can reflect income, wealth, and life stage rather than household size. However, indicative estimates of the types of dwellings that might be required are useful in providing guidance and an indication of future needs.</p> <p>The 2008 based household estimates show an increase of 9,600 households involving one person households and lone parent households between 2006 and 2026. Data from the Survey of English Housing indicates</p>

Residents Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>how different types of households are currently housed and has been applied to the forecast change in the numbers of different households to produce a possible indication of the size of property that new households are likely to occupy, by type of household, if growth in these types of households is achieved as expected. This suggests that just over 9,000 households will require 2 bed or more dwellings. The issue of affordability is outlined in the previous response.</p>

9 Responses to 'Phase 1 Ecological Surveys'

No responses to the Phase 1 Ecological Surveys were made.

10 Responses to 'Master Planning Support'

Table 10.1 Responses to 'Master Planning Support'.

Paragraph Number	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Sandhurst meeting	The concerns raised at this meeting have been ignored in the existing proposals, with no address of the issues and concerns that have been raised.	<p>The concerns raised were registered and reported as part of the process of producing the Preferred Option. However, in meeting the Borough's needs for development it is not possible to meet all the concerns raised by residents. For the reasons set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option and the Sustainability Appraisal the Council considered the site allocations set out in the Preferred Option to be the most appropriate in light of the available evidence.</p> <p>These comments were also expressed by a local amenity group (CVAG), whose comments are set out in section: 17 'Specific Consultee Comments'</p>

11 Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan'

Table 11.1 Responses to 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan'.

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Funding of proposals is most important factor in terms of viability; however the IDP acknowledges funding gaps and so viability of the preferred option sites 'dribbles away in failure'.</p>	<p>Not every item of infrastructure in the IDP is absolutely essential to make a site 'viable', for instance higher priority for allocating funds will go towards items that could be considered as 'show stoppers' if they were not delivered, e.g. school places and transport improvements.</p> <p>Whilst every effort will be made to secure necessary infrastructure, it is acknowledged there will be gaps as a result of finite resources being available on both sides – developers and service providers.</p> <p>A purpose of the IDP is to flag up any potential issues at this early stage so that funding gaps can be addressed to maximise the amount of deliverable infrastructure.</p>
<p>Various improvements to infrastructure were promised for Jennett's Park, none of which have materialised so have no confidence that the appropriate infrastructure will be put in place.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision in a development is often 'phased' - provided incrementally throughout the build. These 'trigger points' might be determined for instance by housing completions which have recently slowed due to the recession – something outside planning control. The knock-on effect has meant the provision of certain infrastructure has been delayed. Examples of this are the recently completed A329 link road and the Jennett's Park primary school, which for reasons as described have been slow in coming forward.</p> <p>Although a place for a doctor's surgery was provided for at Jennett's Park, it was subsequently determined by the PCT that resources would be better directed at existing GP surgeries and Bracknell's new health facility that would be able to serve Jennett's</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Park's residents. This again was beyond the control of planning, more as a result of the PCT's model for providing primary health care.
Would like to see the Infrastructure Delivery Plan when produced.	Progress on the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD) and its supporting documents, which includes the IDP, will be displayed on the Council's SADPD website. Contacts on the SADPD database will also be notified of forthcoming consultations on the document.
Would like to see additional health centre and GPs and funding for services such district nursing and health visiting.	<p>The Primary Care Trust (PCT) was consulted in the development of the IDP. Their requirements are outlined in the 'General infrastructure requirements' infrastructure schedule. As more information emerges, the IDP will be updated.</p> <p>On top of Bracknell Forest's 13 GP practices with 54 GPs, Bracknell is seeing significant investment in healthcare. Berkshire East PCT is delivering Bracknell's new health facility which has recently been given planning permission and is anticipated to be complete by the end of 2012 and operational early 2013, and the Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust is developing specialist cancer and renal services at Brant's Bridge.</p> <p>With regards additional funding for district nursing and health visiting, this is beyond the remit of the IDP and is something to take up with the relevant health authority.</p>
How can the delivery of infrastructure required for the scale of development proposed be guaranteed in the current climate of spending cuts?	<p>The delivery of every item of infrastructure required can not be guaranteed. Despite spending cuts, there is still a need for housing that relies on infrastructure to make them sustainable.</p> <p>Whilst every effort will be made to secure necessary infrastructure, it is acknowledged there will be gaps as a result of finite resources being available. Certain items of infrastructure might have to be prioritised.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	A purpose of the IDP however, is to flag up any potential issues at this early stage so that funding gaps can be addressed to maximise the amount of deliverable infrastructure.
Infrastructure must be delivered before construction of housing can begin.	It is often neither financially viable or practical to put in place all necessary infrastructure before construction begins. Some items, such as access roads and school facilities, to keep apace of demand, might be required in the early stages, whereas it might only be possible to put in place open space in the latter stages of development once spoil heaps are levelled and builder's compounds removed.
The infrastructure requirements are significant and involve matters outside the Council's control. They are highly unlikely to happen in the current economic climate.	It is agreed a significant amount of infrastructure from numerous stakeholders is needed to support development. In a time of recession, the IDP plays an important role in flagging up any potential issues at this early stage so that funding gaps can be addressed to maximise the amount of deliverable infrastructure.
How will the Council phase development so that school places are available at the correct time?	<p>The demand for school places will be forecast based on an assumed yield per dwelling type and for actual applications as and when they are received. The actual pupil numbers will be calculated by applying this yield to the developers' build programmes which will be regularly monitored and reviewed by the Council.</p> <p>The commissioning of the new schools and expansion of existing schools will be aligned to meet this demand and the provision of appropriate contributions from developers will be made conditions of planning permission being granted.</p>
The Council admits that not all the traffic assessments have been done. How can proper proposals be drawn up in the absence of this information?	Extensive background work was conducted that guided the SADPD's development. Now, more detailed transport modelling work has been finalised in conjunction with Wokingham Borough Council. The highway schemes to

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	emerge will be presented in the IDP, whilst the detailed report will be available as a background document to the SADPD.
Traffic components have been over simplified and ignores known bottlenecks.	These known bottlenecks are a result of traffic not being controlled properly as it enters the Borough. The listed improvements, along our main corridors will take this into account along with the implementation of our Intelligent Transport Systems policy and the development of our Urban Traffic Control strategy.
The IDP should take account of the cumulative impacts of development proposed at Warfield (SA9), Binfield (SA6 & 7), Wokingham (at Buckhurst Farm) and Crowthorne (SA4 & 5).	When drawing up infrastructure requirements for each site in the IDP, service providers have considered the cumulative impact of planned development in the area.
High speed internet connection for the Binfield and North Bracknell area should be considered as part of the IDP.	<p>High Speed broadband is both good for the borough's economy and facilitates working from home which can help reduce traffic. Whilst we cannot insist on its installation, as it is not a planning consideration, the IDP will be amended to encourage developers, in conjunction with the service provider, to install fibre optic links from each house in the new developments up to the High Speed Broadband exchange that is soon to be upgraded in the borough.</p> <p>ACTION: Insert reference to High Speed Broadband under 'Telecommunications' in the IDP's infrastructure schedule.</p>
Appears that key aspects are down for developer to decide, onerous responsibility for the delivery of the IDP is misjudged. For example, need for sprinklers is either pay for enhanced facilities for Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue or fit sprinklers into housing (which would encounter a variety of issues).	Whilst some fire prevention and fire safety measures in new buildings to accord with Building Regulations are non-negotiable, the installation of water sprinklers in new homes is a recommendation to developers. Developer contributions to improve RBFRS facilities will need to be justified by the service and subject to infrastructure prioritisation based on development viability.

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>How do BFBC intend to cope with c25% increase in waste disposal. There should be a thorough explanation of how BFBC intends to deal with the waste from an additional 25,000 people, yet still meet its green targets to avoid EU fines.</p>	<p>The new kerb-side waste collection contract has considered planned growth to enable flexibility in order to adapt to borough growth.</p> <p>In accordance with requirements listed in the IDP, developers will be expected to integrate recycling facilities into site plans.</p> <p>The Waste Management department at the Council was consulted throughout the production of the IDP. They have informed that Bracknell Forest is below the waste threshold for the re3 partnership, anticipating sufficient capacity to accommodate growth.</p>
<p>New housing, employment, retail and infrastructure are dependant upon the Council delivering the Town Centre renovations. It has taken several years to make minimal progress and there is very little evidence that this will be done (reference made to announcements on the Council's web page and Retail Study).</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring it forward despite the difficult economic climate.</p> <p>In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration.</p> <p>The past few months have seen significant steps forward in realising plans to regenerate the town centre. Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site, work has already started on site. Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases.</p>
<p>Policy SA5 - Traffic calming measures will be required along Hatch Ride, Maple Drive, Rowan Drive, Ellis Road and Pinewood</p>	<p>Detailed transport modelling work has been carried out to understand what transport improvements are required to mitigate the</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Avenue as these are already used as short cuts during peak times - the IDP should reflect this	impact of development and the effect junction improvements will have on route switching. Identified schemes will be included in the IDP Draft Submission document.
Policy SA5 - Major services like Fire and Police should be maintained at at least their current levels and should be described as 'necessary' for the development in the IDP	<p>The Risk classification should be considered as an infrastructure rank order. Infrastructure in the IDP should all be considered as 'necessary' for a development to go ahead, however with finite resources available this could be a way of prioritising contributions.</p> <p>The IDP's layout will be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>The Fire and Rescue and Police service have identified the need to enhance local services in order to maintain existing service levels. This is likely to require partnership work with developers to ensure their requirements are accounted for in site plans, and where developer contributions are sought, this will require justification by the service providers from a robust evidence base.</p>
Definitions such as 'importance of delivery' and 'risk' should be applied to individual schemes, rather than groups of infrastructure.	<p>The format of the IDP Draft Submission document will be amended to address this.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend format of infrastructure schedules.</p>

Table 11.2 Developer Responses to 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan'.

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
West London Mental Health NHS Trust (Broadmoor)	
Given the methodology, contributions to M4 J10 from Broadmoor development would not be justified, although with more evidence from the HA detailing improvements to M3 J3, such contributions may be justified.	Transport Assessments submitted by developers in support of development will need to consider the impact of increased trips on Bracknell Forest's transport network and key SRN junctions. Subject to suitable evidence being provided by the HA, the Council will

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	consider seeking contributions from developers. In this case, M3 J3 is the principal SRN junction of concern.
The new relief road will result in reduced traffic movements to Crowthorne – such circumstances will need to be regularly updated in IDP monitoring.	Only the proposed Medi-park will be accessed from Foresters Way. The proposed residential development will have access from the existing road network linking to Crowthorne.
Page 9 – Table 1.1 should be amended to add 'West London Mental Health NHS Trust' as a delivery agency for Early Years provision.	Table will be amended accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Early Years' template to add 'West London Mental Health NHS Trust' as a delivery agency for Early Years provision.
Table 4.13 should be amended to include "The Squirrels" at Broadmoor under Early Years – Existing Provision.	Table will be amended accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Early Years' template to include "The Squirrels" at Broadmoor under Early Years – Existing Provision.
No objection to scheme: 1) Converting South Road to footway/cycleway and connecting to Owlsmoor via Toucan Crossing – however there may be conflict with ecology/biodiversity interests and the need for artificial lighting to support the cycleway/footpath conversion.	Meetings have been held with the Council's Biodiversity Officers to discuss upgrading the link to ensure minimum impact on the ecology of the area.
Table 4.13, p 57 - should be amended to refer to the "replacement facility for The Squirrels" under Early Years – Planned Provision.	Table will be amended accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Early Years' template to refer to the "replacement facility for The Squirrels" under Early Years – Planned Provision.
Replacement of Workplace Nursery will increase existing capacity by 50% with open access to whole community – therefore may be eligible for contributions from other developments.	Noted. Where it can be demonstrated that there is insufficient capacity for nursery facilities in the locality and it meets legal tests, contributions may be justified. However, developer funding should only be sought where there are funding gaps, once all other funding streams have been exhausted.

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Amend to add 'West London Mental Health NHS Trust' as a delivery agency for Mental Health provision.	Table will be amended accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Acute Care / General Hospitals & Mental Health Provision' template to add 'West London Mental Health NHS Trust' as a delivery agency for Mental Health provision.
Reference to Broadmoor Hospital should be included under Existing Provision, stating: "West London Mental Health NHS Trust is the service provider for secure mental health services at Broadmoor Hospital, the hospital including the whole of Bracknell Borough within its catchment".	Table will be amended accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Acute Care / General Hospitals & Mental Health Provision' template to include "West London Mental Health NHS Trust is the service provider for secure mental health services at Broadmoor Hospital, which includes the whole of Bracknell Forest within its catchment" under 'Existing Provision'.
For Mental Health Provision, add: "West London Mental Health NHS Trust is making provision for a replacement hospital at Broadmoor to meet the requirements of the Commission for Health Improvement (CHI) and this is provided for in Policy SA4 of the Site Allocations – DPD."	Amendments will be made accordingly. ACTION: Amend 'Acute Care / General Hospitals & Mental Health Provision' template to include "West London Mental Health NHS Trust is making provision for a replacement hospital at Broadmoor to meet the requirements of the Commission for Health Improvement (CHI) and this is provided for in SADPD Policy SA4" under 'Existing Provision'.
Ref. Acute Care / General Hospitals & Mental Health Provision: No site specific requirements. Widely recognised that the existing nationally important mental health facility needs replacing.	Amendments will be made accordingly. ACTION: 'Infrastructure Required' under 'Acute Care / General Hospitals & Mental Health Provision' in the 'General Infrastructure Requirements' schedule in the IDP Draft Submission document will be amended to read "None Identified – existing mental health facility will be replaced on-site as part of sites redevelopment".

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Ref. Public Art: Without clarity of methodology and justification for contribution, the Trust does not consider this approach sound, fair or reasonable. The Trust would expect to provide “Public Art” as part of redevelopment rather than direct contribution to LPA.</p>	<p>The Public Art requirement is a guideline in accordance with ‘A percent for art: a review. The Council would prefer Public Art to be provided in kind by the developer, rather than as a financial contribution to the LPA. To clarify, amendments will be made.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend the 'Public Art' section in the 'General Infrastructure Requirements' schedule in the IDP Draft Submission document to read: "On site in kind contribution of Public Art, negotiated on a site-by-site basis from a starting point of 1% of the gross development cost (excluding land value), excluding incidental costs, subject to viability. Public Art should be freely accessible in or fronting the public realm".</p>
<p>Legal and General (TRL)</p>	
<p>The document is considered to be too detailed and prescriptive - details should be determined at the planning application stage once the nature of the development is clearer.</p>	<p>In accordance with PPS12, “the infrastructure planning process should identify, as far as possible: ...infrastructure needs and costs”. Where information has been provided by the service provider, this has been included in the IDP. A stated in Para 5.3.11 of the SADPD Preferred Options document “identifying requirements at this early stage in the planning process should help to ensure that they are built into developers’ plans and financial models and avoid unrealistic expectations of development land values”. At the planning application stage, when more details of development and infrastructure have been drawn together “it may still be necessary in exceptional cases to prioritise essential infrastructure requirements and allow some flexibility on certain less critical aspects to enable necessary developments to come forward”.</p>
<p>Section 4.1.1 pg 17 and section 6.2 pg 134</p>	<p>BFC has created peak hour versions of the Bracknell Forest Multi-Modal Transport Model (BFMMTM) that include planned and windfall</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that the transport improvements listed are related to the TRL development - strategic road network, local road network, public transport, footpaths and cycleways.</p>	<p>development in the Borough. The models include a number of the highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all development that is envisaged up to the year 2026. Others will be determined as the location of the final new housing developments planned for the period are finally decided.</p> <p>Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from developments.</p> <p>BFC is considering updating its supplementary planning guidance regarding development-related transport contributions that will specify the level of contribution required per net increase in trips at the development site. The developer will also be required to fully implement all highways and transport improvements that are necessary in planning terms for the implementation and operation of the development itself.</p> <p>The transport improvement works, for which developer contributions will be sought, will be determined by taking account of the spatial and temporal distribution of the proposed, planned and windfall developments. They will also consider their relative impact at the locations of the improvements, and will be guided by the outputs of the BFMSTM runs.</p>
<p>Whilst it is accepted that some local road network improvements will be necessary, all of the improvements listed as "critical" are unlikely to be required to mitigate TRL's impact.</p>	<p>Bracknell Forest's Transport Model shows what highway improvements will be required for the Borough's local road network to operate effectively over the Plan period. In conjunction with any Transport Assessment that accompanies a planning application, it will then be determined what improvements are required to mitigate the impact of TRL development.</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The IDP will be amended to reflect this – rigid categorisation, e.g. critical, necessary, preferred, will no longer be used.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend format of infrastructure schedules.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 pg 134</p> <p>Although there is some recognition of the benefits of co-located/co-provided community infrastructure, bespoke dedicated facilities are referred to in respect of early years and youth facilities. The information currently available does not justify such a prescribed detailed approach at this stage - should wait until the planning application stage.</p>	<p>It is important to consider infrastructure needed to support sites from the outset. Not only does it inform developers at the earliest stage what might be expected - inviting comment, it also serves to flag up future pressures on service areas, within Bracknell Forest and across boundaries, so that any issues such as funding gaps can be addressed.</p> <p>Following discussions with community service providers to consider more viable ways of providing community services, the Council will pursue a multi-functional community facility model in the SADPD. This is reflected in 'Community Infrastructure' requirements on Land at TRL, in the IDP Draft Submission document.</p>
<p>IDP should be amended to allow details to be determined only when details of the development proposal have been confirmed through the planning application process. LID already prescribes a detailed approach.</p>	<p>The IDP should endeavour to provide as much detail as possible to inform site viability at this stage. However the document will remain 'live' so that it can be updated when new information emerges.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of development up to 2026 requires holistic, bespoke, phased infrastructure solutions, often requiring more up-to-date evidence than that in LID. Additionally, the IDP will be used to inform CIL charging schedule contributions that will come into effect around 2014.</p>
<p>There is no evidence to indicate that improvements to J10 M4 and J3 M3 would be “necessary” to impact of TRL development.</p>	<p>Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications in support of development will need to consider Bracknell Forest's Transport Modelling work and the impact of additional trips on key SRN junctions.</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Subject to the impact and suitable evidence being provided by the HA, the Council will consider seeking contributions from developers.
Detail of Built Sports & Emergency Services provision, and Community Centre costings are more detailed and prescribed than justified at this stage.	The IDP should endeavour to provide as much detail as possible to inform site viability at this stage. However the document will remain 'live' so that it can be updated when new information emerges.
IDP's approach is too prescriptive in relation to education requirements. Too early to tell what size of school is required. SADPD – Policy SA5 [and IDP site schedule] should be amended to refer to a “suitably-sized primary school” rather than a “2 FE primary school”.	<p>Agreed. Specific sizes of schools will be removed from all policies to allow for flexibility when the housing mix of developments is known. The IDP's purpose is however to identify, based on housing mix and pupil yield assumptions, what the Borough's educational requirements are likely to be, to establish how and where additional school places will be provided. It has therefore been agreed to change policy wording, and instead refer to the IDP for specific educational information, e.g. school sizes and costings.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend educational wording in policies to allow for flexibility.</p>
Regarding contributions to Easthampstead Park School – LID already covers this. Considered inappropriate and unnecessary to duplicate policy.	Noted, but in this case it is considered contributions different to those in LID are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
Interlaken (Amen Corner North)	
Status of the IDP is not clear.	The IDP's status as a supporting document to the SADPD is explained in the introduction (section 1) of the IDP and in section 5.3 of the SADPD Preferred Option document. It is not considered necessary to add any further clarification.
All references to the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategies must be deleted.	Whilst (at the time of writing) the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) remains part of the Development Plan, the Government's stated intention to revoke the RSS is a material consideration and it is expected that the South

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>East Plan (SEP) will not form part of the Development Plan for the majority of the life of the SADPD (i.e. 2026). It is therefore more appropriate to plan in the SADPD for the number of house set out in the adopted Core Strategy, rather than the number required by the SEP. Any amendments to the total number of houses proposed for the Borough will be made through the Core Strategy review following a robust assessment of local need.</p>
<p>Table 1.2: infrastructure defined as preferred cannot, by definition, comply with Circular 05/05 or the CIL regulations as being necessary in planning terms to make the development acceptable.</p>	<p>The Risk classification should be considered as an infrastructure rank order. Infrastructure in the IDP should all be considered as 'necessary' for a development to go ahead, however, with finite resources available, this could be a way of prioritising contributions.</p> <p>The IDP infrastructure schedules will be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend format of infrastructure schedules.</p>
<p>Clarify what low carbon / RE policy is being referred to.</p>	<p>Policies CS10 and CS12 of Bracknell Forest's Core Strategy outline renewable energy policy, whilst the Sustainable Resource Management SPD provides further guidance. Reference to these will be included under 'Renewable Energy' in the amended IDP 'General Infrastructure Requirements' schedule.</p> <p>ACTION: Reference low carbon / RE policy under 'Renewable Energy' in the 'General Infrastructure Requirements' schedule.</p>
<p>The identified improvements at Junction 10 of the M4 should not be solely dependent on developer contributions - the HA should seek national funding as these are partly to accommodate background traffic growth.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence to support requirement to contribute towards SRN improvements.</p>	<p>Justification behind developer contributions to SRN improvements remains uncertain. Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications in support of development will need to consider Bracknell Forest's Transport Modelling work and the impact of additional trips on key SRN junctions. Subject to the impact and suitable evidence being provided by the HA, the Council will</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	consider seeking contributions from developers. The IDP will be updated when more information emerges.
Page 141: incorrectly, reference is made to the potential need for a secondary school on Amen Corner North.	A new Secondary School is essential to support existing need and the delivery of sites to the north of Bracknell. At the Preferred Options stage, the IDP had to keep options open considering the uncertainty over the delivery of development. Policy SA7 and the IDP Draft Submission document will reflect the Council's confirmed stance of locating the Secondary School on Land at Blue Mountain.
Given the scale of development now proposed, contributions towards primary and secondary school facilities elsewhere rather than on-site are supported.	Primary schools should be at the heart of their communities to reduce travelling times and enable walking to school for young children. It is therefore proposed that the Primary School serving Amen Corner North will be located on land at Amen Corner South and the Secondary School as part of the educational complex on land at Blue Mountain, part-funded by contributions from Amen Corner North.
The SEN pupil yield is overstated.	It is noted that no justification is given for why the consultee considers the SEN pupil yield to be overstated. The yield is based on a known average of 1.56% of pupils of school age within Bracknell Forest having SEN that require them to be taught at a specialist facility.
<p>Ref. LID Para 9.2: "Each centre will have the capacity to serve up to 800 children under 5"; considering the estimated site yield of 0-3 yr olds is 84, it is considered unreasonable and disproportionate for the site to require a Children's Centre (CC) and cannot be supported or justified by LID.</p> <p>Consider financial contributions to existing facilities (e.g. Hollies CC) more appropriate or a new facility through pooling with other contributions.</p> <p>Comments for other sites: CC provision appears "entirely out of scale with the estimated demand".</p>	<p>Following discussions with service providers, requirement for a "bespoke dedicated Children's Centre" will be deleted. Instead, financial contributions from Amen Corner North will contribute towards a new multi-functional community facility on land at Blue Mountain that will incorporate the needs of a Children's Centre.</p> <p>With regards other sites, the provision of community facilities have been revised. This is reflected in revised policies SA4-SA9, and is detailed in the IDP Draft Submission document.</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	ACTION: Delete requirements for "bespoke dedicated" community facilities in the IDP, and where appropriate replace with requirements for 'multi-functional community facilities'.
Contributions to Farley Wood are accepted, though if a new centre were needed, it would be better located in Amen Corner South's new local centre.	Following discussions with service providers, financial contributions from Amen Corner North will contribute towards a new multi-functional community facility on Land at Blue Mountain.
Affordable Housing policy should be clarified.	<p>The Council will seek a target percentage of provision up to 25% (subject to viability) and use of the national indicative minimum site size threshold (15 net dwellings).</p> <p>The IDP will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>ACTION: Clarify Affordable Housing policy in the 'General Infrastructure Requirements' schedule.</p>
New drop-in facility has not been justified in accordance with Circular 5/05 and CIL reg. – requirement should be deleted.	The requirement for a police 'drop-in' has been considered as part of the new multi-functional community facility on Land at Blue Mountain. Further justification to warrant developer contributions is required from the Thames Valley Police.
Possible contributions towards Primary Health Care have not been justified in accordance with Circular 5/05 and CIL reg. – requirement should be deleted.	The PCT is identified as the main funding source and developer contributions are as yet not being sought. The IDP will however be updated accordingly if this changes.
Contributions towards the Police, Ambulance and Fire and Rescue Service facilities has not been justified in accordance with Circular 05/05 and the CIL Regulations and should be deleted from the IDP.	Where service providers are unable to provide evidence to back up developer contributions being sought at the time of writing the IDP Draft Submission document, although the requirement will remain provisionally included, it will be the responsibility of the service provider to demonstrate the need and provide robust justification at a later date. The IDP remains a 'live' document and will be updated as more information emerges.

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Contributions to a new health facility is accepted. Considers ACN is less appropriate a location than local centres at ACS or Blue Mountain close to education facility - if existing Binfield surgery cannot be expanded.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Requirement for SAMM SPA contributions should be deleted as it can not be justified in accordance with the Habitats Directive. The bespoke SANG will act as an avoidance measure to ensure no net effect on the SPA.</p>	<p>Contributions towards the SAMM project will be required even where bespoke SANGs (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) provision is proposed. This is necessary for two reasons: as SANGs provision alone cannot be relied upon to entirely avoid harm to the SPA, it must be supplemented with education and wardening on the SPA itself, and; to ensure that visitor management on the SPA is co-ordinated across the area, so that displacement of visitors from one area of the SPA to another is avoided. This is set out in Policy SA6 in the Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options document and is in line with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009).</p>
<p>Do not accept there is reasoned justification for contributions to Coppid Beech roundabout and junctions along A322 and A329. Wokingham SDLs have already been identified to fund £4.2m to Coppid Beech rbt and a Park & Ride scheme west of junction.</p> <p>Development is considered to generate relatively small amount of traffic, therefore there is insufficient detailed justification to support improvements to Items 1.3, 1.13, 1.16, 1.18, 1.20, 1.22 and 1.23.</p> <p>Flexibility should be maintained until outcome of traffic studies are known.</p>	<p>BFC has created peak hour versions of the Bracknell Forest Multi-Modal Transport Model (BFMMTM) that include planned and windfall development in the Borough. The models include a number of the highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all of the developments that are envisaged up to the year 2026. Others will be determined as the location of the final new housing developments planned for the period are finally decided.</p> <p>Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from developments.</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>BFC is considering updating its supplementary planning guidance regarding development-related transport contributions that will specify the level of contribution required per net increase in trips at the development site. The developer will also be required to fully implement all highways and transport improvements that are necessary in planning terms for the implementation and operation of the development itself.</p> <p>The transport improvement works, for which developer contributions will be sought, will be determined by taking account of the spatial and temporal distribution of the proposed, planned and windfall developments. They will also consider their relative impact at the locations of the improvements, and will be guided by the outputs of the BFMMTM runs.</p>
<p>Page 136: Replace West Binfield with Amen Corner North.</p> <p>Amen Corner North development should not be required to contribute towards the existing commitment to a recycling facility at Amen Corner South which can serve both developments.</p>	<p>Noted. Amendment will be made.</p> <p>There is as yet no “commitment” to provide recycling facilities at Amen Corner South, nor will it necessarily absorb demand from the Amen Corner North development.</p> <p>Following further discussions, the Council's Waste Management service providers have identified a need for one overground recycling facility on Land at Amen Corner North.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend 'Waste Management' in the Amen Corner North Infrastructure Schedule to include: "One overground recycling facility on site with good access - incorporating an area of hard standing to accommodate three glass banks, a charity clothing bank and a litter bin".</p>
<p>Page 143: Considered that contributions to the recently refurbished Priestwood Youth Centre, the closest facility, would be more appropriate, as the site will not yield sufficient</p>	<p>It is assumed reference is made to Youth Facilities – p161. Requirement for a “bespoke dedicated youth centre” will be deleted. The centre at Priestwood is not suitably located to</p>

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
11-19 yr olds (78) to warrant or justify a new facility. Requirement not supported by LID – 1 YC/650 dwellings.	serve Amen Corner North (ACN). Following discussions with service providers, the preferred option is to direct contributions from ACN to provide for youth facilities in the proposed new multi-functional community facility at the Blue Mountain development.
Page 143: the contribution for built sports facilities should accord with the LID SPD contribution of £670 per dwelling (to give a total contribution of £268,000) rather than the £1.3-5m set out.	<p>The figure presented was incorrect. This figure will be amended accordingly, based on an assumed housing mix.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend the 'Built Sports' figure in the Amen Corner North Infrastructure Schedule to read: "Developer contribution of £257,280".</p>
Page 144 and 145: contributions towards the Police, Ambulance and Fire and Rescue Service facilities has not been justified in accordance with Circular 5/05 and the CIL Regulations and should be deleted from the IDP.	Where service providers are unable to provide evidence to back up developer contributions being sought at the time of writing the IDP Draft Submission document, although the requirement will remain provisionally included, it will be the responsibility of the service provider to demonstrate the need and provide robust justification at a later date. The IDP remains a 'live' document and will be updated as more information emerges.
Page 147-8: the requirement for SAMM SPA contributions should be deleted as bespoke SPA mitigation will be provided on site	Contributions towards the SAMM project will be required even where bespoke SANGs (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) provision is proposed. This is necessary for two reasons: as SANGs provision alone cannot be relied upon to entirely avoid harm to the SPA, it must be supplemented with education and wardening on the SPA itself, and; to ensure that visitor management on the SPA is co-ordinated across the area, so that displacement of visitors from one area of the SPA to another is avoided. This is set out in Policy SA6 in the Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options document and is in line with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009).
Luff Developments Ltd. (Blue Mountain)	

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Concerned that the dense tree coverage over the part of the site identified as SANG and open space, does not appear possible to create 'open space' in amongst trees that characterise the setting.	Measures to maintain the character of an area will be an important factor in the determination of a planning application. Woodland falls within the definition of 'open space' in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation.
The cumulative impact with Wokingham's development proposals on the road network needs detailed consideration before the proposal is confirmed.	Transport Modelling work has been conducted in collaboration with Wokingham to assess what road network improvements are necessary to maintain an effective road network with all development considered. Following the developer's submission of a Transport Assessment, this will be used as the evidence base to secure developer contributions.
Warfield Consortium & Mr Henderson (Warfield SPD)	
Financial contribution levels require justification.	Between this consultation and the IDP Draft Submission document, work has been carried out to gather evidence and firm up justifications. Where 'gaps' exist, the IDP will remain 'live' in order to be updated when information emerges.
Justification / evidence base for educational requirements need to be presented to back up requirements.	Justification and evidence base for school places, which is based on pupil yield and housing mix assumptions, is available on request.
Rationale and justification for underground recycling facilities is required.	The Council's Waste Management service providers have identified requirements set out in the IDP to mitigate the development's impact. Underground waste recycling facilities are able to provide a higher capacity to footprint ratio compared with overground recycling facilities, therefore it was considered appropriate for a development the size of Warfield. Following further consultation, the Council's waste management services have stated that as an alternative, an equivalent mix based on 1:2 - underground : overground ratio could be applied, e.g. four overground recycling facilities could be provided spread throughout the development, which could assist accessibility.

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	ACTION: Amend 'Waste Management' sections of appropriate site infrastructure schedules to allow flexibility in providing on-site recycling facilities, based on a 1:2 - underground:overground waste facility ratio.
Full evidence base is required (ref. Education).	Justification and evidence base for school places, which is based on pupil yield and housing mix assumptions, is available on request.
The option of funding all school provision by means of financial contributions should be identified in text.	Due to financial uncertainties related to obtaining funds for the LEA to build schools and ensuring the needed land is available, the Council prefer schools to be provided in-kind.
Evidence base for the provision of 2 new primary schools has not been explained or justified.	Justification and evidence base for school places, which is based on pupil yield and housing mix assumptions, is available on request. The exact educational requirement will be determined once the precise housing mix for the site is known.
School Places Plan 2010-2015 (Sept 2010) does not look beyond 2015 in detail (it is within the post-2015 period that most of the site will be built out). This is required in order to provide a sound evidence base which relates an assessment of anticipated pupil yield to available capacity.	The Council conduct pupil projections beyond the School Places Plan period. This forms the evidence behind educational requirements sought. This information can be made available on request.
Bearing in mind sequencing of development – an alternative option should be offered whereby the developer can contribute land and financial contributions for the LEA to deliver the school.	Any alternative offer would need to adequately cover the LEA's risks given that the construction of the new housing is beyond the LEA's control.
Ref. Pre-school and SEN: Evidence base needs to be presented to justify requirements	The projected demand for pre-school and SEN places is based on the best available evidence taken from surveys of recently occupied developments and an assumed housing mix.
Ref. Secondary Education: Evidence base for cost apportionment is awaited.	This information can be made available on request.

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Ref. Public Art: Financial contribution (1% of gross development cost excluding land) requires justification.	Refer to Bracknell Forest's adopted Limiting the Impact of Development SPD. It is used used as a negotiation starting point. It is an established guideline – refer to publication: 'percent for art: a review'.
Financial contribution towards improvements to Bracknell Fire Station requires justification.	<p>Justification is being sought. However, where service providers are unable to provide evidence to back up developer contributions being sought at the time of writing the IDP Draft Submission document, it will be the responsibility of the service provider to demonstrate the need and provide robust justification at a later date. The IDP remains a 'live' document and will be updated as more information emerges.</p> <p>The Fire and Rescue Service have indicated that contributions to upgrade the local service could be offset if developers install sprinkler systems into residential units. This is likely to require partnership work with developers to ensure their requirements are accounted for in site plans.</p>
No justification or evidence base has been given for stipulating a 8ha/1000 persons <i>minimum</i> area.	This is in line with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009) and was a recommendation of the South East Plan Technical Assessor.
By providing SANG to <i>avoid</i> SPA impact and then contributing towards SAMM to <i>avoid</i> impact is double charging for the same impact.	Contributions towards the SAMM project will be required even where bespoke SANGs (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) provision is proposed. This is necessary for two reasons: as SANGs provision alone cannot be relied upon to entirely avoid harm to the SPA, it must be supplemented with education and wardening on the SPA itself, and; to ensure that visitor management on the SPA is co-ordinated across the area, so that displacement of visitors from one area of the SPA to another is avoided. This is set out in Policy SA9 in the Site Allocations DPD Draft

Developer/ landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Submission document and is in line with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009).
Financial contribution towards 'off-site provision' require justification bearing in mind "the onerous requirements" for SANG.	Contributions will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis, dependent on the scale and impact of development. For justification, refer to Paras 12.9 & 12.10 of Bracknell Forest's adopted Limiting the Impact of Development SPD.

Table 11.3 Statutory Consultee responses to Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Crowthorne Parish Council	
The recommendations in the SADPD have been made without consideration of the infrastructure requirements necessary to support them.	The SADPD was produced as a result of information presented in the background documents, which includes the infrastructure requirements contained in the IDP. Any amendments in the IDP Draft Submission document will be reflected in the SADPD.
Wokingham Borough Council	
The IDP does not adequately address improvements to non-car modes of access to TRL (and the provision of developer contributions towards these).	The IDP includes improvements to the surrounding footway/cycleway network and changes to the bus route but access to the site will be covered at the site masterplanning stage.
Proposals in BracknellForest should mirror the approach in Wokingham Borough to include funding for a community manager for the first five years.	The need for a community manager has not been identified at this stage, nor does the Council think it could be justified under s106. It might however be an option to explore through CIL.
Object to the general lack of information on whether adequate infrastructure can be delivered to support the growth envisaged – full details of the works required (including those outside of the Borough) are not included within the IDP. Specifically, there is no information on how traffic flows around the preferred sites could be affected by development.	The IDP Draft Submission document includes more detailed infrastructure requirements to support SADPD policies and indicative costings. Delivery of infrastructure will be subject to viability, determined at the planning application stage. Viability work is being conducted at the time of writing to highlight potential issues. Since the Preferred Options consultation, joint Transport Modelling work

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	has been conducted with Wokingham to establish transport improvements required. Schemes to emerge will be included in the IDP Draft Submission document.
Environment Agency	
Welcome the policy on water resources and water efficiency. Would like to see this evidence transposed into local policy.	Noted. This will be considered during the Core Strategy review.
It is unclear what impact growth will have on sewerage treatment facilities and receiving watercourses. BFC need to ensure future housing development helps to achieve the aims of the Water Framework Directive, prevents further deterioration and protects and enhances the aquatic environment.	The IDP has been, and will continue to be developed in consultation with water supply and waste water companies to ensure that all development is supported by necessary infrastructure to meet standards set under the Water Framework Directive (2000).
Might be worth including regional SUDS provision.	<p>On-site SUDS are the Council's preferred option. The IDP will refer to EA good practice guidance.</p> <p>ACTION: Include reference to the EA's SUDS good practice guidance in the 'Flood Defence' section of the IDP.</p>
Berkshire East Primary Care Trust	
<p>The majority of the Borough's GP surgeries have little or no capacity in their current premises to accommodate an increase in population. The PCT would want to speak to developers of individual sites to ensure s106 contributions in land or financial assistance to mitigate impact.</p> <p>At this stage it is proposed that the Health space will accommodate the growth in population from the proposed developments at Amen Corner, Blue Mountain, Warfield and the TRL site in Crowthorne. However should additional capacity be required elsewhere, the PCT may need to consider a new facility or the replacement of the existing Binfield Surgery.</p>	The Council will continue to work with the PCT to ensure their needs are considered. At the time of writing, justification to require developer contributions has not been received, however the IDP will remain a 'live' document that can be updated when this information emerges.

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>It is anticipated that the Broadmoor development would require an extension to the existing Heath Hill Road Surgery.</p> <p>It would be expected that financial contributions would be made from developments to the completion of the Health space (to plug funding gaps) and towards improvements at Heath Hill Road Surgery.</p>	
<p>Securing good access from new developments to the HealthSpace in Bracknell town centre by public transport is an essential part of the delivery of primary care services.</p>	<p>Financial contributions will be sought to improve public transport connectivity where feasible from new development. Improving accessibility to Bracknell Town Centre is a priority.</p>
South East Water	
<p>Generally supportive of IDP. It makes adequate provision to identify and secure the necessary improvements and enhancements to water supply infrastructure for identified development. SEW reiterate the importance of being regularly consulted and updated on the implementation of the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will work closely with SEW to resolve any issues that arise.</p>
<p>Most of the schedules for the urban extension sites acknowledge that both upgrades to local water supply infrastructure is likely to be required and that new homes should be delivered with a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/head/day, but the Warfield schedule does not identify water efficiency standards to be achieved, which should be amended for consistency with other schedules.</p>	<p>Noted. The schedule will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend the Warfield Infrastructure Schedule to include the requirement for new homes to be delivered with a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/head/day.</p>
Thames Water	
<p>No objection in principle to allocation of sites for development. There may however be capacity issues to the existing waste water treatment capacity and sewerage networks. Recommend adding the following to relevant site schedules:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development</p>	<p>Noted. Amendments will be made accordingly. The Council will work closely with water and waste water providers to overcome any issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Add the following text under 'Key Issues' of the Waste Water Infrastructure Template: “Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve</p>

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>	<p>the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
<p>Land at Broadmoor:</p> <p>Concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Easthampstead Park STW unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>	<p>This will be highlighted in the amended IDP. The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend Land at Broadmoor's 'Waste Water' section of the Infrastructure Schedule to include: "Thames Water have concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Easthampstead Park STW is unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>
<p>Land at TRL:</p> <p>Concerns, specifically the sewerage network and treatment capacity – Easthampstead Park STW unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>	<p>This will be highlighted in the amended IDP. The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend Land at TRL's 'Waste Water' section of the Infrastructure Schedule to include: "Thames Water have concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Easthampstead Park STW is unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>
<p>Amen Corner North:</p> <p>Concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area - Bracknell STW unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations</p>	<p>This will be highlighted in the amended IDP. The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p>

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>	<p>ACTION: Amend Land at Amen Corner North's 'Waste Water' section of the Infrastructure Schedule to include: "Thames Water have concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Bracknell STW is unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>
<p>Land at Blue Mountain:</p> <p>Concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area - Bracknell STW unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>	<p>This will be highlighted in the amended IDP. The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend land at Blue Mountain's 'Waste Water' section of the Infrastructure Schedule to include: "Thames Water have concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Bracknell STW is unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>
<p>Warfield SPD:</p> <p>Concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area - Bracknell STW unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>	<p>This will be highlighted in the amended IDP. The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend land at Blue Mountain's 'Waste Water' section of the Infrastructure Schedule to include: "Thames Water have concerns, specifically sewerage network capacity in the area – Bracknell STW is unlikely to be able to support demand. Investigations necessary into the impact of development - takes up to 12 weeks. Up to 3 year lead-in if upgrade required.</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	

Statutory consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Comments set out in letter dated 3rd August remain pertinent (with particular respect to mitigation measures at M4 J10)	Noted.
Seek confirmation that the IDP will be updated to reflect the results of Bracknell's updated transport model.	The IDP will be a 'live' document, therefore as relevant information emerges, the IDP will be updated accordingly.
Interested to know how local road network improvements will affect the SRN, as well as potentially examining the HA's own M4 J10 improvement scheme in the model.	Up to date modelling of the baseline year and forecast scenarios to 2026, including key strategic routes to the SRN, have been sent to the HA for comment. The IDP Draft Submission document will contain any relevant information to emerge.
The IDP notes the importance of improvements to M4 J10 and M3 J3, but the HA requests more work is undertaken by BFC on a mechanism for cost apportionment and scheme delivery. To deliver, it is essential for partners to 'sign up to it'.	Noted. However, to meet Circular 5/05 and CIL tests, developers will only be expected to make financial contributions to infrastructure that is 'directly related to the development', therefore there remains uncertainty as to how the Highway Agency can justify apportioning costs between Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell Forest when there will be additional, significant background growth.
Suggest collaborating with partners, particularly Wokingham Borough Council.	Bracknell Forest's Transport Model has been developed in partnership with Wokingham. This collaboration will continue.

Table 11.4 Amenity Group responses to Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Chavey Down Residents Association	
Table 4.25: Would like to see a hospital before extension to Easthampstead Park Cemetery and Crematorium.	These services are provided by different funding mechanisms. No specific hospital requirement has been flagged up as a result of consultation with service providers; however health care in the borough will see huge benefits from the new health facility in Bracknell town centre and the new specialist cancer and renal care services at Brant's Bridge, east of the town centre.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Table 4.2: Welcome improvements planned for the Green Oaks / Mercedes / Baldocks roundabout and would ask that residents be consulted at an early stage.</p>	<p>This junction is on one of the Borough's busiest corridors and has been part of council plans for a number of years mainly due to the ongoing regeneration plans for the Town Centre. When the scheme is finally implemented the advance notice of the works will be posted and affected residents will be consulted.</p>
<p>Page 82, Table 4.26 - allotment provision: more provision is needed in the North, especially as there is a 5 year waiting list in Winkfield. 50 plots allocated in the Warfield SPD is small, at least 200 are needed.</p>	<p>Noted. The developer cannot be expected to make up for an existing shortfall of allotments in the area. Under Circular 5/05, developers will be expected to provide enough allotments to meet demand from its own development. Allotments will be sought on all the strategic development sites.</p>
<p>Page 89 - SANG: for the purposes of SANG, Lily Hill Park has been declared at capacity by Natural England (see application 09/00019/OUT) for mitigation for the town centre redevelopment. The only capacity left therefore is in the small cluster.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Specific consultees, such as South East Water, Highways Agency and Environment Agency are also included in the following section: 17 'Specific Consultee Comments', as they also raised issues in addition to the IDP.

12 Responses to 'Retail Study'

Table 12.1 Responses to 'Retail Study'

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Acknowledge findings	Noted
<p>New housing, employment and retail and infrastructure is dependant upon the Council delivering the Town Centre renovations. It has taken several years to make minimal progress and there is very little evidence that this will be done (reference made to announcements on the Council's web page and Retail Study).</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring it forward despite the difficult economic climate.</p> <p>In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration.</p> <p>The past few months have seen significant steps forward in realising plans to regenerate the town centre. Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site, work has already started on site. Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases.</p>

13 Responses to 'Transport Accessibility Assessment'

Table 13.1 Responses to 'Transport Accessibility Assessment'

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The Council haven't fully considered the pressure the A329(M) will be under from the Jennetts Park, Amen Corner/Warfield, Binfield and Crowthorne developments, especially given the number of commuters these will generate (and not taking account of developments planned in Wokingham)	The study takes account of the future highway changes planned as part of the developments. These are set out in Table 5. The further modelling work being undertaken by the Council also takes account of future background traffic growth and that generated by other planned developments including those in Wokingham with whom transport modelling data has been shared.
The proposed road improvements should also include the Temple Way roundabout	Transport modelling shows that this roundabout is operating well within its capacity and no improvements are therefore proposed.
It is not clear why access to public transport routes is used as a key determinant for suitable sites, when only 6% of residents in the Borough commute to work by this means. In any event, there are only 2 bus services to Binfield, one of which finishes at 16.30 hours	The objective is to achieve sustainable travel choices. Much of the existing urban area of Bracknell is built around the car with many parts not being laid out in a manner that is conducive to the viable operation of bus services. To create wider transport choices the proposed new developments will be designed to facilitate bus, pedestrian and cycle travel, particularly to the town centre and other employment areas. The proposals in the preferred option also include improvements to existing services which are likely to include increased frequency.
The report doesn't acknowledge the significance of train services to commuting. The services to both London Waterloo (from Bracknell) and to London Paddington (from Maidenhead and Twyford) that arrive pre-rush hour are 'standing room only'	The assessment includes consideration of the role of rail travel and accessibility to rail stations at paragraphs 4.5.12 to 4.5.16

Table 13.2 Developer Responses to 'Transport Accessibility Assessment'

Developer Responses	
Broadmoor (on behalf of owners of site, West London Mental Health Trust)	

Developer Responses	
<p>The study compares sites for their accessibility, but this is predominantly judged on distance from Bracknell Town Centre. Journey times would be more appropriate in considering accessibility rather than just distance. Accessibility of a site could be improved as through public transport / cycle / pedestrian improvements, some of which are noted in the document, but not given full consideration in the scoring system.</p>	<p>The inclusion of congestion hot spots is a measure by which journey times are included in the assessment. For walking and cycling the distance is a direct measure of journey times as traffic congestion is not a factor for these modes.</p> <p>For public transport usage the frequency of service is often as important as journey times in the determining people's propensity to use it.</p>
<p>Accessibility is a material consideration for assessing suitability of sites but this should be considered alongside other factors such as proximity to employment areas and schools (which will influence the need to travel and impact upon travel demands during traditional peak periods). An appropriate assessment would be to weight these factors in considering a suitable site, without the need to access a town centre.</p>	<p>There is a range of services such as employment and education that it would be beneficial to have good access to. However, the clear Council priority in Core Strategy Policy CS3, and the accompanying text is to create a vibrant town centre that becomes a first choice destination for the Borough's residents. The town centre will be a major location for retailing, leisure and many other services and employment opportunities. The strategic locations being proposed will in many cases provide new primary schools and in one case a secondary school and special educational needs facility. It is not therefore possible to accurately assess the role of access to education.</p>
<p>Enabling development at Broadmoor reduces the need to access town centres by providing employment, a workplace nursery and potential to improve public transport accessibility for the wider Crowthorne area.</p>	<p>While the mix of uses proposed for Broadmoor is supported, it is not considered appropriate to adjust its ranking within the assessment as many of the other sites will also have access to employment areas (often much larger ones than at Broadmoor) and other facilities and all proposed development sites will be expected to include proposals to improve public transport.</p>

14 Responses to ' Archaeological Site Assessment'

No responses to the Archaeological Assessments were made.

15 Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'

Table 15.1 Developer Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Developer responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Several non-strategic sites proposed for allocation at Binfield under Policies SA1-3 are identified as having their SANG requirement met at the existing 'Cut Cluster'. There is no reason why land identified in SA9 at Warfield should not also make use of such SANG 'on its doorstep' (in the form of dual use informal open space within the 'Cut Cluster').</p>	<p>It is Council policy for developments in excess of 108 dwellings to provide a bespoke SANG. This would therefore apply to the Land at Warfield. For developments of 108 dwellings or less, the Council will accept a payment contribution of strategic avoidance and mitigation measures in line with its adopted Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
West London Mental Health Trust		
5.10 and 5.13	<p>Paragraph 5.13 requires that sufficient SANG should be provided in advance of new dwelling occupation to ensure that there is no likely significant effect on the SPA. The requirement at para. 5.10 for a programme of visitor access management measures to mitigate impacts arising from new development is redundant as such impacts will have been mitigated under para. 5.13</p>	<p>SPA avoidance and mitigation measures are based on a combination of access management and monitoring and the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG). This is clearly set out in the South East Plan (2009) policy NRM6, the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009) and the BFC Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
5.17 and 5.18	<p>Where bespoke SANG is required this should be designed in accordance with the guidance provided by Natural England. Para. 5.18 should be amended</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.18 states' "<i>In assessing the required quality for new SANG land regard should be had to</i></p>

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Developer responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	to read, "In assessing the required quality of new SANG land the guidance published by Natural England should be followed".	<i>the guidance published by Natural England</i> ". This is consistent with para. 5.14 in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009). No changes necessary.
Table 5.2	Reference to ownership of SANG to be amended to read "...(or an alternative acceptable ownership solution such as retained ownership by the Trust)". Reason - to add clarity in the light of current Trust intentions.	Retention of ownership of the land by the Trust may be one solution. However, in the interest of not compromising future discussions, the Council believes that the relevant wording in Table 5.2 should remain.
5.21	Having regard to our comments under para. 5.10 and 5.13 above, the fourth bullet point to para. 5.21 should be deleted.	This bullet point is valid as access management and monitoring measures must be applied. SPA avoidance and mitigation measures are based on a combination of access management and the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG). This is clearly set out in the South East Plan (2009) policy NRM6, the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009) and the BFC Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
5.21	The third bullet point, the word 'dedicated' should be replaced by "appropriate" as there will be potential for shared provision and an overall parking reduction.	Further discussions may indicate that there is potential for shared car park provision. However, given the size of the SANG, it is envisaged that dedicated parking will be

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Developer responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
		required to help attract visitors to the SANG and away from the SPA.
7.3	We support this statement.	Noted.
Appendix 2	The current status of the Dartford Warbler is inaccurate. The last two cold winters have decimated the population and we believe that there were no confirmed successful breeding pairs in 2010.	The Council has been unable to obtain more reliable up to date information on the Annex 1 birds specifically on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

Table 15.2 Adjacent County, District/Borough and Parish Council responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Wokingham Borough Council		
	BFC needs to ensure that adequate SANG is proposed to match the distribution of development proposed, and consider potential implications of large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA.	Adequate SANGs to meet the distribution of development is set out in Appendix 3 of the Draft Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment Site Allocations DPD. This has been agreed with NE. There are no large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA.

Table 15.3 Other Statutory Consultee Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Natural England		
	Natural England have no comment to make on this document.	Noted.

Table 15.4 Non-Statutory Consultee Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment'

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)		
Tables 4.1 and 5.1, Paragraphs 3.5 and 2.2	Given the close proximity of large developments allocated in the Site Allocations DPD to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, we do not consider it sufficient to only address those potential impacts in these paragraphs. Other impacts that should be included (as identified in Table 10 of the Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment) are: urban effects (including vandalism, fire, motorbikes, BMX and other anti-social activities), enrichment from fly-tipping garden waste, predation by cats, reduction in quantity or quality of supporting habitats e.g. for foraging nightjar, hydrology, and noise, light and air pollution. Many of these were identified in Allison Hulbert's Proof of Evidence dated October 2008 for the Council at the TRL appeal (paragraph 8.3) and are also issues that need to be addressed at the BroadmoorHospital site.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD Appropriate Assessment is a strategic assessment which specifically considers impact on the SPA as a result of the increased housing numbers set out in the DPD. If these sites come forward for development, a more detailed Appropriate Assessment will be carried out at the planning application stage, where appropriate, and in consultation with Natural England. These more detailed Appropriate Assessments will need to consider other potential impacts such as those listed in Table 10 of the Core Strategy Technical Background Document (2007).</p> <p>Action: The potential requirement for a further more detailed Appropriate Assessment at the planning application stage has been added.</p>
Table 3.1 and Paragraph 3.10	The estimated increase in population from developments within 400m and 5km should be 7152 people (3096 x 2.31 = 7152 (rounded up)). An estimate of developments within 5km, population and visits should be made for the windfall sites as it is not reasonable to assume that all 480 dwellings over the plan period will be outside the 5km zone. The estimated increase in visits to the SPA should then be recalculated.	The Council has taken account of windfall sites as outlined at the end of Section 5. These are developments of less than 10 dwellings and even if they all fall within 5km of the SPA, they will be able to be allocated to SANGs in the south of the Borough where the Council has spare capacity. In the Submission SADPD the figure for windfall sites is much lower than in the Preferred Options document.

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
		Action: The figures in Table 3.1 and para. 3.10 and 3.13 have been recalculated.
Paragraph 5.14	This should make clear that there may need to be discounts as a result of nature conservation interests too such as nightjar foraging areas.	Agree that any existing nature conservation interests must also be taken into account as stated in the Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework (2009). Action: This wording has been added.
Table 5.2	Given this site supports foraging nightjar, the fourth point in this table should be reworded to read <i>“Levels of existing visitor use and Annex I bird use on the SANG will need to be discounted to protect current access and use.”</i>	Agree that any existing nature conservation interests must also be taken into account as stated in the Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework (2009). Action: This wording has been added.
Paragraph 1.3	Reference to the Delivery Plan should be the Delivery Framework.	Action: Paragraph 1.3 has been noted and amended.
Paragraph 1.8	There is no reference to national planning policy “described above”.	Action: This has been deleted.
Paragraphs 1.10, 1.14, Table 8.1	“Competent Authority”: Reference should be to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.	Action: Noted and amended.
Paragraphs 1.12, 1.14 and 1.15	These should refer to the relevant subsections in Regulation 102 which deals with land use plans. References to projects should be removed except when considering in combination effects.	Action: Noted and amended.
Paragraph 1.13	Where does the term “reasonably foreseeable” originate? We cannot locate this in PPS 9 Circular or the EC Managing Natura 2000 Sites guidance.	Action: This wording has been deleted and replaced by reference to paragraph 102 (4) of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010.

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Paragraph 2.6	This now needs updating in light of the Cala Homes decision though it is probably worth referring to the situation both with and without the South East Plan to 'future proof' the assessment.	Action: Noted and amended.
Table 2.1	There is new condition assessment information on the Natural England website which slightly updates this information as at 1 November 2010.	Action: Noted and amended.
RSPB		
	Policy SA11 - the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst. We note that the site boundary is situated within immediate proximity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Depending on the nature, scale and design of employment development at this site, impacts on the SPA could arise. This allocation must be fully appraised in the Appropriate Assessment before completion of the Site Allocations DPD in order for the DPD to be legally compliant and to ensure that potentially damaging development does not come forward in this location.	As stated in SA11, development on this site will be suitable if it does not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Development on this site may require a detailed Appropriate Assessment at the planning application stage, in agreement with Natural England. This more detailed Appropriate Assessment may need to consider other potential impacts such as those listed in Table 10 of the Core Strategy Technical Background Document (2007). Action: A paragraph of explanation has been added to section 5. The scope of this AA has been made clear in the Introduction in Section 1.

16 Responses to Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (Incorporating SEA)

The following comments have been received as a result of consulting on the Draft Sustainability Appraisal. These comments have been responded to and where changes to the scoring or document are required these will be noted and any actions will be shown in **bold**.

Table 16.1 Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
General Comments and Para 1.7	<p>The Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) definition of sustainability in para 1.7 is commendable in that it states: "...sustainability is acting to create harmony between a developed economy and the environment...." and this highlights the most significant failing of the Sustainability Appraisal – it fails to recognise the fact that Crowthorne is a small rural village stuck between two developed towns (Bracknell and Wokingham) and one fast developing town (Sandhurst). It also fails to indicate how the proposed new developments would maintain/increase the sustainability of the existing Crowthorne village environment and society. All the sustainability documents explain is how the new developments can be "made sustainable" by modifying/changing the existing environment potentially to the significant detriment of the existing Crowthorne community, both Crowthorne Parish and Wokingham Without Parish.</p>	<p>An essential consideration when drawing up planning documents is their effect on the environment and people's quality of life, both now and in the future. To help address this, Sustainable Appraisals and Strategic Environmental Assessments are carried out alongside the preparation of these plans to make sure social, environmental and economic issues are taken into account at every stage so that sustainable development is delivered on the ground.</p> <p>The Draft SA Report documents the SA process which has been carried out for the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options. It applied the SA methodology that was set out and agreed through consultation in the Site Allocations DPD SA Scoping Report (Jan 2010) and the Local Development Framework Scoping Report (Jan 2010).</p> <p>The overall aims of the SA/SEA is to:</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the DPD as sustainable as possible by integrating sustainable development into the strategy making process, influencing all stages of plan development. • Provide a high level of environmental protection and balance environmental, economic and social considerations in the plan's preparation. • Consult on the SA process at various stages to allow the public and stakeholders to input into its production. • Provide an environmental, social and economic audit at appropriate spatial and temporal levels. <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required by European Union Directive (2001/42/EC) on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.</p>
	<p>It appears the “sustainability” of Crowthorne as a rural village has been totally ignored and the intention is that it will become part of the southward urban sprawl, linking Bracknell through Great Hollands with Sandhurst. Crowthorne Parish Council will continue to vigorously oppose this.</p>	<p>When appraising sites the character and appearance of existing communities is taken into consideration. The aim of SA Objective 7 is to retain the distinctiveness of existing communities. The sites have been appraised with this in mind. The rationale for the scoring can be found in the relevant full appraisal tables.</p>
<p>Tables 16 and 24</p>	<p>Overall CPC believes that many of the “significantly positive” ratings are erroneous and appear to have been</p>	<p>The sites have been appraised using the information available at the time. The purpose of the Draft</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>done with very little local knowledge, despite the earlier consultation where these concerns were detailed in several forums, not least of which was the “Workshop” in Sandhurst in May 2010. A cynic might suggest that the weightings have been enhanced to provide a better view of what are basically “not very sustainable but very financially attractive sites for development”. This can be quite clearly seen where the “weightings” in Table 16 - Issues and Options Sites Scores, with a large amount of judicious “tweaking”, becomes Table 24 - Site Scores.</p> <p>It appears that the commercial exploitation of the TRL and Broadmoor sites takes absolute precedence over the significant detrimental impact on the quality, sustainability and separate identity of the village of Crowthorne, which will be incurred by these excessive aspirations for development.</p>	<p>Report was to engage with local residents and test the SA scoring given local knowledge.</p> <p>The appraisal work was carried out independently however it fed into and has as such heavily influenced the selection of the preferred options.</p> <p>The weighting methodology was considered and accepted by an Inspector at the examination of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The fact that scores have improved at the preferred option stage when compared with their original scoring at the Issues and Options stage demonstrates that concerns raised have been taken into consideration and possibly mitigated as required.</p> <p>There was also an increase in the level of detail on the concept plans at the preferred option stage.</p> <p>These points will be addressed in the background paper.</p>
Summary of Policy SA4		
Para 4.21	Accessible services: The statement made – “....provides improvements to highway capacity, signalisation and pedestrian and cycle	Baseline information including the current access arrangements were taken into consideration when appraising Policy SA4.

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>provisions.....” - ignores the fact that the only access roads in and out of the proposed new estates at Broadmoor are already severely speed restricted roads going through mature residential areas. These access roads exit onto already congested village centre roads with severely restricted capability for improved throughput. CPC considers the weighting given to be significantly erroneous.</p>	<p>The weighting methodology was used to appraise the adopted Core Strategy. The methodology took into account locally important issues and was found sound. It was considered appropriate to apply this method of weighting to both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options scores in-order to complete a comparative exercise.</p>
<p>Para 4.23</p>	<p>Urban Renaissance: The statement implies that keeping the ‘Listed Building’ and ‘Hospital’ use can be regarded as ‘Urban Renaissance’. CPC regards this as incorrect and the weighting therefore incorrect.</p>	<p>This policy seeks to retain both the listed building and the hospital use on site. This was considered to represent a good example of urban renaissance as the development of the site would retain the established hospital use.</p>
<p>Para 4.24</p>	<p>There appears considerable uncertainty as to how the significant concerns raised at the issues stage may be overcome. CPC share these concerns. Some 1500 new dwellings will be allowed to be built within 1km of the SPA boundary and it is proposed to build a care home and school within the 400m “exclusion zone”. Even at this stage BFC Planning appears to be at variance with its own expert opinion on biodiversity. CPC will be very interested to see Natural England’s comments on the latest proposals.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Option stage the outline of the broad area fell within 400m of the SPA. A significant negative score was given (--) as there was no confirmation that housing wouldn't be located within 400m of the SPA. However, this can be mitigated (by not locating housing within 400m of the SPA) and this was acknowledged in the full appraisal tables.</p> <p>Natural England are a Statutory Consultees and their comments on the Preferred Option SADPD are addressed in Section 16 of this report. However, Natural England had no comments on the SA/SEA.</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Para 4.25	<p>Travel Choice: The statement “it is unlikely that the car will be the preferred mode of transport” is probably the most blatantly unsubstantiated statement made throughout this document. Nowhere does the document provide evidence for it and it flies in face of the existing situation in the Broadmoor area, where most households have two cars and the existing (poor) bus service in Crowthorne is under-utilised.</p> <p>Nowhere is it explained what improvements will be made to bus links. CPC believes the weighting given is significantly erroneous.</p>	<p>SA Objective 15 Travel Choice-seeks to improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p> <p>In this case this policy was considered to provide infrastructure that could promote non-car travel for example walking, cycling and travelling on the bus with the new bus route. For this reason the site scored a minor positive score (+).</p> <p>It can not be confirmed that people will not use their cars. However the policy is worded to provide an alternative so as to discourage the use of cars.</p>
Para 4.26	<p>Employment: The statement “.....as the hospital is a major employer in the local area, this resulted in a positive score...” is incorrect. Losing employment would be regarded as negative, creating employment as positive, therefore retaining employment would be neutral. In fact as has been indicated by Broadmoor Hospital itself, any ‘new’ Broadmoor Hospital would be significantly smaller and employ less people than at present. CPC believes the weighting to be erroneous.</p>	<p>The Parish Council's approach in scoring the site neutral (0) is understood. However this policy was also given a minor positive (+) score as the site would locate housing within close proximity to existing employment sites.</p> <p>Therefore the score is to remain minor positive (+).</p>
Summary of Policy SA5		
Para 4.27	Affordable housing: Whilst the statement in 4.27 – “policy can provide a significant level of	As the site could provide up to 1000 homes the Local Planning Authority would be looking at approximately

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>affordable housing..." - is laudable, this is not reflected on Map 3 of the SADPD Final, which refers to "low density housing", and "affordable housing within policy" (item 7 of Policy SA5). It appears that this weighting is erroneous.</p>	<p>250 homes (25%) being affordable. For this reason the site scored a significant positive (++)</p>
<p>Para 4.29</p>	<p>Community: The statement (ref: local centre) made about benefits extending towards Wokingham Borough on the opposite side of Old Wokingham Road ignores the fact that residents in that area already have their own local centre along Greenwood Road. It also ignores the fact that Old Wokingham Road is already a major thoroughfare in and out of Crowthorne and establishing a 'local centre' on this busy thoroughfare will be to the detriment of both existing and new residents in the area. CPC agrees that establishing a SANG and POSB will benefit all, but will hardly "retain the distinctiveness of the existing community". CPC believes the significant positive score is erroneous</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there is a Local Centre at Greenwood Road. However this is a substantial walk from properties on Old Wokingham Road and therefore a new Local Centre on the edge of TRL would provide an additional facility giving people in the area choice.</p> <p>Placing a local centre on a busy thoroughfare will make local centre viable. Providing a meeting point on a well used road.</p> <p>Providing SANG and Public Open Space will help to retain the distinctiveness of the existing communities by placing a buffer to the south-east of the site and along the northern boundary with Nine Mile Ride. This would focus development in the north-west corner of the site close to the boundary with Wokingham Without and maintaining a gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell. Although links with Bracknell will be improved.</p>
<p>Para 4.30</p>	<p>Accessible Services: The ability to make the "highway, pedestrian and cycle and public transport improvements" is severely restricted by the current layout of access roads in and out of the Crowthorne area. More importantly it ignores the</p>	<p>As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>fact that Nine Mile Road is a major (if not the only) east west thoroughfare through south-central Berkshire, serving major populations in Wokingham and Windsor in addition to Bracknell, and that Nine Mile Ride is already significantly congested at peak times and within one hour of either side.</p>	<p>term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. Example of this would include improving the ped/cycle link between Crowthorne and Sandhurst by upgrading South Rd and making further connection improvements to the existing ped/cycle network leading into Bracknell.</p> <p>With regard to "through" Roads such as Nine Mile Ride, these known congestion areas are a result of traffic not being controlled as it enters the Borough. The listed improvements along our main corridors will take this into account along with the implementation of our Intelligent Transport Systems policy and the development of our Urban Traffic Control strategy which allows us to monitor and control the through traffic you have described.</p>
<p>Para 4.33</p>	<p>There appears considerable uncertainty as to how the significant concerns raised at the issues stage may be overcome. CPC share these concerns. Some 1500 new dwellings will be allowed to be built within 1km of the SPA boundary and it is proposed to build a care home and school within the 400m "exclusion zone". Even at this stage BFC Planning appears to be at variance with its own expert opinion on biodiversity.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Option stage the outline of the broad area fell within 400m of the SPA. A significant negative score was given (--) as there was no confirmation that housing wouldn't be located within 400m of the SPA. However, this can be mitigated (by not locating housing within 400m of the SPA) and this was acknowledged in the full appraisal tables.</p> <p>Natural England are a Statutory Consultees and their comments on the Preferred Option SADPD are</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	CPC will be very interested to see Natural England's comments on the latest proposals.	addressed in Section 16 of this report. However, Natural England had no comments on the SA/SEA.
Para 4.35	<p>Travel Choice: The statement "it is unlikely that the car will be the preferred mode of transport" is again probably the most blatantly unsubstantiated statement made throughout this document. Nowhere does the document provide evidence for it and it flies in face of the existing situation in Crowthorne where most households have 2 (sometimes 3) cars and the existing (poor) bus service is under-utilised.</p> <p>Nowhere is it explained what improvements will be made to bus links, other than routing the 194 bus service through the TRL estate.</p> <p>Also it is implicit in the documents that the preferred secondary school for new residents will be Easthampstead Park. This is likely to increase the need for car transport to/from school rather than decrease it - adding to the already congested Nine Mile Ride!</p> <p>CPC believes the weighting given is significantly erroneous.</p>	<p>SA 15 (Travel Choice) seeks to improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. In this case this policy was considered to provide infrastructure that could promote non-car travel for example walking, cycling and travelling on the bus with the new bus route. For this reason the site scored a minor positive score (+).</p> <p>It can not be confirmed that people will not use their cars. However the policy is worded to provide alternatives so as to discourage the use of cars.</p> <p>The 194 bus links will be improved allowing the 194 service to infiltrate the TRL site.</p> <p>There may be an increase in traffic using Nine Mile Ride. However there are already good pedestrian and cycle links with Easthampstead Park School.</p> <p>The weighting methodology was used in the appraisal of the adopted Core Strategy. This methodology was found sound and considered relevant to the Site Allocations appraisal process.</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Para 4.36</p>	<p>Employment: The statement “.....this policy confirms that the employment area mentioned in the Employment Land Review will be retained and improved...” appears to be in strong variance with 2.4.7 of the SADPD document which seeks to remove the status of ‘Major Employment’ from the whole TRL site. On the old TRL site most of the buildings have been vacated. Only the Crowthorne Enterprise Centre, which is to be relocated on the site, will remain. CPC notes that the map of the proposed TRL development does not show the “new” TRL buildings – will this employer remain on-site after 2011? CPC believes it is likely that overall employment on the whole site will be broadly unaffected. Hence the weighting given is erroneous.</p>	<p>The policy states that the Enterprise Centre will remain on site although it will be relocated. This goes with the recommendation of the Employment Land Review. Some of the employment floorspace will be removed.</p> <p>The retention of the Enterprise Centre will provide smaller units within close proximity to existing settlement and the proposed housing at TRL.</p> <p>The main TRL building will remain and is shown on the concept plan.</p> <p>There is nothing to suggest that TRL will vacate their building although the test track facilities will be removed.</p> <p>As the policy addresses recommendations outline in the Employment Land Review this is considered to have a significant positive (++) effect upon SA Objective 21- Employment.</p>
<p>Para 4.37</p>	<p>Economic Growth: For the same reasons as stated above, CPC believes the weighting given is erroneous.</p>	<p>As the policy goes with the Employment Land Review recommendation in retaining the Enterprise Centre this was considered to have a positive effect upon SA Objective 22- Economic Growth. However there was some concern that certain uses could not be accommodated on the site in</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		close proximity to new residential properties. For these reasons the policy was given a minor positive (+) score against SA Objective 22.
Appendix 2 and 7		
General Comments on both Crowthorne Sites	<p>SA 3 Health and SA4 Poverty & Exclusion, refer to the (Crowthorne) Ward as being “one of the most health-deprived in the Borough”.</p> <p>CPC finds this statement surprising, more especially as no real explanation or evidence is given for it, and no solution is suggested to overcome it. CPC believes that the IMD data has been used erroneously without looking at real local facts.</p> <p>SA8 Accessible Services and SA 15 Travel Choice – the list of improvements appears to be largely a wish list, unsubstantiated as being achievable and effective (in fact during discussions with BFC officers at the Crowthorne exhibitions, it was agreed that these would be subject to final discussions and negotiations with developers). The list ignores the fact that Crowthorne is a small, very compact village with two major through routes – Duke’s Ride and the High Street. Neither of these are conducive to large scale capacity improvements and a very large sum of money was spent many years ago on creating the “Crowthorne Bypass” to alleviate traffic on the High Street. Duke’s Ride has become a “rat run” to get away from problems on Nine</p>	<p>According to IMD the Local Planning Authority found that Crowthorne Ward is “one of the most health-deprived in the Borough”. A suggested reason could be that within the ward there are a number of mentally ill patients located within Broadmoor Hospital. Unfortunately the IMD data suggests that it is one of the most deprived in the Borough and there is no reason given for this.</p> <p>The list of Highway improvements presented by the policies are required to accommodate development as proposed on the relevant sites. These requirements will be tested by ongoing transport modelling work that will feed into the process.</p> <p>A viability study is also being carried out to see whether or not financially the development as set out in the policies is viable. This will take into account the cost of any highway improvements that are required to support the development.</p> <p>The SA fully acknowledges that the High Street/Dukes Ride area of Crowthorne was going to be designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The Sustainability Appraisal can only be</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Mile Ride. Any proposal to improve throughput on these roads will exacerbate problems further up the line. Also there is a statement on page 28 under SA 15 that “Car likely to be Preferred Choice...”. There is no clear evidence that the suggested highway improvements will do anything other than move the problem around to a different location.</p> <p>SA 11 – There is a serious air quality issue that has been known about by BFC for some time and it is incorrect to imply that there are no issues. It is known that the air quality issue has been compounded by the ‘canyon’ development allowed by BFC along the High Street and the number of car movements in the area.</p>	<p>carried out using the information available at the time. However the SA acknowledged that this designation was likely and that it is a material consideration that will require further work. As it stands an Air Quality Action Plan is being prepared and will be a material consideration.</p>
	<p>There appears to be some uncertainty how concerns raised for both sites at the Issues and Options stage can be overcome. An example of this is the number of homes to be built within 1km of SPA and a care home and school to be built within 400m of the SPA. This goes against BFC thoughts on Biodiversity.</p> <p>Will be interested to see what Natural England say.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Option stage the outline of the broad area fell within 400m of the SPA. A significant negative score was given (--) as there was no confirmation that housing wouldn't be located within 400m of the SPA. However, this can be mitigated (by not locating housing within 400m of the SPA) and this was acknowledged in the full appraisal tables.</p> <p>Natural England are a Statutory Consultees and their comments on the Preferred Option SADPD are addressed in Section 16 of this report. However, Natural England had no comments on the SA/SEA.</p>

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council

Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Broadmoor	SA 6 Crime states that there are no issues at the location, yet BFC's own CADIS data reports significantly higher rates of ASB at the Morgan Recreation Ground, which has been pinpointed as originating in the "affordable" housing areas in the east of Crowthorne.	According to national data there were no significant concerns. This point has been noted. However there is no evidence to suggest these incidents are connected with 'affordable' housing.
TRL	<p>The completed Urban Profile for this site states "it maintains a gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell". Yet in the appraisal documents, there are numerous places where quite clearly the opposite is implied or even stated.</p> <p>Some examples are:-</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Part 1 – Table 4 section 5 says: "secondary school places at Easthampstead Park", which connects Crowthorne 'north' to Bracknell 'south'.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Part 1 – Table 4 section 7 says: "aid in steering the new community towards Bracknell", which hardly maintains the strategic gap.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Part 1 – Table 4 section 10 says: "integrating the Hanworth and Crowthorne communities looks to encourage urban renaissance", and certainly removes the strategic gap.</p> <p>We have covered some of the employment issues above, but the following must be challenged.</p>	<p>The profile for the TRL preferred option does confirm that the gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne will be maintained.</p> <p>Comments in the SA regarding the proximity of Easthampstead Park School to TRL and the integration of Crowthorne with Hanworth highlight potential accessibility issues. Development at the TRL site as shown in Policy SA5 was considered to provide improved connectivity between Crowthorne and Hanworth therefore linking the settlements without adversely affecting the buffer that is recognised as playing an important role in retaining the distinctiveness of the existing communities.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review (ELR) made the following comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBE not needed to meet the Boroughs target for office development. • Not a great location for large scale new offices and not related to Bracknell Town Council. • Site could be released for housing.

Parish Council responses: Crowthorne Parish Council		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The completed Urban Profile states "...a significant positive score when measured against employment", but this is completely at variance with the Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Part 1 – Table 4 section 21 which say: "loss of employment" and "not a great place for large-scale new offices" and "CBE not needed".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the existing units should be retained for smaller B1c/B2/B8 uses. • However the Enterprise Centre should remain on site. <p>Although there would be some loss of employment the ELR accepted that this could be the case but the Enterprise Centre should be retained. For this reason the Policy scored a minor positive (+) score against SA Objective 21.</p>

Table 16.2 Statutory Consultee: Wokingham BC

Statutory Consultee: Wokingham BC		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
General Comment	<p>BFC has produced a draft SA for the Preferred Options Document including each site. Wokingham BC has concerns that the SA does not accord with Bracknell Forest's Core Strategy. Furthermore, the Sustainability Appraisal does not recognise the need for development in Bracknell Forest to contribute towards improvements within Wokingham Borough. As such the following objection should be made:-</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal produced does not accord with Bracknell Forest's own Core Strategy since it does not take account of preventing coalescence. It also does not</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal does acknowledge that settlement coalescence should not be encouraged.</p> <p>The concept plan layouts in both policies SA6 and SA8 show development located against the Borough boundary with Wokingham BC. However there is a significant buffer of open space between the Borough boundary and the A329. Development planned within Wokingham Borough has not been located up against the Borough boundary. Therefore if development were to take place as suggested in the preferred option concept plans including what is</p>

Statutory Consultee: Wokingham BC		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	take account of whether adequate infrastructure can be delivered in Wokingham Borough to support the growth envisaged.	<p>planned for Wokingham, it is not considered that there would be any coalescence and therefore does not go against the spirit of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council has exchanged data with Wokingham Borough Council to feed into the Councils' respective transport models and will maintain dialogue with Officers as preparation of the SADPD continues.</p> <p>The level of development planned is required to meet the Borough's development needs in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy (which has been independently examined and found to be both robust and soundly based).</p>

Table 16.3 Statutory Consultee: English Heritage

Statutory Consultee: English Heritage		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Summary of Broad Area 5 - East Binfield	No reference to the potential impact upon the setting of the registered historic park and garden and the statement that 'there are listed buildings on site with no confirmation that they will be retained'. This would appear to fall short of the	Although the summary does not mention the parks and gardens these were taken into consideration when appraising the Broad Area. The full appraisal table acknowledges the 2no. Listed Buildings and the Grade II listed historic

Statutory Consultee: English Heritage		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	strategic objectives set out in the Core Strategy.	gardens. The appraisal states that as it was not known at the time that the listed buildings and historic gardens wouldn't be harmed then a negative score was awarded (-). The site was compared with other sites on the basis of this score, although there was an error in the summary that suggests a significant score was awarded. Action: This will be amended as such.

The following Statutory Consultee responses are the ones received as a result of the consultation process:-

Table 16.4 Statutory Consultee: Natural England

Statutory Consultee: Natural England		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	Natural England have no comments to make on this document.	Noted

Table 16.5 Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
General Comments	Generally speaking, the Sustainability Appraisal is robust and makes clear and justified recommendations about	Noted.

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>each site and broad area. The scoring used against sustainability objectives seems novel and is not one I have come across before with regard to weighting locally important objectives against say more nationally derived policy objectives.</p> <p>The approach used for individual site assessment is good however whilst the Environment Agency does not raise any concerns about the sites included within the SADPD there could be challenges to the fact that some sites which are less sustainable have been taken forward on the presumption that mitigation can be delivered.</p> <p>For example, the urban areas to be taken forward for development did not score positively prior to mitigation being considered. There were other broad areas which had higher overall sustainability scores (For example Broad Area 8, Broad Area 4). The general principle adopted with regard to site selection is to first avoid sensitive sites and then, if they have to be developed, be mitigated. You will have to justify selecting these apparently (from table 16) more sensitive sites and then choosing to mitigate rather than selecting other less sensitive sites first.</p> <p>Other than this point, we have very minor comments on the specifics of the sustainability appraisal as it is backed up by robust evidence base and a clear assessment methodology. We provide comments on the preferred option stage.</p>	<p>The scoring was developed during the appraisal of the now adopted Core Strategy. This methodology was found sound at examination.</p> <p>If sites scored negatively against SA Objective 2 (Flooding) then the suggested mitigation was to avoid development within recognised flood plains and to implement SUDs where appropriate.</p> <p>A site may be considered sensitive as there is an element of flood risk. However the fact that it could be mitigated and that the site may be considered the most sustainable in terms of transport links provides a case not to look at less sensitive sites.</p> <p>There were no less sensitive sites that could provide the level of housing required.</p> <p>Noted. Justification for the choice of the preferred options is set out in the background paper.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Summary of Policy SA1 (P56)	<p>The sustainability appraisal appears robust for individual sites.</p> <p>Drainage measures will be required on all sites greater than 1 hectare. The SA has noted these as mitigation measures on some of the sites and as a development requirement in others.</p> <p>We also agree broadly with the comments in respect of Biodiversity and that mitigation will be required on many of the sites. In particular the Warfield site where a biodiversity and flood risk buffer should be included especially along the Cut.</p>	<p>First point is noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Development on SA9 (Land at Warfield) was appraised during the appraisal of the Core Strategy. Therefore a view was taken at the preferred options stage not to re-appraise the site. However it is agreed that a buffer would be required for both biodiversity and flood risk.</p>
Summary of Policy SA2 (P59)	<p>Again, we agree with many of the conclusions of the SA. We would add that Table 63 should take account of the fact that this site may well have an impact on either soil or controlled waters (Water resources) if it is not developed appropriately.</p> <p>Again, we note that most sites score a negative impact on biodiversity. This is a consistent theme across many of the sites and some strong Biodiversity mitigating policy should be required as a part of this DPD and subsequent policy hooked Supplementary Planning Document (SPDs).</p> <p>We note you already have the Thames Basin Heaths SPD. Perhaps a green infrastructure policy should also be incorporated in to the allocations DPD to cover the sites which fall outside of the broad strategic areas.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to say the site will result in an impact upon either soil or controlled waters. Although the Environment Agency's concerns have been noted.</p> <p>Even if there is no designated habitat of significance development of a site is likely to result in some adverse impacts upon biodiversity. For this reason the sites have scored at least a minor negative (-) score.</p> <p>The EA's comment has been noted.</p> <p>We have a chapter in the Limiting the Impact of Development (July 2007) that refers to Thames Basin Heath mitigation. The Council is looking to consult on a draft SPD in the Autumn 2011 and adopt in the December 2011.</p> <p>It is noted that the EA would like to see a green infrastructure policy. These comments will be picked up in the background document.</p>

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	We are pleased to see the SA make mention of surface water drainage and SUDS where relevant.	It is noted that the EA is happy with the SA referring to SUDS where relevant.
Summary of Policy SA3 (P62)	We agree with many of the comments in the sustainability appraisal. We disagree with the conclusions reached for SHLAA sites 122 & 300 and would suggest that without mitigation the effect on objectives 19 and 18 would be negative. It is likely that land investigation will be required and those investigations should confirm remediation requirements where necessary.	<p>Do not agree that SHLAA sites 122 & 300 should have scored negatively when appraised against SA Objectives 18 and 19. The EA do not state why although it is thought to be due to an old landfill site being located north of the SHLAA sites. This old landfill site has been acknowledged in the appraisal of the site.</p> <p>Action: The scoring is to be changed from a 0 against SA Objective 18 (Water) to a (?)</p> <p>This will then acknowledge that further work is required to understand any possible implications. This was the case when appraising the sites against SA Objective 19 (Soil).</p> <p>This one change in scoring would have no overall implications for the sites rating.</p>
Summary of Policy SA4 (P65)	We broadly agree with the comments and Table 45 of Appendix 7. We would add that the SA would suggest that Green Infrastructure should be added as a requirement.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: The table will be amended to reflect that Green Infrastructure should be a consideration of the Preferred Option policy.</p>
Summary of Policy SA5 (P66)	We broadly agree with the comments and Table 46 of Appendix 7. We would add that the SA would suggest that requiring SUDS as a part of the infrastructure requirements would act	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: The SA appraisal table will be amended as such.</p>

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	as mitigation for the likely increase in runoff rates and volumes that would otherwise occur for smaller phases of the development. The policy wording of SA5 should be changed to reflect this.	
Summary of Policy SA6 (P68)	We have no additional comments to make and welcome the mitigation measures proposed.	Noted.
Summary of Policy SA7 (P69)	The sustainability appraisal is thorough at this point. As the North East corner has not been removed you as LPA will need to be satisfied that any development in that location can pass the flood risk sequential test. Of course, allocation in that part of the site for open space and/or nature conservation would be in line with the Sequential Approach as shown discussed in PPS25. We are satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures which have been set out.	Noted.
Summary of Policy SA8 & SA9	There does not appear to be any further information in the Sustainability Appraisal on these sites. We have assumed this is because they have essentially already been allocated as a part of the core strategy considerations. If however, they have accidentally not been included please reconsult us on the individual appendix assessments of both these broad areas.	<p>The two sites being Land at Amen Corner and Land at Warfield have already been identified in principle in the Core Strategy (2008).</p> <p>Land at Amen Corner has been subject to SA for both the Core Strategy and the Amen Corner SPD.</p> <p>Land at Warfield has been subject to SA at the Core Strategy and has been subjected to a Draft SA of the Draft Warfield SPD.</p> <p>For these reasons a new and separate SA of both sites was not considered to be necessary. Therefore the EA are correct in their thinking that "this is</p>

Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		because they have essentially already been allocated as a part of the core strategy considerations."
Para 4.3 (Policies SA8 & SA9)	There does not appear to be any further information in the Sustainability Appraisal on these sites. We have assumed this is because they have essentially already been allocated as a part of the core strategy considerations. If however, they have accidentally not been included please reconsult us on the individual appendix assessments of both these broad areas.	A Sustainability Appraisal of both the Warfield and Amen Corner sites was carried out and found sound by an Inspector at the Examination of the Core Strategy. For this reason no further appraisal of these sites (Policies SA8 and SA9) took place.

Table 16.6 Developer: Legal & General- Represented by Quod

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Quod who represent Legal & General reiterated the SA scoring in their comments and then went on to suggest amendments to the scoring as follows:-		
SA Objective 2- Flooding	Through the use of SUDs the development of the TRL site could help to improve the existing drainage situation. As a result of this the site should score positively (+) and not (0).	That may be the case however the drainage issues on site are not as yet fully understood. Action: Score to remain the same.

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
SA Objective 3- Heath	The reliance upon policy and implementation to deal with the effects of development upon health is inappropriate.	Unfortunately the location of doctors and dentists is down to the local Primary Care Trust (PCT). The PCT have been consulted on each stage of the Site Allocations process. Action: Score to remain the same.
	The planned SANG and open space provision would have a positive effect upon health.	This may be true but the overriding factor is that the effects upon health will be determined on what health care provisions are put forward by the Primary Health Trust. Action: Score to remain the same.
	Legal & General are willing to provide a doctors and dentists.	This may be the case. However this was not confirmed in the Preferred Options document and therefore was not appraised as such. Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 4- Poverty and Social Exclusion	The site can provide a level of affordable housing and therefore this must score positively against this SA Objective.	This may be the case but how will this address the poverty and social exclusions issues that may exist because of Broadmoor Hospital. Action: Score to remain the same.
	TRL HQ building to be retained and the Enterprise Centre is to be retained although relocated on site.	This has been acknowledged in the scoring. Action: Score to remain the same.

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	80% of the TRL site is derelict and therefore providing 1000 new residential units would have a positive effect upon this SA Objective.	<p>Not sure how this will improve on any Poverty and Social Exclusion concerns. Although this is noted.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>
SA Objective 13- Biodiversity	<p>The TRL site was attributed a 'very negative' score against SA Objective 13 (Biodiversity), with the Draft SA referring to an ecologically varied site including features that may be of County importance (survey suggests parts of the site would qualify for Local Wildlife Site status due to the reptiles found there) and the development of the site could result in a loss of species or habitats of high/county value or higher.</p> <p>However Ecology Solutions advise that the criteria for selecting Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is set at an extremely low level and all the sites which would meet criteria can be selected not, as in the case of SSSI's, just the best examples. Even if the TRL site was selected as an LWS, Ecology Solutions advise that the interest could be readily accommodated within the SANG or other green infrastructure that forms part of the development proposal.</p>	<p>The current Local Wildlife Site criteria are used in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire using data from the local records centres as a basis for this guidance and it is implemented by the county nature conservation forums. A copy of this document is available from www.berksbap.org. The Environmental Statement submitted with the Crowthorne Business Park application (07/01207/OUT) includes information about the ecological surveys undertaken at the site within Chapter 6 "Natural Heritage" and associated appendices as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 6.90 states " Both dry dwarf shrub heath and acid grassland are National and Berkshire BAP priority habitats. These habitats on site are valuable on a county level due to their botanical diversity and because they support areas of similar habitat to that found on the SPA in the south".</p> <p>Paragraph 6.91 adds " Within this habitat, species of County importance also occur, including Dwarf Gorse".</p>

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Although the TRL site is located close to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, development of the site would include on-site open space and SANG provision which exceed the relevant standards and no residential development would be proposed within the 400 metres SPA buffer. Access routes to the development, connecting habitats and providing wildlife corridors, signposting, provision of recreation routes etc.</p> <p>Accordingly, it would seem reasonable to expect that the site would be scored positively against the SA Objective in respect of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Appendix 6.9 shows reptile survey results which confirm low numbers of four species of reptiles i.e. Common Lizard, Slow Worm, Grass Snake and Adder. The Local Wildlife Site criteria for designation on reptiles is a site that supports at least three species.</p> <p>There is no confusion with the habitat surveys undertaken by John Wenman Ecological Consultancy as the survey report for Broad Area 3 did not cover the TRL site due to existing survey information.</p> <p>Designation of the site as a Local Wildlife Site may not prevent its use as a SANG or public open space and it will be for Legal & General to demonstrate how these sensitive ecological features can be protected in the long term.</p>
SA Objective 16- Resource	Minerals are not considered to be a significant constraint at the site.	<p>Noted but further work would be required.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>
	Minerals area would not be built on as this would form a landscaped area.	<p>Development would take place on an area shown as having a gravel plateau. The whole site has been marked as having Bagshot beds. Therefore further work is required.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Gravel is considered to be comparatively shallow and therefore not a commercially viable source of extraction.	<p>This information is not available to the the Local Planning Authority. This may be the case but can not be clarified at this time. Therefore it is not unreasonable to suggest that further work is required.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>
	The scoring does not reflect the statement that the development would allow for a positive effect upon using and re-use of renewable and non-renewable resources. This would be addressed through policy that uses current BREEAM and CfSH best practice.	<p>The full appraisal table acknowledges this and the other preferred option sites are likely to have a positive effect upon this SA objective. However all the sites require further work to be carried out to assess the likely implications for the mineral sources on the sites.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>
	The site would be a re-use of previously developed land.	<p>This is true but it is considered that this issue is more suitable to SA10 (Urban Renaissance) and SA14 (Countryside and Historic). Therefore the scoring for this site against these objectives has resulted in positive scoring.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Sustainable forestry could supply materials such as pallets.	This seems to be an aspiration and not substantial enough to feed into the appraisal process. Action: Score to remain the same.
	For the reasons given above the site should score positively against this SA Objective.	For the reasons given above the scoring is not to be changed at this stage. Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 17- Waste	The scoring is dependant upon the implementation of the scheme and relevant policies. This scoring is inappropriate as to some extent it could apply to all SA Objectives.	The only way to assess the waste issues that may arise from development is upon the implementation of the scheme. Other SA Objectives have issues that cannot be addressed prior to the implementation of the development. Action: Score to remain the same.
	Assessment of waste matters would be completed and submitted with a planning application.	This may be the case but we were at the preferred option stage of the Site Allocations DPD. Any information submitted with a planning application can not be used in the appraisal work at this stage especially as the appraisal is a comparative exercise between sites. The level of detail would not necessarily be the same as other sites.

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Appropriate waste recycling and collection would be achieved through the implementation of BREEAM and CfSH.	This correct but will depend upon how policy implemented. Also some work is being carried out on possible locations for low carbon renewable energy generation measures. This work will feed into the process. Action: Score to remain the same.
	For these reasons this site should score positively.	It is not clear how this site could score positively as the likelihood of effects is dependant upon the implementation of policy. Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 18- Water Quality	The development of the site will improve on the existing surface water drainage through new measures such as SUDs and grey water harvesting. Likely to provide ecological and aesthetic improvements. As such the site should score positively.	The site could improve on the existing drainage situation. However it is equally likely that as a result of development the situation could be worsened. Therefore the effects are dependant upon the implementation of policy. Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 19- Soil Quality	The score against this SA Objective as neutral (0). RPS Environment and Jacobs have considered this matter and provided the following findings:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been thoroughly investigated (with the site investigated in 2004, 2006 and 2006) and no significant levels of contamination have been recorded. 	This may be the case but the information needs to filter through the Site Allocation document. In order to compare sites for their 'Sustainability' a comparable evidence base is required. I understand that separate work may have been carried out on certain sites as some sites are being promoted but when appraising other site this information is not present.

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contamination that was found (hydrocarbons, metals, asbestos in some buildings etc) is typical of many light industrial/brownfield sites. • Some additional contamination could still be found. • No evidence of significant ground water contamination, contamination migration or existing harm to the environment. As such there is no statutory need to remediate the site. • The 2007 Environmental Statement concludes that there will be no residual effects associated with contamination. • The Environment Agency and BFC (Environmental Health Officer), having reviewed the findings of previous site investigations and the ES, have raised no concerns over contamination. • Asbestos at the site will be removed under controlled conditions prior to demolition. • The development of the site will be subject to appropriate consents in due course, but available evidence suggests that no extensive remediation will be necessary in order to prepare the site for development and this could occur in conjunction with other enabling works activity (i.e. The ground contamination does not warrant a specific phase of remediation). 	<p>Therefore for the purpose of this site appraisal this information has been discarded.</p> <p>Please note that it would be unreasonable to apply evidence compiled by the applicant as it should be independent.</p> <p>Action: Score to remain the same.</p>

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
SA Objective 20- Energy	A minor positive score was applied as it was recognised that there would be consequential improvements in energy efficiency as a result of the future redevelopment of the TRL site. However this is considered to downplay the long term energy and carbon savings a development at this site could offer.	This may be true but there will be an increase in the energy demand as a result of the development. So it is unlikely that any site would score a significant positive score. This was the approach to all the sites. Action: Score to remain the same.
	The site would have a combined heat and power plant that would use waste wood which represents a renewable source. Other renewables such as Photovoltaic (PV) panels would be installed.	This may be the case when the development is implemented. However this information was not present at the preferred option stage and is unlikely to be present until the scheme is implemented. Action: Score to remain the same.
	Buildings would be built to the highest contemporary standards to meet with the requirements of BREEAM and CfSH.	This would be a policy requirement to meet with the best practise at that time. Therefore this will be assessed upon implementation of the scheme. Action: Score to remain the same.
	As a result this site should be scored positively for the reasons given above.	For the reasons given above the site scoring is to remain as it is at this time. Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 22- Economic Growth	Site scored a minor positive (+) score against this SA Objective.	All the sites have been appraised in a consistent manor.

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	However it should have been scored a significant positive score (++) . Whilst this positive approach is welcomed there should be some consistency with the assessment of sites against the SA Objectives.	Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 23- Smart Growth	The scoring of this site is 'dependant upon implementation' (I) is considered inappropriate. This is likely to apply to all the SA Objectives.	This scoring (I) does not apply to all the objectives but does at the preferred options stage apply to all 4 four of the large preferred options sites. It is considered that it is unlikely to be clear what effects this and the other developments will have upon this SA Objective until implementation of the scheme(s). Action: Score to remain the same.
SA Objective 24- Skilled workforce	This site is given an 'impact cannot be predicted' score. The detailed community infrastructure required for the development of the TRL site will be determined when the details of the proposed development for the site have been confirmed through the planning application process.	The details were not available at the preferred option stage. Again in-order to take such information into consideration the same level of information should be available to other sites so that a fair comparison can be made. Action: Scores to remain the same.
Overall conclusion	Quod believe that they have demonstrated that on 12 of the 24 SA Objectives the site could score higher than that of the draft SA. The score should be 27 points higher than the draft SA score therefore being 62. The established weighting	Having looked at the comments provided by Quod on behalf of Legal & General these are considered to be the main issues why the overall score of the site should not be increased:-

Developer: Quod comments on the appraisal of SA5- TRL		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	has been used to come up with a new site score going on the reasons previously stated.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A lot of the scoring is dependant upon further work or policy implementation. 2. Supporting evidence is available from the site developers that has or will be made available at the formal planning application stage. <p>In response to point 1 none of the scores have been changed at this stage as it is considered acceptable to score sites with a no overall positive or negative score when either further work is required and/or any effects would be dependant upon the implementation of the scheme through the planning process.</p> <p>In response to point 2 a lot of where Quod believe their scores could be increased depend upon the inclusion of additional supporting material commissioned by Legal & General. For the purposes of this appraisal and in-order to compare sites this information can not be taken into consideration at this stage. At the preferred option stage TRL scored the highest following the SA and for the reasons raised by Quod it is not considered necessary to amend the scoring as such.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that supporting material is or may later be available to address any mitigation requirements listed in the full appraisal tables.</p> <p>Action: Scores to remain the same.</p>

Table 16.7 Representations

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Issues and Option Stage		
Paras 3.26 - 3.30 <u>Summary of Broad Area 1- South West Sandhurst</u>	When assessing Broad Area 1 against SA Objective 7 (Communities) there was no justification for the negative result.	Justification for scores can be found in the relevant full appraisal tables located in the appendices. Development of this site was considered to have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the area. Development of this site could lead to a separate community turning it's back on the borough and focusing out onto surrounding areas such as Camberley.
	When assessing Broad Area 1 against SA Objective 8 (Essential Services) why is a negative rating given when there are train services from both Sandhurst station and Blackwater station and an adequate bus service?	Train services at Sandhurst and Blackwater stations are not considered to be within walking distance. This is further exacerbated by the lack of bus services in the area. Buses can not easily serve the site for example the railway bridge at Sandhurst Station where long and tall buses cannot navigate under.
	Why has Broad Area 1 been given a negative score as it is located within 5km of the SPA? It should have been given a positive score.	This site was given a negative score as it is a greenfield site, adjacent to a river corridor, adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (Blackwater Valley and Thames Basin Heath) and close to an ancient woodland.
	Why when assessed against SA Objective 14 (Historic and Countryside) has Broad Area 1 been given a (--) when the issues mentioned are no more or less than Broad Area 5.	Broad Area 1 is located within an Area of Landscape Importance (ALI). This site is located within Blackwater Valley and as such has considerable potential both as a landscape feature and as a recreational resource. The site has

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		significant landscape constraints for example Tree Preservation Orders.
Paras 3.31-3.35 <u>Summary of Broad Area 2- Broadmoor</u>	3.31- How can you use the word 'may' when explaining how effects can be overcome?	One of the SA objectives is to raise possible mitigation measures should issues come to light as a result of the appraisal. Mitigation measures 'may' be suitable but may require further surveys and/or work to be carried out.
	How can more houses contribute to village community life?	At the Issue and Options stage the implementation of housing at this broad area could have encouraged additional community facilities to be introduced. These could be to the benefit of existing residents that may have a long walk to reach such facilities.
	Where is the proof that there are high levels of economic growth in Crowthorne?	At this stage Broadmoor was considered to be a site that may not be suitable to accommodate some employment uses other than the hospital use. At the Issues and Options stage no such comment regarding economic growth was made.
	Increase in traffic flow in and out of Crowthorne.	This site was considered at the Issues and Options stage to result in additional traffic. This would have to be addressed in any future design work including improvements to the highway network.
	How will health and wellbeing of an increase population be addressed when there is a strain on existing services?	We consult with the Primary Health Trusts (PCTs) and it is for them to respond to potential development.
	Remaining biodiversity resource will be lost. There will be a strain on the existing natural resources.	This is true biodiversity may be affected and was highlighted in the significant negative scoring (--) at the Issues and Options stage, as it could not be confirmed that it would not be harmed.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Broad Area 2 abuts the SPA and therefore this should render all housing development impossible.</p> <p>Agrees with negative assessment of this option.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Option stage the broad area outline fell within 400m of the SPA. No housing shall be located within 400m of the SPA. A significant negative score was given (-) as there was no confirmation that housing wouldn't be located within 400m of the SPA. However as the full appraisal table states this could be mitigated.</p>
	<p><u>WLMH Trust</u></p> <p>The supporting material previously provided shows that the development of the Broadmoor site can provide a positive biodiversity outcome and therefore scoring. (Table 23 and para 4.24 should be amended as such)</p> <p>Hydrology investigations have shown that the Broadmoor proposal is likely to have a neutral effect on SA18. (Table 12 should be amended)</p>	<p>Any supporting material can help to mitigate. However a decision has been taken to disregard such information from the comparative appraisal as such information is not available for other sites.</p>
	<p>Broad Area 2 (Broadmoor) is subject to flooding and should score -.</p>	<p>These comments have been noted. However the localised events are not directly related to watercourses. Any further masterplanning work if carried out can take this into account and design any issues out.</p> <p>Localised topography led events are hard to predict and therefore can not necessarily be evidenced.</p> <p>Score to remain the same.</p>
	<p>The + for Urban Renaissance is difficult to justify.</p>	<p>Development of this site could help to retain existing listed buildings; and encourage the use of predominately previously developed land in meeting housing needs.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	It is the Core Strategy's objective to achieve sustainable development yet Broadmoor was ranked 6th out of the 8 sites.	At the Issues and Options stage Broadmoor ranked 4th out of the 8 sites. The site scored 0 and therefore could be considered not to be the most sustainable site although it did not score a negative score. However there were concerns regarding biodiversity, listed buildings and associated historic gardens along with the issue of accessibility to essential services. These could all be mitigated against and the purpose of the SA is to highlight concerns and suggested mitigation to aid the decision making process and promote sustainable development.
Paras 3.36 - 3.39 <u>Summary of Broad Area 3- North East Crowthorne</u>	When assessed against SA7 (Communities) and SA 10 (Urban Renaissance) Broad Area 3 states 'could allow integration with Hanworth' and due to this scored positively. Broad Area 3 integration with Crowthorne and retaining the green gap is an over riding criteria.	The intention behind the scoring was that development of this broad area could allow for new and improved pedestrian, cycle and public transport links between Crowthorne and Hanworth. Therefore integrating communities. However any development would have to be mindful of preserving a gap.
	Should retain TRL within the Crowthorne community.	This could be achievable through appropriate masterplanning.
	The + for Urban Renaissance is difficult to justify.	This option was considered to encourage development of predominately previously developed land in meeting future housing needs, Therefore this is why the area scored positively (+)
	It is the Core Strategy's objective to achieve sustainable development yet N.E. Crowthorne was ranked 5th out of the 8 sites.	At the Issues and Options stage N.E. Crowthorne ranked 3rd out of the 8 sites.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		The site scored 2 and although low was considered to be a sustainable location. However there were concerns regarding biodiversity and accessibility to essential services. These could all be mitigated against and the purpose of the SA is to highlight concerns and suggested mitigation to aid the decision making process and promote sustainable development.
	No mention that TRL is currently zoned as light industrial. This would require a change of use by the Council.	TRL was mentioned in the associated full appraisal table as being an established employment area and that the Employment Land Review recommended that a level of employment use be retained. It is also mentioned in para 3.31 of the Preferred Option that the site is within a defined employment area. Therefore a change of use would not be required.
Paras 3.40 - 3.44 <u>Summary of Broad Area 4- West Binfield</u>	Development could create urban sprawl and blur the distinction between Bracknell, Binfield and Wokingham.	This was raised at the Issues and Option Stage as a concern. However the mitigation recommendation was to "maintain and create buffers on the site, This should prevent the blurring of settlements".
	When assessed against SA 8 (Accessibility) why has Broad Area 4 deemed to have good public transport to the 'town' (presumably Bracknell) and at the same time it is said that 'non car mode to town (is) relatively poor'?	This was an error however it does not affect the scoring. Action: Text in full appraisal table to be amended so that it reads: "The site is not located within close proximity of of a railway station. However the site has reasonable public transport links and therefore scores a minor positive (+)".

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	3.40 Disagree. Development of this site would have a huge impact on the character and appearance of the area.	The Landscape Assessment Study stated the following:- "is considered to have moderate capacity to development without affecting the character of the area". This study forms part of the background evidence to the Site Allocations Document.
	3.41 Disagree. Most people who currently live in Binfield area do not work locally. Any increase in commuters working out of the area would increase traffic in the surrounding area of Binfield.	Residents in the area may work outside of the local area. However the intention behind the positive scoring was that development in such a location would provide housing close to existing employment areas. This would provide the opportunity to encourage sustainable living.
	3.44 Strongly agree.	Noted. However if mitigation such as the following is taken into account then concerns could be addressed:- "maintain and create buffers on the site, This should prevent the blurring of settlements".
	Development of this site would extend housing to the very edge of the borough boundaries and intrude on existing open space. This with the planned development in Wokingham result in merging Bracknell with Wokingham.	The above mitigation measures as mentioned in the associated full appraisal table would address these concerns.
Paras 3.45 - 3.48	It is of noted that this Broad Area was the only one to have seven negative points against it.	That is incorrect as Broad Area 1- South West Sandhurst had seven negative scores of which two were significant negative scores (--). There were also

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
<u>Summary of Broad Area 5-East Binfield</u>		three other sites with significant negative scores (--).
	Your own comments seem loaded against this site, providing a key recreational area and open space between the village and already quite large housing estate at Temple Park.	At the Issues and Option stage it could not be demonstrated that some of the existing openspace would remain. The site was acknowledged as a buffer between settlements.
	The view from the hill near Newbold college looking out over the countryside would be significantly and negatively altered.	The view could be affected but at the Issues and option stage there were no concept plans. Development could be planned as to work with the topography of the land and therefore limit any impacts there may be on external views.
Paras 3.55 - 3.60 <u>Summary of Broad Area 7-Chavey DownLong Hill Road</u>	When assessed against SA Objective 8 (Accessibility) why has Broad Area 7 been given a neutral rating when there is a London train service on the doorstep?	This site has an unsatisfactory bus service and the site is sufficient distance away from the Town Centre to encourage the use of cars. For this reason the site was given a negative (-) score. Yes the site is close to Martins Heron station and for this reason the site was given a positive (+) score. Therefore the overall scoring was +/-.
	Why has this Broad Area been given a negative score against SA Objective 13 (Biodiversity)	Development of this site is likely to result in the loss of habitat and therefore have a negative impact upon biodiversity. This has been the case with all sites, especially at the Issues and Option stage as there is a lack of detail.
Paras 3.61 - 3.64 <u>Summary of Broad</u>	Broad Area 8 scored the highest at the Issue and Option stage out of all the 8 broad areas. However it was rejected. This shows the scoring methodology is flawed.	The site is no longer available and therefore could not be taken forward as a Preferred Option (see Background Document and summary in the SEA Report).

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
<u>Area 8- East Bracknell</u>		
Paras 3.69 - 3.74 <u>Land South of Cricket Field Grove</u>	Increase the strain on the surrounding infrastructure.	All development will increase pressure on existing infrastructure. However with new large scale development comes the opportunity to seek financial contributions to limit the impact of development. Contributions can be secured to provide improvements to the highway network affected by the development and provide schools and community facilities should they be required.
	Development at 'Land South of Cricket Field Grove' does not meet with any of the SA Objectives.	<p>According to the Issues and Options appraisal Land at Cricket Field Grove scored positively (+) against SA Objectives 7 (Community), 9 (Culture, Leisure and Recreation), 16 (Resource Use), 20 (Energy), 21 (Employment) and 22 (Economic Growth).</p> <p>It did score negatively against SA Objectives 13 (Biodiversity), 14 (Countryside & Historic) and 15 (Travel Choice).</p> <p>All the other scores were neutral as there was no overall effect, required more work to determine or depended upon implementation.</p> <p>Therefore the site was considered to meet with SA Objectives.</p>
Preferred Options Stage		

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Paras 4.11 - 4.16 <u>Summary of Policy SA2- Other Land within Defined Settlements</u>	<p><u>WLMHT</u></p> <p>The supporting material previously provided shows that the development of Land at School Hill and Cricket Field Grove would have no significant effects on biodiversity, site can provide a positive biodiversity outcome and therefore scoring. (Table 21 and para 4.52 should be amended as such)</p>	<p>Any supporting material can help to mitigate. However a decision has been taken to disregard such information from the comparative appraisal as such information is not available for other sites.</p> <p>However the information will be used if required at a later date in the Site Allocation process.</p>
	<p>The Master Plan proposals for Broadmoor will address any issues such as Accessibility, heritage impacts and replacement of Open Space of Public Value. It is anticipated that the scoring will be amended.</p>	<p>Masterplanning may addressed concerns raised through the appraisal process. However for the purpose of this site comparison sustainability appraisal/SEA the scores will not be amended.</p>
<u>Summary of Policy SA3- Edge of Settlement Sites</u>	<p>Appraisal of Policy SA3 is supported and the outcome is considered to be correct.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>White Cairn</p> <p><u>SA 13 Biodiversity:</u></p> <p>The woodland is full of life and development of the site would surely have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p><u>SA3 Heath:</u></p> <p>Our surgeries are full and likely to be unable to cope with the additional residents given the cumulative effect of other sites in the village. Ridiculous to suggest capacity is unknown.</p> <p><u>SA4 Poverty:</u></p> <p>What health deprivation?</p> <p><u>SA5 Education:</u></p>	<p>This may be the case and this is why a minor negative score (-) has been given.</p> <p>The Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) are consulted on every stage of the Site Allocations process. It is for the PCTs to respond to development and ensure that there are the facilities to support the demand.</p> <p>According to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Crowthorne Ward is considered to have a high level of health deprivation. There is no direct reason given however the fact that Broadmoor Hospital is located within the ward may suggest why this is the case.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of development is a consideration when looking to see if there is capacity to offset demand.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Schools are at capacity. This site is just one of many and therefore the cumulative effect on school capacity should be considered.</p> <p><u>SA7 Community:</u></p> <p>How can people understand what a positive and negative impact upon this SA Objective means. There are no positive effects.</p> <p><u>SA8 Accessible Services:</u></p> <p>Site is not accessible to essential services. No buses along Dukes Ride.</p> <p><u>SA10 Urban Renaissance:</u></p> <p>Dues Ride is not part of the High Street.</p> <p><u>SA15 Travel Choice:</u></p> <p>People in Crowthorne do not have a good choice of public transport and there are not a number of essential services close by this site. The preferred choice of transport would be the car.</p>	<p>The full appraisal tables in the appendices describe why we came to the conclusion of a + or -. The tables will list both the positive and negatives impacts against the relevant SA Objective.</p> <p>The site is accessible to essential services such as shops, post office, railway station and doctors and dentists.</p> <p>This is correct Dukes Ride is not the 'High Street' in Crowthorne. However for the purpose of appraising the site this section of Dukes Ride has a parade of shops that provide a high street feel to the area.</p> <p>The site is located close to a railway station and within 15 mins walk of High Street Crowthorne where there are a range of shops and services. Therefore the preferred mode of transport may not necessarily be the car. The purpose of this SA objective is to encourage other modes of transport and discourage the use of the car. This site was considered to be a reasonably good location as to warrant a minor positive score (+).</p>
	<p>(Agent to Foxley Lane Site)</p> <p>SA13- Biodiversity. Negative scores are given because of the potential for development to have an impact upon biodiversity. Hedgerows around boundaries will be retained and an area of open space will be provided. Therefore biodiversity will be retained and enhanced.</p>	<p>Do not agree as the level of detailed mentioned by the agent acting on behalf of the site owners was not present in the preferred option document. However if in the document this was to be confirmed via a masterplan then the scoring could be amended.</p> <p>As it stands the scoring will remain.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Score should be revised to at least 0 or +	
	SA14- Countryside and Historic. Negative scoring has been provided as there is a threat to TPO trees. Trees are to be retained. Score should be revised to at least 0 or +	TPO trees at the entrance to the site have already been removed and/or harmed. Scoring to remain the same.
Paras 4.18 - 4.26 <u>Summary of Policy SA4- Land at Broadmoor.</u>	To suggest that the proposals would satisfy the requirement for good public transport is laughable.	Development of this site could provide the opportunity to improve on the current public transport provisions. Development of the site could provide the opportunity for a viable bus service. The policy also seeks to improve highway capacity, signalisation and pedestrian and cycle provisions.
	The Broadmoor Area regularly floods and yet this has not been taken into account.	These comments have been noted. However the localised events are not directly related to watercourses. Any further masterplanning work if carried out can take this into account and design any issues out. Localised topography led events are hard to predict and therefore can not necessarily be evidenced.
	Why with the scoring given has the Broadmoor site been selected as a Preferred Option.	The reason why the site was taken forward as a preferred option can be seen in the Background Paper and the SA/SEA for the Draft Submission Site Allocation Document.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>This document fails to illustrate how development of Broadmoor would as SA15 says 'Improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys'.</p>	<p>This statement was made following the appraisal of Policy SA4 against SA Objective 15. Policy SA15 states that development will be accompanied by the following necessary items of infrastructure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highway capacity improvements to Forests Way junction with Nine Mile Ride, Bracknell Rd junction with Old Wokingham Rd. 2. Signalisation of Rackstraw Rd and Owlsmoor Road including bus priority and improvements to Crowthorne High Street. 3. Potential contribution towards strategic highway network improvements (M4 junction 10 and M3 junction 3). 4. Provision of bus links to Crowthorne town centre and the wider area and associated infrastructure. 5. South Rd to be footway/cyclepath with Toucan crossing to link Owlsmoor. 6. Pedestrian and cycle improvements to Upper Broadmoor Rd and Sandhurst Rd. <p>Together these infrastructure requirements will seek to 'Improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys'.</p>
	<p>Summary is a post hoc justification for sites that already scored negatively.</p>	<p>The 4 preferred options were chosen for reasons stated in the background paper and the SA/SEA for the Draft Submission Site Allocation Document.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		The 4 preferred option policies and associated concept plans were then re-appraised. The reason why sites scored positively when they originally scored either negatively or had low scores can be put down to the appraisal process influencing the design amongst other considerations. Concerns raised at the Issues and Options stage were taken on board when choosing sites and then influenced the evolution of the policies and their associated concept plans.
	The Borough has no way of imposing a sustainable bus service.	The Council has powers to procure bus services that would not be supplied by the free market alone, and to use developer contributions for this purpose to allow bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than an 'add on' at a late stage. In the longer term, bus priority measures (allowing the most efficient use of buses) and improved accessibility from homes to bus stops, both built into the design of a development from day one, are the best means of enabling the provision of a commercially viable bus service in the longer term
	There is no financial availability for the mentioned infrastructure.	Contributions would be sought via development approvals as to provide suitable infrastructure that would be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	I dispute many of the scores, particularly those relating to impact on existing infrastructure, culture, amenities, as there is no evidence in the document that proves how these are improved or not deteriorated. Particularly when the document is populated with the world 'could'.	The purpose of the appraisal is to highlight any potential concerns and suggest any appropriate mitigation measures that may help to address the concerns. The appraisal also sets out the likelihood of the effect and therefore one scenario is that there 'could' be an impact.
	<u>WLMHT</u> The supporting information previously provided on behalf of the WLMHT shows that, through survey, careful design and a firm commitment to positive management, the proposed development will be able to achieve at least a minor positive effect on biodiversity and possibly a very positive effect. (Table 12 and Para 4.24 should be amended as such)	Any supporting material can help to mitigate. However a decision has been taken to disregard such information from the comparative appraisal as such information is not available for other sites.
	<u>WLMHT</u> Hydrology Investigations on behalf of the WLMHT have shown that the proposed Broadmoor development is likely to have a neutral effect on SA18. (Table 12 should be amended as such)	Any supporting material can help to mitigate. However a decision has been taken to disregard such information from the comparative appraisal as such information is not available for other sites.
Paras 4.27 - 4.35 <u>Summary of Policy SA5-TRL</u>	Had the SA been prepared against one of the four 1999 criteria themes of 'A Better Quality of Life' it would fail on not 'ensuring social progress which recognises the needs of everyone'. The PO's do not do this for Crowthorne. They still fail measured against one of the five themes identified in the currently adopted 'Securing the Future.' The theme 'Ensuring a strong, healthy and	The site, like that of others, was appraised with both the existing and potential new communities in mind. If a scheme looked likely to have negative effect upon the distinctiveness of existing communities then it scored as such. Development of the TRL site as outlined in Preferred Option Policy SA5 was considered not to adversely impact upon the distinctiveness of existing

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>just society' cannot be created and sustained throughout Crowthorne during the PO's 16 years plus sentence to development.</p>	<p>communities. Buffers would retain the distinctiveness of the existing communities and the proposed local centre would provide community facilities for both existing and new residents.</p>
	<p>In ignoring Crowthorne community the SA becomes a self serving placing of symbols in boxes and an unexplained basis of score weighting and number assignment. An exercise of BFC creation in order to justify it's PO selection. It fails Crowthorne as a study of the related Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) shows.</p>	<p>An essential consideration when drawing up planning documents is their effect on the environment and people's quality of life, both now and in the future. To help address this, Sustainable Appraisals and Strategic Environmental Assessments are carried out alongside the preparation of these plans to make sure social, environmental and economic issues are taken into account at every stage so that sustainable development is delivered on the ground.</p> <p>The Draft SA Report documents the SA process which has been carried out for the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options. It applied the SA methodology that was set out and agreed through consultation in the Site Allocations DPD SA Scoping Report (Jan 2010) and the Local Development Framework Scoping Report (Jan 2010).</p> <p>The overall aims of the SA/SEA is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the DPD as sustainable as possible by integrating sustainable development into the strategy making process, influencing all stages of plan development. • Provide a high level of environmental protection and balance environmental, economic

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		<p>and social considerations in the plan's preparation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on the SA process at various stages to allow the public and stakeholders to input into its production. • Provide an environmental, social and economic audit at appropriate spatial and temporal levels. <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required by European Union Directive (2001/42/EC) on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.</p>
	I find it hard to believe that the school, roads and transport links will be built in time.	Infrastructure needed to support such sites would be phased in a way that would limit any adverse impacts.
	This document fails to illustrate how development of TRL would as SA15 says 'Improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys'.	<p>This policy acknowledges that the following sustainable transport improvements will take place:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway capacity improvements. • Provision of improved bus links to town centre (including enhancements to the 194) and wider area. • Improvements to cycle and pedestrian provisions including Peacock Farm, across Old Wokingham Road and north and south of the site. <p>For these reasons this policy was given a minor positive (+) score.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>This site does not meet with the following SA Objectives:- SA7: To create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive communities, SA8: To provide accessible essential services and facilities, and SA9: To make opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation readily accessible.</p>	<p>This policy was considered to score positively against SA Objectives 7, 8 and 9 for the following reasons:-</p> <p>SA7 (Community)- Housing would support a new local centre that would in turn provide community facilities. The community benefits of such facilities would extend beyond the borough boundary including areas of Wokingham Without. Inclusion of a bus routes would benefit both the existing and new community. SANG and Public Open Space shown on the concept plan would provide a buffer and place residential development close to existing residential development. This would retain the distinctiveness of the existing community.</p> <p>SA8 (Accessible Services)- This policy would provide highway capacity improvements and the provision of improved bus links to town centre (including enhancements to the 194) and wider area. Its also outlined improvements to cycle and pedestrian provisions including Peacock Farm, Old Wokingham Road and north and south of the site. The policy also seeks to provide a new local centre, employment areas and a Care Home.</p> <p>SA9 (Culture, Leisure and Recreation)- This policy confirms that open space provision will be in excess of 8ha. This would provide open space that was not previously available to the public. There would also be a green route along Nine Mile Ride.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Why with the original negative scoring given has the TRL site been selected as a Preferred Option.	The site scored +2 and therefore scored positively. The reason why the site was taken forward as a preferred option is stated in the Background Document and will be mentioned in the submission SA/SEA.
	When looking at SA Objectives on Leisure and Recreation why are there positive scores when there would be a loss of a Tennis, Squash and amenity hall facility.	Such a facility was not known of at the time of the Daft SA assessment. However this facility is not considered open to all members of the public as membership is required through the TRL site. This will also be clarified in the Background Document.
	Recreational facilities should be enhanced not destroyed. CS8 seeks to protect recreation/sporting facilities.	Areas of the site will be opened up for recreation that were not previously accessible to the public.
	I dispute many of the scores, particularly those relating to impact on existing infrastructure, culture, amenities, as there is no evidence in the document that proves how these are improved or not deteriorated. Particularly when the document is populated with the world 'could'.	The purpose of the appraisal is to highlight any potential concerns and suggest any appropriate mitigation measures that may help to address the concerns. The appraisal also sets out the likelihood of the effect and therefore one scenario is that there 'could' be an impact.
Paras 4.38 - 4.44 Summary of Policy SA6- Amen Corner North, Binfield	4.41- I cannot see why pedestrian and cycle network needs improving at the cost of building so many houses on this land. No house no need for an improved network in this area. This would spoil the look and feel of the area.	There is an established housing need. Policy SA6-Amen Corner North, Binfield was taken forward as a preferred option. Therefore to support the new housing additional infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle provisions would be required. Financial contribution from the development itself could support such requirements.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Paras 4.45, 4.47 & 4.49</p> <p><u>Summary of Policy SA7- Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield</u></p>	<p>1. Blue Mountain Golf course is an important amenity for Binfield and Bracknell and is heavily used by local residents, societies and companies. Blue Mountain provides a large driving range, conference and banqueting facilities, restaurant and bar.</p>	<p>The issue of PPG17 will be addressed as a response to policy SA7.</p>
	<p>Ref: PPG 17</p> <p>'Open spaces, sport and recreation all underpin people's quality of life. Well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are therefore fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives.'</p> <p>For this to be built on there needs to be evidence that this facility is "surplus to requirements". How can this be the case when it is extensively used?</p>	
	<p>Binfield residents have not been consulted on the proposals for Blue Mountain Golf Course by the developer and therefore the plan does not meet PPG17 requirements.</p>	
	<p>Policy fails to provide adequate mitigation against the loss of the golf course and associated conference and recreational facilities.</p>	
	<p>This policy will provide open space provision not previously available to the public alongside the relocated football club. For these reasons the scoring would be positive against SA Objective 9. The golf course is already publicly available. How can the loss of the golf course result in a positive score. At best</p>	

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	the loss of the golf course and relocation of a football club would cancel each other out. However the village already has a football club but only one golf course.	
	2. Removal of Blue Mountain Golf course and public green space reduces the open space provided for the village.	The open space is not currently all accessible to the public. The concept plans show that areas will be developed on. It also shows that areas of open space not currently accessible to the public could be made available.
	Concept plan shows a large buffer that would retain the distinctiveness of the existing community of Binfield village....The existing community could also benefit from a new local centre and relocated football club. For these reasons the site resulted in positive scoring (+) Its is laughable that a small strip of land would act as a buffer. The golf course was created as a buffer between development at Temple Park and Binfield.	<p>The area shown on the concept plans as SANG or Open Space are considered to form a buffer that would maintain the distinctiveness of the existing communities. Although there would be less open space than currently available.</p> <p>The topography of the site can lend to the development being screened.</p> <p>Error in the Draft SA regarding the Local Centre.</p> <p>Action: The term Local Centre will be omitted from the relevant full appraisal table.</p> <p>This did not affect the scoring as such as the text was meant to refer to the the site being able to use a new local centre at Amen Corner South, not providing a new one.</p> <p>The concept plan showed a buffer to the north of the site. This buffer would contain development to the south of the site and prevent the coalescence of settlements.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	The site goes against the Council's Final Sustainability Appraisal 2006 Objective 14 (To protect and enhance where possible the Borough's countryside and its historic environment in urban and rural areas) and Objective 9 (Make opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation readily available).	<p>The policy scored negatively against SA Objective 14 but scored positively against SA Objective 9. Therefore this statement is incorrect.</p> <p>The appraisal against SA Objective 14 stated that development would be located within the Popeswood Meadow where the landscape assessment stated that there would be moderate to low capacity to development. This is not correct and is therefore an error.</p> <p>Action: The text in the relevant full appraisal table will be amended so that there is no reference to Popeswood Meadow being located within the preferred option site.</p> <p>There was also an error with the text stating that the site had Listed Buildings and Historic Gardens present.</p> <p>Action: Relevant full appraisal table to be amended so that the site is listed as not having any listed buildings and historic gardens located within it.</p>
	Playing fields are not a suitable alternative to natural habitats and dog walking areas.	The concept plan shows an area of SANG and Open Space to the north and east of the site that could accommodate dog walking and provide an enhance habitat.
	SANG is not an adequate replacement for the loss of green landscape.	SANG is required to mitigate against a possible impact upon the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The area would have to be maintained to a standard that would

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		provide an alternative greenspace and would have to remain undeveloped in perpetuity.
	The open space is currently accessible to the public. The site can be accessed via paths and footpaths. Both walking and running activities bisect the site.	The appraisal acknowledged that this policy would allow for areas of the golf course to be open to the public for walking that would normally be restricted to paths. The majority of the site is not publicly accessible unless you are playing golf.
	The golf course provides a significant green breathing space and wildlife corridor.	This was acknowledged in the appraisal of this policy. The policy scored a minor negative (-) score like that of other sites as there is likely to be an impact upon biodiversity. The existing habitats and biodiversity value of the site would have to be taken into account in any masterplanning.
	Loss of gap and impacts upon the visual amenity of the area.	Views into and across the site would be affected. When appraising the policy the 'Landscape Capacity Study' was consulted. This acknowledged that a large majority of the site had capacity to development. The topography of the land could also lend itself to accommodating the football club.
	3. Information received from Planning Officers at the exhibitions indicated that there would be no or at least little affordable housing on the Blue Mountain site. Instead there would be high value, low density, executive type homes.	This policy would allow for the Blue Mountain site to provide a level of affordable housing. Currently this would have to be at least 25%. The Site Allocations Preferred Option document provided no mention of executive homes.
	This policy scored positively against SA Objective 1 (Housing) as a level of affordable housing could be provided. Surely this is a negative.	It is the Council's objective to provide a percentage of affordable housing within the borough. Therefore a percentage of the residential development shown on this policy's concept plan would have to

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		be affordable. For this reason the site scored positively due to the amount of affordable housing that could be accommodated.
	4. With reference to the provisions for schools the site was given a significant positive score (++) . However this fails to mention that the schools are required primarily for Warfield and not Binfield.	The secondary school at Blue Mountain would accommodate residents of both the Blue Mountain site and the Warfield site, plus residents living within existing communities. A primary school is proposed on the Warfield site to accommodate its residents.
	This policy confirms that as a primary and secondary school would be located on site then a significant positive (++) scoring is awarded. Only if they are built should a significant positive scoring be awarded.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan acknowledges the need for the schools provision. Policy SA7 says it would be provided on site and therefore the policy has been appraised as such. As the provision could be accommodated on site to address the need a significant (++) positive score was given. The school provision would have to be provided to enable the development.
	Football club will require floodlights as it would be used in the evenings. This would result in light pollution. New lights would be more obtrusive than the existing driving range lights.	This would have to be addressed at the masterplanning stage. Action: The relevant full appraisal table will make reference to the potential increase in 'sky glow' from external lights.
	Replacing the valuable golf course with an unwanted football club and a much reduced open space is not what residents want in Binfield.	This has been noted.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	To say that the relocated football club will benefit the existing community is ignoring the fact that Binfield already has a successful and well supported football club. Is a second club needed?	The fact that Bracknell Football club wishes to relocate to Binfield suggests that there is a need to accommodate a club on this site. There are many communities that have multiple football clubs and other sports club facilities. The facilities could be beneficial to the existing community.
	<p>Increased traffic and pollution from relocated football club.</p> <p>The significant traffic onto Temple Park can only have a negative effect on traffic flow. Already hard to exit from roads on to Temple Way during the mornings and evenings.</p>	There could be an increase in traffic and associated pollution. This could be accommodated within the proposed improvements to highway infrastructure as listed under Policy SA7.
	More of the Countryside would have to be taken for parking.	This could be true. However for the purposes of the appraisal this information was not available at the time.
6	<p>The Council says that the 'existing community could benefit from a local centre and relocated football club'. For this reason this policy resulted in a minor positive effect (+), when assessed against SA Objective 7 (Community). Binfield already has a Local Centre and Football club, so the objective has been achieved without the new development.</p> <p>Disagree that 'objective weighting was applied' and therefore the consultation process is flawed.</p>	<p>This site was never going to provide a local centre.</p> <p>Action: error in the relevant full appraisal table to been omitted.</p> <p>This does not affect the scoring as the text was meant to refer to the the site being able to use a new local centre at Amen Corner South.</p>
7	Negative scores against SA2- Flooding raised at the Issues and Options stage have disappeared. If flooding was a concern it can only increase with the loss of open space.	Since the Issues and Option stage an area of land located north of Forest Road and Tilehurst Lane was removed from the Preferred Option site boundary. Parts of this were located within a

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		<p>recognised flood plain. Therefore any concerns previously raised regarding this area of land are not relevant now.</p> <p>The concept plans for Policy SA7 show that there would be a significant buffer between the flood plain for the cut on the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Therefore this is why the appraisal scored this policy (0) neutral as there would be no overall impacts upon any watercourses in terms of flooding. Although it was acknowledged that SUDs should be incorporated where necessary to avoid surface water flooding.</p>
	<p>The Western Industrial Estate employment area is half empty. Couldn't some of this be re-designated. This would locate housing closer to employment. Provide more of an opportunity for affordable housing therefore improving on SA Objective 1 (Housing)</p>	<p>Parts of the site look to be reallocated as mixed use through the Site Allocations DPD as shown in the Preferred Option Consultation Document. These could be sites for affordable housing.</p>
	<p>General: Bracknell Forest Council's Planners have grossly manipulated their own weighting figures applied to East Binfield (Blue Mountain) sustainability score, changing it from a low -8 in the first consultation to a positive score of 20 in the second one. They have thus succeeded in changing Blue Mountain from being one of the least sustainable options originally proposed (25th out of 27) to becoming the 8th best sustainable option available.</p>	<p>This site had a score of -7 in the 2006 Final SA compared with -8 in the Draft SA.</p> <p>The concept plan put forward at the Preferred Option stage has taken on board concerns raised at the Issues and Options stage and therefore now scored positively.</p> <p>The Background Paper outlines why this site was taken forward as a preferred option.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	The development of the site does not fit with the Council's own set of objectives given that it is a greenfield site. Why has it been chosen as a Preferred option?	
	Why was this scheme put forward as a Preferred Option if it came second bottom out of the sites appraised and had 7 negative scores out of the 24 SA Objectives.	The Background Paper outlines why the site had been taken forward as a Preferred Option.
	It would appear that the only way that the scoring has been raised is the presumption that schools can be incorporated on site.	The scoring for Policy SA7 when appraised against SA Objective 5 (Education) did result in a significant positive (++) score. This was an increase over what was given at the Issues and Options stage. The reason for the scoring being that the concept plan and the policy itself confirmed that both a Primary and Secondary school would be located on-site as to accommodate the need.
	Its would appear that the logic is heavily flawed due to considering wishful possibilities whilst ignoring real current facts.	Both what could be achieved on the site as outlined in the policy and the current facts were taken into consideration when appraising the relevant policies. However policies could only be appraised with the facts available at the time. Any new evidence will be fed into the final appraisal if the same level of evidence is available to all options.
Paras 4.75 - 4.90 <u>Summary of Policy SA12-Bracknell Town Centre</u>	I am in agreement to improve the vitality and therefore quality of life in the Town Centre.	Noted.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Appendices		
Appendix 2- Appraisal of Broad Areas (Issues and Options). North East Crowthorne (CVAG)	TRL scored (++) against SA 7 Community when the appendix stated that 'Development of this site could allow for integration between Hanworth and communities off Old Wokingham Road'.	The Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages are being confused. In Appendix 2 North East Crowthorne (Partly TRL) scored + against SA7. The supporting text in Appendix 2 did say 'Development of this site could allow for integration between Hanworth and communities off Old Wokingham Road'. However these comments demonstrate that there was an opportunity to improve accessibility between existing communities. This did not mean that the distinctiveness of existing communities would be lost as a result of better accessibility.
	Chavey Down scored negatively as people would have to use there cars. However this was not the case for TRL.	Again there is some confusion between the Issues and Options and Preferred Option stage. At the Issues and Option stage Chavey Down did result in a minor negative score (-) against SA Objective 15 (Travel Choice). However so did Broad Area 2- Broadmoor and Broad Area 3- North East Crowthorne for similar reasons. At the Preferred Option stage both SA4 (land at Broadmoor) and SA5 (TRL) scored a minor positive (+) score as the preferred options provided a level of detail that looked to satisfy some of the concerns previously raised at the Issues and Option stage. Please note that the size and shape of Broad Area 3 (North East Crowthorne) change as a result of it becoming a preferred option.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	The assertion that 'it is unlikely that the car will be the preferred method of transport' is totally unsubstantiated.	This was considered to be 'unlikely' that the car would be the preferred method of transport. The statement does not refer to this being definite. The assessment is made on the basis of the information available to the appraiser at the time the appraisal is carried out.
	This evaluation should have been made available to the Executive prior to the approval for consultation.	<p>The Draft SA including both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options assessments were sent to and therefore made available to the Executive prior to their decision on 19th October 2010. The Draft SA was also available at the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 1st November 2010.</p> <p>Both these meetings demonstrate that the Draft SA was assessed and approved to go out for consultation between November 2010 and January 2011.</p>
	TRL is prone to flooding why has this not been picked up in the SA scoring?	There are no known watercourses in and around the site. The site maybe prone to localised flooding and the reason why this may not have been originally considered was that there is no information to substantiate this. However this could be designed into any comprehensive development of the site. This can be seen from the Preferred Option concept plan for TRL where Sustainable Drainage will form part of the sites infrastructure.
	Appendices 1-6, Table 15- Travel choice is considered to be poor. However statement 4.25 says that improvements in the highway capacity and cycle	When concerns and/or potential conflicts between policies SA Objectives arise. Any suitable mitigation measures that could overcome these issues should be raised in the SA assessment tables.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	provision could allow the car not to be the preferred mode of transport. This is unsubstantiated, and frankly, unlikely.	Therefore improvements in the highway capacity and cycle provision could allow the car not to be the preferred mode of transport. This 'could' take place but needed to be highlighted at that stage.
Appendix 7- Appraisal of Urban Extensions (Preferred Options)	It is unacceptable that against SA Objective 3 appraisal results state: Unclear at this stage how improved health provisions can be provided, or that health care provision capacity not understood and will depend upon implementation.	It is for the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to respond to development and the subsequent demand. The PCTs have been involved in the consultation process.
Appendix 8- Appraisal of Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements (Preferred Options)	It is unacceptable that so many locations state that it is unclear whether or not the existing health care provision can accommodate houses. Therefore the effect will not be known until implementation.	It is for the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to respond to development and the subsequent demand. The PCTs have been involved in the consultation process.
Appendix 9- Appraisal of Other Land within Defined Settlements (Preferred Options)	It is unacceptable that so many locations state that it is unclear whether or not the existing health care provision can accommodate houses. Therefore the effect will not be known until implementation.	It is for the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to respond to development and the subsequent demand. The PCTs have been involved in the consultation process.
Appendix 10- Appraisal of Edge of Settlement Locations.	It is unacceptable that so many locations state that it is unclear whether or not the existing health care provision can accommodate houses. Therefore the effect will not be known until implementation.	It is for the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to respond to development and the subsequent demand. The PCTs have been involved in the consultation process.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
(Preferred Options)	Is this why we need an extension to Easthampstead Park Crematorium identified in the IDP.	
Appendix 13- Consultation Responses (Transport Table 76)	<u>Chavey Down Association</u> Spatial Planning cannot be carried out without an integrated transport system.	That is correct and transport modelling is being carried out that will feed into the Site Allocation process. The findings will influence what highway infrastructure provisions will be required in-order to accommodate development of the preferred options.
	Final box (Other Issues) fails to give full answers to several of the points raised. In particular, the suggestion of the use of derelict/empty offices is not specifically answered at all.	Parts of the Eastern Employment area look to be reallocated as mixed use through the Site Allocations DPD as shown in the Preferred Option Consultation Document. In the future these sites could possibly accommodate housing.
	The Borough is not in control of crucial infrastructure such as rail.	The Council works closely with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies to improve accessibility to and from the stations and is also consulted with on any infrastructure and time table improvements.
General comments on SA Process and Procedure		
General SA Comments including the approach	SA only refers to the benefits the 4 Preferred Options will gain by being located close to existing settlements.	<p>The SA considers the effects the policies could have on both the existing and any new communities that may be formed as a result of new development.</p> <p>An essential consideration when drawing up planning documents is their effect on the environment and people's quality of life, both now and in the future.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Areas understood to be available were not considered by the SA.	It is not clear what sites this comments refers to.
	The section of two sites in Crowthorne with negative scores, even after (largely unjustified) 'weighting', confirms that the selection process is seriously flawed.	Reasons why sites were put forward as 'Preferred Options' is explained in the Background Document and the SA/SEA Draft Submission.
	Site Scores in Table 24 demonstrate that how flawed the weighting methodology is.	The weighting methodology is the same as used in the appraisal on the adopted Core Strategy (2008). This was found sound by an Inspector and therefore was used in the appraisal of the Preferred Options.
	SA Objective 13 puts a responsibility on the Borough to not only conserve but enhance biodiversity. Yet in Table 24 TRL is listed first and Broadmoor is listed fourth. Biodiversity is not given serious consideration. Biodiversity weighting needs to reflect both regional and local importance.	In the weighting methodology set out in the Draft SA (Table 10) it can be seen that SA Objective 13 (Biodiversity) is given high importance locally and therefore is weighted as such. Any concerns regarding biodiversity on both the TRL and Broadmoor sites is reflected in the scoring and explained in the full appraisal tables.
	Table 3 SA Objective 7 (To create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive communities) will not be achieved by the proposals for development in Crowthorne. This is also the case with policy SA11 (To maintain air quality and improve where possible) is also not met.	The two main sites within Crowthorne are SA4 (Land at Broadmoor) and SA5 (Land at TRL). When appraised against SA Objective 7 (Community) the Broadmoor site scored a minor positive (+) as the concept plan showed an area of SANG/Open space that would be retained to provide a buffer between development as well as a Special Protection Area mitigation measure. This buffer was considered to help retain the distinctiveness of the existing communities.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		<p>When appraised against SA Objective 7 (Community) the TRL site scored significantly positive (++) as the policy confirmed the inclusion of a new local centre which was considered to benefit the new residential community as well as both the existing communities at Crowthorne and Wokingham Without.</p> <p>For these reasons development as proposed under policies SA4 and SA5 is not considered to conflict with the objective to create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive communities.</p> <p>When appraising policies against SA Objective 11 (Air Quality) it is true that development and the subsequent intensification in use of a site is going to result in an increase in emissions however it is important how these are limited and this can be designed into a scheme.</p> <p>There is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Crowthorne High street and this must now be a consideration when planning any new development. Any new development will have to work with the findings of an Air Quality Action Plan, of which one for Crowthorne High Street is currently being worked on.</p>
	Housing must be reigned in until we know whether the health care system can cope.	The PCTs (Primary Health Trusts) need to react to the demand for housing. They are consulted on the various stages of the Site Allocations process.
	How can spatial planning work if it is not properly planned and integrated?	The process of consulting on the Issues and Options and then the Preferred Options stages forms part of the process of planning for development on suitable

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		sites. This is where concerns can be raised and addressed therefore limiting any future problems at the implementation stage.
	The document is very difficult to understand and read through without extensive knowledge of the process and this makes it very difficult to comment effectively on.	<p>The document has been summarised where appropriate and contains tables graphically demonstrating the scores for sites and how they compare with other sites.</p> <p>The final Sustainability Appraisal will be accompanied by a stand alone Non-Technical Summary.</p> <p>The main document was considered to have been set out in away that clearly explained the process and the findings so that people could easily comment on the individual stages. The full appraisal tables were separate to the main document although they were made available to comment on.</p>
	"To protect and enhance where possible the Borough's characteristic countryside and its historic environment in urban areas."- I don't see how this is compatible with the massive house building plans for Binfield and Warfield, which could largely achieve the opposite.	There is a need for housing in the borough alongside associated infrastructure. The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal is to make sure any new development is located so that it is sympathetic to that of existing communities and limits any potential harm.
	Para 3.13- While 'no further development' is a totally unrealistic option, the numbers of dwellings being sought should have been reconsidered in the light of greatly changed economic circumstances.	The justification for the housing number can be found in the Site Allocations Preferred Options Background Paper.

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	The sustainability document fails to illustrate how the site would enhance quality of life.	By applying the principles of sustainability to a plan or document and making sure that the various stages of this plan or document are influenced by the SA, will make sure that peoples 'quality of life' is given adequate consideration.
	There is no regard to existing housing and infrastructure.	The appraisal does take into account both existing housing and infrastructure.
	Fails to show how Core Strategy Objectives E and F are met other than ticking boxes on a compatibility matrix.	The comparative matrix is there to discover any inconsistencies between sets of objectives. The end result is that it identifies areas where objectives need to be balanced to ensure outcomes are consistent and where possible achieve a win-win situation.
	The document is far too complicated and slanted towards justifying the outcome that the planner desire being to increase house building.	The SA appraised the Preferred Options that have been taken forward with the main objective being that they address the housing need within the borough.
	Para 4.52- This paragraph negates the whole process defined in this document and suggests that final choices are the result of whim or external pressure.	This paragraph highlights the fact that even with negative scoring it is the purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal to suggest where necessary any mitigation measures that can overcome any previous concerns. Any suggested mitigation measures were placed within the full appraisal tables.
	I dispute that Council's conclusions that the Draft SA took into account earlier appraisal stages. I do not believe your residents were involved and signed-off any earlier appraisals. Please provide a list of residents names and dates who were involved in these appraisals. If none exist then the process is flawed.	<p>Earlier appraisal work was included within the Participation Document. This document included initial SA work used to form the Issues and Options.</p> <p>This participation document was open for consultation from 26th February 2010 - 16th April 2010.</p>

Representations		
Paragraph Number, Section or Table	Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The Council has provided late and restricted consultation engagement. The electronic consultation process has been designed to make it difficult for residents to respond. People rights were not explained to residents.</p>	<p>The Council entered into a widespread campaign in-order to notify borough residents of the Preferred Options document and how to express their views.</p> <p>Six public exhibitions were held where planners were available to talk through the preferred options and explain face to face how residents can respond to the consultation.</p> <p>The consultation was not restricted in anyway as comments were acceptable by letter, email and via our online consultation form on the Council's website.</p>
	<p>The SA does not take into account the effects on existing communities.</p>	<p>The SA does take into account any effects the policies may have upon existing communities as well as any new communities that might be created.</p>

17 Specific Consultee Comments

Specific consultee responses

Several statutory and non-statutory bodies responded to the consultation and these are summarised below. Some respondents/organisations' interest related to specific sites or geographical areas, and others interests related to specific issues (e.g. biodiversity, highways). The tables below represent a summary of the issues raised; full copies of the consultation responses are available on the Council's consultation portal or on request.

The tables in this section divide the comments made by statutory and non-statutory consultees as follows:

- Bracknell Forest Parish and Town Council responses
- Adjacent County, District/Borough and Parish Council responses
- Other statutory consultee responses
- Non-statutory consultee responses
- Local amenity/residents group responses (this also includes results of a survey undertaken jointly by the Binfield Village Protection Society (BVPS), Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG) and the Northern Arc Action Group (NAAG), which was submitted to the Council after the close of the SADPD Preferred Options consultation).

Table 17.1 Bracknell Forest Parish and Town Council Responses

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
Binfield Parish Council		
Policy SA3, Policy SA6 and Policy SA7	Object to all the housing proposed in Binfield as it is inappropriate in this part of the Borough - conflicts with the recommendations of the Borough's own Character Area Assessment	The selection of sites has followed a process of assessment of the available options in terms of the sites available to meet the Borough's development needs. This has been carried in accordance with Core Strategy policy, sustainability assessment and the strategy of locating major new greenfield sites as extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements. The Character Areas SPD makes it clear that allocating sites to meet our development needs may have an impact on some of the character areas detailed within it. It also states within the SPD that it is therefore not to be seen as a tool to stifle or resist development proposals, but as a tool to inform change and guide future development.

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		<p>The disposition of uses shown on the preferred option concept plans seek to maintain the integrity of Binfield Village and some of the key views by for example maintaining large areas of open space on the south side of Forest Road.</p> <p>The major development areas of Blue Mountain and Amen Corner North lie outside the character areas defined in the SPD.</p>
	<p>The development would cause harm to the strategic gaps identified in Core Strategy Policy CS9</p>	<p>The proposals map does not define strategic gaps.</p> <p>The scale of development required means that there is a need to allocate greenfield sites (there are insufficient previously developed sites). In accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will include greenfield extensions to existing settlements and inevitably these will include land that forms part of a gap between one settlement and another.</p> <p>The proposal for Amen Corner North involves locating housing to the south of woodland that will screen views of the development from the north and preserve a physical and visual gap between Bracknell and Binfield. Following further landscape advice and the consideration of the topography of the site, adjustments are to be made to the concept plan which will result in the higher land on the south western side of the site being used as greenspace rather than built development. This and open land further west will help preserve a gap between Bracknell and Wokingham.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		<p>With regard to the land at Blue Mountain; in order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focused on the southern part of the site where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. The northern part of the site will be allocated as SANG/OSPV. This will ensure that an undeveloped gap remains between Binfield and Bracknell. It will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p> <p>Action: Concept Plan for Amen Corner North to be amended to show revised location of residential development in the interests of reflecting landscape concerns and maintaining gaps.</p>
	Concern expressed that additional traffic on London Road (which is already very busy) will impact routes around Binfield, and that if improvements are to be secured S106 these are unlikely to be in place before the adverse effects are created	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies the junction improvements required to accommodate increased vehicular movements based on extensive transport modelling. Once phasing of development is known, road improvements will be prioritised to ensure that unacceptable adverse impacts are avoided.
	Note that the local doctor's surgery has some capacity for growth but not enough for the housing proposed. Access will be required at new/expanded/other surgeries	The outcome of discussions with the Primary Care Trust is reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This envisages a model of enhanced local delivery that might involve the expansion of GP facilities in Binfield and good access to the planned new Healthspace in Bracknell Town Centre. This is in an accessible location in the south-west of the town centre adjacent to a planned new bus station.
	Binfield Primary School is full; a primary school is proposed at Blue Mountain but this site	The SPD for Amen Corner includes the requirement for a new primary school. The proposed new primary school at Blue

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	should be kept as a local gap and for leisure purposes. A primary school should be provided at Amen Corner (south) as a greater number of new pupils will be in this area of the Parish	Mountain would provide for the additional spaces required in this part of the Borough.
Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)	Changes to the settlement boundary are unwelcome - this area is a rural gateway and high density development would damage its character	The sites proposed for Binfield within Policy SA3 are considered appropriate for the reasons set out in Section 2.7 of the Preferred Option Background Paper. The proposals are for 35 dwellings per hectare (SHLAA site 24) and 33 dwellings per hectare (SHLAA site 93). These are not considered to be high densities. The density proposal for SHLAA site 24 is based on only 70% of the site being developable (due to the need for on-site open space). The proposal for SHLAA site 93 is based on a reduced site area being developable (0.95ha out of a 1.3ha site) due to the existing trees on the site. Additional landscape evidence has been undertaken, and if appropriate capacities/requirements for sites will be adjusted (which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper).
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	If some housing is needed in Binfield it should be at Amen Corner North as it would be closer to Amen Corner South, where the school could be increased to 2-form entry and where the traffic flows would still be an issue but would be more manageable	Whilst Amen Corner North form an extension to the built up area of Bracknell and is screened from Binfield by the presence of woodland, there is a limit to the amount of new housing that can be accommodated on the site in the interests of character and respecting landscape and ecological issues.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	It makes no sense to have Bracknell football stadium in Binfield and it would bring no benefit, only noise, traffic and floodlights. If insufficient parking is provided traffic will spill onto	It is considered that a shared access route and parking facilities could work well with the proposed location of the new football ground and education facility which would have different hours of peak movement and activity. The proposed

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<p>Temple Way - the infrastructure delivery plan makes no mention of the challenges raised by a football stadium.</p>	<p>new football ground has been included in the transport modelling work carried out to support the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The area proposed for the football ground is already occupied by a floodlit driving range and is visually quite well contained. Conditions would be applied to any planning permission to control levels of light spill and hours of operation.</p>
	<p>If Bracknell FC need a stadium it should be at the Downshire complex which would serve a large part of the community and have good access via Nine Mile Ride to both Bracknell and Wokingham (who share the stadium)</p>	<p>The proposal is to establish the principle of the use as a football ground, and is being promoted by the owners as a new ground for Bracknell Town FC. The location on the existing driving range at Blue Mountain is visually contained and could provide positive synergies with the proposed new education facilities.</p>
	<p>A new secondary school will not be required if the housing development is elsewhere - Garth College has capacity for growth. Instead this site should be retained for its rural nature and leisure activities, and for the highly valued views from all sides</p>	<p>Garth Hill does not have capacity for growth. A new school is needed in the north of the Borough to meet needs arising from a number of new developments (Amen Corner, Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain and Warfield and a number of smaller sites) and from the population already resident in the area.</p>
<p>Policy SA9 (Warfield)</p>	<p>Object to planned provision of a secondary school at Blue Mountain to serve the Warfield development: it is inappropriate for the Warfield proposals to be dependent on the Blue Mountain site when they are at different stages of consultation. Secondary school provision for Warfield should be at an expanded Garth Hill School.</p>	<p>Garth Hill has been built to the optimum size in terms of the management of the school and the delivery of excellent outcomes.</p> <p>Although the principle of development has been agreed on land at Warfield through the Core Strategy, the disposition of land uses within the site is open to discussion through the progression of an SPD.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		The design of development at Warfield will need to include good, convenient transport links to all new educational facilities, particularly by sustainable modes of travel.
Responses to 'Other Considerations'	<p>Paragraph 5.3, Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a poor history of delivery of services, and the IDP identifies a number of areas where there is a high risk of work not proceeding even though it is considered necessary. 	<p>The aim of the IDP is to provide clarity at an early stage of the range and scale of infrastructure required to support the developments. Both providers and developers therefore have time to take requirements on board in the production of their programmes/plans.</p> <p>However, viability is a significant consideration. This is dependent on market factors and it is accepted that in some instances it may be necessary to prioritise certain forms of infrastructure.</p>
Bracknell Town Council		
Introduction	In general BTC supports the preferred options as set out in the consultation document	Noted.
Policies SA1-SA9	Stress the importance of new quality recreational facilities to accompany new development – every opportunity should be made to seek developer contributions	The Council will seek to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing open space, and other recreational facilities. Existing facilities will be maintained. The Council will also require the provision of new recreational facilities through on site provision or seek contributions for provision elsewhere in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS6 Limiting the Impact of development'. CS6 sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The SPD provides guidance on how this will be implemented.
Policy SA1 (PDL within settlements)	The Depot, Old Bracknell Lane West, Bracknell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome proposed change of designation from defined employment area to housing 	Noted.
	Land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome proposed change of designation from defined employment area to housing 	Noted.
	Albert Street Car Park, Bracknell: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed at loss of parking, given that this car park is close to Garth Hill College. Albert Street already suffers from parking issues, so proposals for this site should make sure that the problem is not exacerbated. It is not acceptable to assume that car ownership levels will be low for residents of these sites and therefore that parking provision can be correspondingly low 	Part of the site could be retained for parking (see Draft Submission Background Paper). The site is well located to Bracknell Town Centre, and is within the defined settlement, so is an acceptable location for development. Any development of the site would need to accord with the Council's parking standards as set out in the "Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document" (July 2007).
Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)	Larges Lane, Bracknell: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Larges Lane already suffers from parking issues, so proposals for the site should make sure that 	Any development of the site would need to accord with the Council's parking

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	the problem is not exacerbated. It is not acceptable to assume that car ownership levels will be low for residents of these sites and therefore that parking provision can be correspondingly low	standards as set out in the "Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document" (July 2007).
Policy SA12 (Bracknell Town Centre)	Concern at lack of progress on the town centre redevelopment and note the economic implications of delay in its regeneration. Accept principle that highest densities of development should take place in the town centre	The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring it forward despite the difficult economic climate. In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration.
Policy SA13 (The Peel Centre)	Peel Centre compliments the town centre but is no substitute for lack of progress on the town centre redevelopment	Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site. Work has already started and the store is due to open by Spring 2012 at the latest. Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases.
Responses to 'Other Considerations'	Paragraph 5.3 'Infrastructure': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required contributions should reflect that this area is highly sought after for developers. Appropriate new infrastructure should 	Noted - water and sewerage undertakers were consulted on the proposals. No objection in principle to allocation of sites for development. Developers will be expected to work closely with the relevant water company, and pay any relevant

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	accompany new development – particularly water and sewerage infrastructure	financial contributions for necessary improvements to the water company. (see water and sewerage undertaker comments below).
Appendices	<p>Appendix 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BTC supports legislative changes which would encourage owners of unused office accommodation to bring such areas forward for housing • Extensive open space is a characteristic of Bracknell Town; policy should therefore protect these valued green spaces. Equally, SANGs accompanying developments should be of adequate quality and provide genuine alternatives to the SPA. 	<p>Noted - Strategic sites that are within 5km of the SPA will require their own bespoke SANG solution, in accordance with quality standards as set by Natural England. Smaller sites within 5km of the SPA will be required to contribute towards the Council's SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy in order to mitigate their impact upon the SPA.</p> <p>Sites over 1ha will also be expected to provide an element of on-site open space for future residents, (the larger the site the greater the reduction in the developable area, i.e. The greater the provision of on-site open space), which will need to be provided at a rate of 4.3ha of open space per 1,000 population (as set out in the Council's Limiting the Impact of Development Supplementary Planning Document, July 2007).</p>
Crowthorne Parish Council		
Introduction	Object to inaccurate reporting of previous workshops held and which CPC attended	The Council published a summary of the main issues raised by respondents to the SADPD Participation Consultation (including workshops) which took place between 26th February - 9th April 2010. The consultation response does not point out specifically how the reporting was inaccurate, so it is difficult for the Council to respond at this stage.
	Do not feel that appropriate cross-boundary working has taken place with Wokingham Borough Council, would like to see a report with	The proposals have been developed in knowledge of the proposed development in Wokingham Borough. The Council has exchanged data with Wokingham Borough Council to feed into the

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<p>recommendations which considers the impact of cross-boundary issues on Crowthorne</p>	<p>Councils' respective transport models. Joint working has also taken place on various items of infrastructure including educational facilities. A dialogue with Officers will be maintained as preparation of the SADPD continues.</p>
	<p>There appears to have been little consultation with residents of Wokingham Without Parish via WokinghamBC and request a formal consultation to discuss impacts of the TRL development in particular with sites proposed by both WBC and BFC.</p>	<p>Wokingham Without Parish Council is a statutory consultee and responded to the SADPD consultation.</p>
Responses to 'Housing'	<p>Paragraph 2.1.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise the need to deliver housing in the Borough and would not oppose a reasonable expansion or regeneration of "brownfield" sites. Intend to vigorously oppose the plans for 1,444 houses at TRL and Broadmoor. 	<p>Noted.</p>
Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)	<p>Land at School Hill, Crowthorne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impacts of this development should be considered together with the Broadmoor and Cricket Field Grove sites (as they use the same roads) 	<p>Noted - Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p>
	<p>Land at Cricket Field Grove:</p>	<p>Noted - Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impacts of this development should be considered together with the Broadmoor and School Hill sites (as they use the same roads) 	the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	<p>White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne;</p> <p>Object to the number of dwellings proposed as this can only be met by flatted development, which CPC have consistently opposed</p>	As set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (page 60 & 61) this site is considered acceptable as a edge of settlement location, and a small block of sensitively designed flatted (broadly according with the existing built footprint/hardstanding area) could be accommodated on the site.
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	<p>Object to the inclusion of land at Broadmoor for numerous valid planning reasons which have been explained at the various meetings and the workshop</p>	Noted.
	<p>Feel that the number of houses references under the Policy should be an upper limit (for developers not to exceed)</p>	If an application were to come with numbers exceeding that set out in the Policy, it would need to be judged on its own merits.
	<p>Challenge designation of this site as 'brownfield' as it comprises the Broadmoor Garden Farm – this has no buildings and is more akin to a residential 'back garden' (i.e. no longer brownfield in PPS3 terms). Suggest it should instead be designated for allotments</p>	<p>The site is partly brownfield where it relates to the development within the existing hospital footprint. Clarity will be provided in the background paper.</p> <p>Action: provide clarity on greenfield/brownfield in Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<p>Fundamental bottlenecks at key road junctions have not been examined, nor the decrease in air quality which will result from the additional traffic</p> <p>Highlight existing problems with various junctions and roads which would serve the development</p>	<p>Noted - Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p>
Policy SA5 (TRL)	<p>Object to the inclusion of land at TRL for numerous valid planning reasons which have been explained at the various meetings and the workshop</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>Development at TRL would conflict with BFC's adopted Policy CS9 which seeks to protect strategic gaps and issue which was reinforced by the Inspector at the TRL appeal in 2008)</p>	<p>The application was refused in 2008 (07/01196/OUT) and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The Inspector's comments on the gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell have been noted. It is hoped that the location of SANG/OSPV will help to maintain a buffer between the two settlements.</p>
	<p>Environmental and infrastructure impacts should be assessed against the current 'status quo' i.e. that the site has been vacant for some 10 years (rather than assessed against the existing</p>	<p>As far as the existing position on the site is concerned, the appeal decision refers to the older buildings having a total floorspace of over 47,000 sq.m. and states that the buildings vary in size, quality and nature.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	planning permission for light industrial use)	<p>In addition to the above, there is also the relatively new TRL HQ building that was permitted in 2002 (01/00722/FUL). This involves 13,585 sq.m. of offices and a storage building (1,307 sq.m.). This would be retained in any future scheme.</p> <p>This represents the baseline situation against which proposals need to be assessed.</p>
	The number of new homes referred to in the Policy should be an upper limit (a developer should not exceed the figure)	If an application was to be submitted involving numbers that exceeded that set out in the Policy, it would need to be judged on its own merits.
	Suggest relocation of the proposed local centre (further away from existing facility in Greenwood Road and towards the centre of the site to encourage residents to walk rather than drive)	<p>The proposed 'Local Centre' is to be re-classified as a 'Neighbourhood Centre'. As such it will be a fairly small scale facility including one or two shops to meet local needs and thereby assist in creating a sustainable development e.g. a 'one-stop' style convenience store along with other units such as a café, hairdressers etc. This type of retail floorspace typically has a smaller catchment and is therefore unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on other retail centres.</p> <p>Convenient direct routes from the remainder of the site to the neighbourhood centre will need to be incorporated in the design to encourage travel by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Action: Change references from a Local Centre to a Neighbourhood Centre</p>
	Suggest consideration of a road from the site to the Crowthorne	This would involve the construction of a new road through an area destined to be

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	bypass (perhaps along the existing test track) to alleviate congestion from traffic heading to/from the M4.	greenspace. It is not therefore appropriate to access the site from this direction. There are already existing access points off Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride. It is considered important that the planned new homes are properly linked to Crowthorne to form a sustainable urban extension rather than an isolated pocket of residential development.
	Fundamental bottlenecks at key road junctions have not been examined, nor the decrease in air quality which will result from the additional traffic	<p>The Council has modelled the impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration in the baseline situation even allowing for the additional traffic that the new development will generate (and traffic from proposed development in Wokingham).</p> <p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate how proposed transport improvements will mitigate the impact of their development and this will involve contributing in-kind and/or financially towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles and therefore pollution levels.</p>
	Object if the proposals to 'improve' the High Street are to remove the traffic calming measures – these were introduced to improve	Some of the current speed humps on the High Street are currently being replaced with speed cushions. These will allow traffic to flow and still act as a safety measures in slowing traffic. This work is

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	pedestrian safety which will be required even more if there are more pedestrians using the High Street (as a result of the new development).	part of the current capital programme and not associated with new site developments at Crowthorne.
Responses to Supporting Documents	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendations in the SADPD have been made without consideration of the infrastructure requirements necessary to support them. 	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan"
	<p>Masterplanning Support Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question accuracy of statements in the document e.g. relating to bus services and the characteristics/nature of roads around the Broadmoor site. Object to BFC over-riding the concerns set out in this document to the Broadmoor site which is described as heavily constrained and is not included in the site selection section. 	The Masterplanning support was just one of the pieces of background evidence that was used to consider whether sites were appropriate for inclusion within the Preferred Option, and was not the sole piece of evidence used as a basis for making decisions about which sites should allocated. The Background Paper supporting the Preferred Option consultation set out why particular sites were included in the Preferred Option, and drew from a wide range of supporting documents, including the Draft Sustainability Appraisal. An updated background paper to support the Draft Submission document.
Sandhurst Town Council		
	None received.	N/A
Warfield Parish Council		
How to get involved	As the document includes Warfield development, it is appropriate for Warfield residents to be involved and have an opportunity to respond. Concerned that BFC has declined an invitation to hold	Advertising of the consultation went out equally to all areas of the Borough. Public exhibitions were held in Binfield and Crowthorne as the areas most affected by the proposed new allocations (given the land at Warfield is already identified for development in the Core Strategy)

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	open sessions in Warfield despite this being larger than any of the other proposed sites.	although people were able to discuss any of the sites at any of the exhibitions irrespective of location. Furthermore, Warfield has already had similar sessions to that for the new Binfield/Crowthorne proposals on during two separate consultations the production of the Core Strategy. Further sessions were also held at the earlier SADPD consultation.
	There has been a significant failure in the delivery of the Town and Country newspaper, which should have been delivered in November, and it appears that very few residents had copies delivered to their homes.	The Council is aware of issues surrounding the delivery of Town & Country and has passed the information to the relevant Department. However, residents were also notified of the consultation via an advert in the Bracknell Standard and a significant number of people were contacted directly through the Council's LDF database.
	On this basis consider that majority of residents were unaware of the consultation, and that has been a failure in the process which would not withstand scrutiny.	In advertising the consultation, the Council followed all statutory requirements and those set out in the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Additional measures were also taken as a result of feedback from the last consultation. However, we are continuing to try and improve consultation methods.
	Requested that BFC take remedial action to ensure Warfield residents are aware of the opportunity to respond to consultations on Site Allocations Preferred Option, Warfield SPD and Local Transport Plan 3 consultation.	The consultation period relating to the SADPD was extended from 6 weeks to 10 weeks to align the closing date for representations with that of the Warfield SPD.
Para 2.1.1 (Core Strategy Housing numbers)	Consider the figures uses for housing projections (set in 2004 during the preparation of the Core Strategy) are out of date as they predate the financial crisis of 2008 and the depressed	See responses to Section 2 'Housing'. Population and household projections show that there is a need for new homes in Bracknell Forest which arises from a number of sources including population

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<p>economic conditions since then, and are expected to continue for several years.</p> <p>Housing projections do not take account of the nature of job losses within the Thames Valley in general , and Bracknell Forest, for example Hewlett Packard in Amen Corner has shed over 2,000 jobs. Unlikely that these jobs will be recreated in the UK when conditions improve as there is a strong migration of skilled IT work from western economies to Asia.</p> <p>Bracknell is an unfavourable location to choose for business due to the run down Town Centre which suggest strongly that past performance provides a grossly over-optimistic projection of housing demand in the future.</p> <p>Since the Government's commitment to localism and removal of central control over planning, it provides an opportunity for Bracknell Forest to review housing numbers in light of uncertainties set out above.</p>	<p>growth, reduction in the average household size, people living longer and the balance of migration to and from the Borough. This evidence, which supports the housing requirement of 10,780 contained within the Core Strategy, is not affected by economic considerations and the current downturn in the economy. Planning for the Core Strategy requirement is therefore considered to be a justified and robust approach.</p>
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	<p>Illustrative concept plan in the Site Allocations Preferred Option does not coincide with the area detailed in the Core Strategy Submission. Land to the west of West End Lane is protected under policy EN10(ii)(a) as a defined area of local landscape</p>	<p>The Core Strategy DPD defines the broad area - it does not allocate the land. The local plan designation will be reviewed as a consequence of the Warfield development. Cabbage Hill will remain largely undeveloped and will therefore perform a role in separating settlements.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	importance, and provides a natural gap separating Warfield from Binfield.	
	Land between West End Lane to the west and Avery Lane and the Splash to the east, and Garth Meadows to the south are also protected as open landscape under Policy EN14 as a river corridor. The illustrative concept plan shows eight low density housing areas and a primary school in this area.	The Local Plan designation will need to be reviewed as a consequence of the Warfield development.
	The protected land needs to be retained and enhanced, and development in these areas must have minimal impact.	Development will need to take account of a number of factors including impact on the surroundings and landscape. The Warfield SPD will provide further guidance on such matters. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
	Existing bridleways and byways in Quelm Lane, Avery Lane and Hedge Lane must be retained as green corridors and are ignored on the Concept Plan.	This is agreed and it is the intention of the Council to ensure this happens. The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft contained text on this issue but it has been recognised that this text should be more explicit in its intentions to protect these rights of way. Therefore, this has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Projection for 2,200 houses is unrealistically high. A total figure of 1,700 seems more realistic and in keeping with the existing urban extensions in Warfield. A total of 1,700 dwellings is more sensitive to	This is disagreed because the Council has in the past undertaken capacity work at several stages during the process which has underpinned the Core Strategy DPD and the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. The Council has also undertaken further work which relates to the capacity

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	the needs and and aspirations of the community, but would still make it the largest planned urban extension.	of the site in terms of development, infrastructure and open space. This work has informed the final version of the Warfield SPD. The site should remain as capable of providing 2,200 dwellings.
	The balance should be distributed equitably across other developable sites in the Borough, including land being brought forward in the south of the Borough.	The Site can accommodate 2,200 dwellings and therefore it is not appropriate to place any other residual in other sites. The other sites will also have capacity work underpinning their housing numbers.
Policy SA2 (Bracknell Football Club)	Welcome the relocation of the football club as it would free central land for high density and affordable housing.	Noted.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	Proposed new location of football club at Blue Mountain is inappropriate as long established football clubs in Binfield would be compromised, and it is understood that the existing ground-share agreement with Wokingham FC would continue resulting in home fixtures every weekend during the football season.	It is not clear in what way established Binfield Football Clubs would be compromised. The proposal is to establish the use of part of the site as a football ground. It is considered inappropriate to base decisions on any current or possible future ground-sharing arrangements.
	Inappropriate to bring match day traffic into a residential areas away from major routes through Warfield along Harvest Ride.	Transport planners are satisfied with the proposal to have a direct link along the west side of the site to the schools and the football club will mean that penetration of traffic into the residential areas of the site will be minimised. The peak uses of the education and football club sites are also likely to be at different times.
	Alternative locations for the football club suggested at either Jennett's Park or Amen Corner North.	The proposed site at Blue Mountain would take advantage of an existing floodlit driving range that is visually well contained. There is no such suitable or available location at Jennett's Park or

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		Amen Corner North. The Blue Mountain location also has the advantage of potential synergies with the proposed education provision on an adjacent site.
Winkfield Parish Council		
Responses to 'Housing'	<p>Paragraph 2.4.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WPC is broadly in favour of the proposed new urban extensions but (a) reiterate the need for appropriate highways infrastructure to support these (including parking at Martin's Heron station); (b) would like to see more provision for small business development in the Borough to encourage localised employment; and (c) would like to know what provision is being made for Youth and Community in the Borough. 	Noted (although items (b) and (c) are not points that are/can be addressed in the SADPD).
Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)	<p>Sandbanks, Longhill Road, Bracknell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on this site should reflect the existing neighbourhood character (of large detached dwellings on spacious plots) – therefore challenge whether the density of 35dph is appropriate Any development on this site will increase pressure on already strained local infrastructure The area is already overloaded in terms of highways (particularly at the Martin's Heron 	Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	<p>roundabout on the A329) and so improvements must be made to highway infrastructure</p>	<p>Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p>
	<p>152 New Road, Ascot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at this site would increase pressure on local infrastructure, in particular parking associated with the nearby Abba Warehouse / Londis Store / Ascot Tool Hire. Would only support development of this site if BFC use compulsory purchase powers to provide an off-street car park for the Londis store, to relieve congestion on the highway • The A329 is already heavily congested in both directions in the vicinity of this site. Any access to this site would need to be signalled, and these 	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p>

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	would need to be optimised with the proposed signalisation of the Martin's Heron roundabout	
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	<p>Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any access to this site would need to be signalised, and these would need to be optimised with the proposed signalisation of the Martin's Heron roundabout some 500m away Housing here should reflect the character of the area / London Road marks the boundary between higher density housing to the south and rural villages to the north – therefore challenge whether the density of 35dph is appropriate 	Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	Consider that 35 dph should be a maximum, and that a density of 25 dph would actually be more appropriate	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Request clarification on the proposed road improvements and maintain that it is essential these are delivered in advance of any development	The details of road and junction improvements are provided in the next version of the SADPD and will be refined as necessary from that in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. In this respect, further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD. The timing of works will relate to

Bracknell Forest Parish/Town Council responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
		development phasing and is a matter for negotiation.
	Raise a number of specific points in relation to the Warfield SPD which are considered in the Responses document to that consultation	These comments are considered in the Warfield SPD under Rep No. 40.
Appendices	<p>Appendix 4 (Map 22) and Appendix 5 (Map 28):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land identified as being included within SHLAA site 137 (Sandbanks, Longhill Road, Bracknell) also appears to be included within SHLAA site 122/300 (Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell) – clarification is therefore sought on the total number of dwellings to be provided across these two sites 	<p>Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities (of 122, 137 & 300 combined) will be amended accordingly, and will be reflected in the both SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011) and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).</p> <p>Action: amend site boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122.</p>

Table 17.2 Adjacent County, District/Borough and Parish Council responses

Adjoining Authorities' responses:	Response
Summary of main issues raised	
Surrey County Council	

Adjoining Authorities' responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
Para 5.3.5	<p>Given the potential impact on Surrey roads we would wish to see the following wording included in paragraph 5.3.5 on infrastructure:</p> <p>'Surrey County Council is concerned about the potential impact on the A322 in the vicinity of Bagshot (A30), and Lightwater (M3). Transport modelling will need to account for the impact of development on the Strategic Road Network in these locations and may have to provide mitigation.'</p>	<p>The 2007 base year models were validated to DMRB standards. This process included an outer calibration cordon that crossed the A322 south of the Coral Reef roundabout and a series of motorway counts in the region that included the M3 either side of Junction 3. The forecast models representing alternative development scenarios in 2026 were built by applying TEMPRO (dataset 6.2) growth to the base year population figures. This growth was applied to every zone in the model, with specific developments in Bracknell and Wokingham included within this. Although the A322 in Bagshot and Lightwater lies outside the main study area of the model, it is sufficiently robust in these areas to assess the impact of developments within Bracknell. Existing traffic levels on these links include a low proportion of trips to or from Bracknell's development zones. The forecast models show little change in trips to or from these zones.</p>
Hampshire County Council		
	No response received.	N/A
Hart District Council		
	No response received.	N/A
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM)		
Map 1 - Key Map	<p>Concerns were raised by RBWM at the participation stage about the proposed "northern arc", including Sites 7 and 8, Chavey Down & East Bracknell), in terms of potential impact upon local road network. The omission of these sites are welcomed.</p>	Noted.

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	No concerns raised about this site.	N/A
Policy SA5 (TRL)	No concerns raised about this site.	N/A
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Only way to provide a robust assessment upon RBWM road network is to run proposals through RBWM's traffic model. Until this is done, or sufficient transport modelling evidence provided to assess the proposals, proposals appear unsound on the lack of supporting evidence and a holding objection is raised.	Noted - Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
	Concerned that the proposals are dominated by housing. The absence of employment opportunities will cause increased traffic movements to access sources of employment which may adversely impact upon the RBWM network.	Bracknell Forest already has a good supply of available employment floorspace for the plan period. Further housing is required as an objective is to plan for a balance between housing and employment. Some of the sites proposed do have mixed uses including elements of employment.
	If new school provision is proportionate to the number and type of dwellings to be built, then no particular concerns should arise.	Comment on school places is noted.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	Only way to provide a robust assessment upon RBWM road network is to run proposals through RBWM's traffic model. Until this is done, or sufficient transport modelling evidence provided to assess the proposals, proposals	Noted - Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	appear unsound on the lack of supporting evidence and a holding objection is raised.	Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Draft Submission Document.
	Also concerned that the proposals are dominated by housing, absence of employment opportunities will cause increased traffic movements to access employment which may adversely impact upon the RBWM network.	Bracknell Forest has a good supply of available employment floorspace. The over-riding need is for sites to provide the Borough with a five year housing land supply. Some of the sites proposed do have mixed uses including elements of employment.
	Whilst the site does not fall within the designated area of any RBWM schools. If new school provision is proportionate to the number and type of dwellings to be built, then no particular concerns should arise.	Comment on school places is noted.
Policy SA8 (Amen Corner South)	The broad concept of development has already been accepted by its allocation in the Bracknell Forest Core Strategy, however RBWM express continued concern at the lack of any transport modelling work to support this allocation.	This site has already been established through the adopted Core Strategy (Feb 2008). Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	If new school provision is proportionate to the number and type of dwellings to be built, then no particular concerns should arise.	Noted.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	The broad concept of development has already been accepted by its allocation in the Bracknell Forest Core Strategy, however RBWM express continued concern at the lack of any transport modelling work to support this allocation.	This site has already been established through the adopted Core Strategy (Feb 2008). Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
	Also concerned that the proposals are dominated by housing, absence of employment opportunities will cause increased traffic movements to access employment which may adversely impact upon the RBWM network.	Bracknell Forest has a good supply of available employment floorspace. The over-riding need is for sites to provide the Borough with a five year housing land supply. Some of the sites proposed do have mixed uses including elements of employment.
	If new school provision is proportionate to the number and type of dwellings to be built, then no particular concerns should arise.	Comment on school places is noted.
Surrey Heath		
	No response received.	N/A
Wokingham Borough Council		
Introduction	Note the need for joint planning and co-ordinated delivery of	Noted.

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>infrastructure for development in the area between Bracknell, Crowthorne and Wokingham</p> <p>Express concern about the delivery (funding) of improvements to the transport network and ability to adequately address growth.</p>	<p>The Council has exchanged data with Wokingham Borough Council to feed into the Councils' respective transport models and will maintain dialogue with Officers as preparation of the SADPD continues.</p> <p>The modelling work will determine the level of improvements required. The developers will be required to pay for these works through legal agreements and/or other means such as CIL. Viability assessments have been carried out of the proposals.</p>
Responses to 'Housing'	<p>Paragraph 2.1.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WBC has confirmed that it will deliver the 13,230 dwellings required in the SEP. Given that BFC are intending to deliver a lower number than set out in the SEP, should evidence suggest that BFC's number should be higher BFC will need to demonstrate that it cannot deliver any more dwellings in its area before it relies on other areas to provide homes. <p>Paragraph 2.1.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that built development might arise in areas outside those indicated on the Key Map and in the Concept Plans (so undermining the approach in the Core Strategy to prevent coalescence of settlements). 	<p>The level of development planned is that required to meet the Borough's development needs in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy (which has been independently examined and found to be both robust and soundly based). Housing need will be reviewed at a later date as part of the Core Strategy Review.</p> <p>It is not clear why WBC express concern that development may arise in areas other than specified on the Key Map, but this concern is noted.</p>
Concept Plans (Policies SA4-SA9)	Need to be certain of the status of the Concept Plans – concern expressed that built development might occur outside of the areas	The concept plans are clearly marked as illustrative. As detailed plans are developed for the sites the Council will seek to ensure that the most appropriate

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	indicated on the Concept Plans which would undermine the approach in the Core Strategy (to prevent coalescence of settlements)	areas are retained as open space / SANGS in order to achieve Core Strategy and other planning objectives.
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	<p>Land east of Murrell Hill Cottage, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to modelling information WBC may seek a contribution towards improvements for bus services to Wokingham and for improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout/the CoppidBeechPark and Ride • Contributions may be sought from WBC for improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout, the CoppidBeechPark and Ride, and other local improvements 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The focus for sustainable transport will be on improving links with the town centre rather than with areas within Wokingham.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.</p> <p>WBC will be consulted at the next stage of the document (Site Allocations Draft Submission), and as a neighbouring authority could make representations at such times if and when a formal planning application is submitted.</p>
	<p>Land at Forest Rd/Foxley Lane, Binfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request further information on the proposed access arrangements as Foxley Lane forms the Borough boundary and so access works may require work within Wokingham Borough • Contributions may be sought from WBC for improvements to the Coppid Beech 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The focus for sustainable transport will be on improving links with the town centre rather than with areas within Wokingham.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.</p> <p>WBC will be consulted at the next stage of the document (Site Allocations Draft Submission), and as a neighbouring</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>roundabout, the Coppid Beech Park and Ride, and other local improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to modelling information WBC may seek a contribution towards improvements for bus services to Wokingham 	<p>authority could make representations at such times if and when a formal planning application is submitted.</p>
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	<p>Object, due to the impact of sites around Crowthorne on infrastructure within Wokingham Borough and on coalescence between Crowthorne and Bracknell</p> <p>WBC trusts that BFC will continue to ensure sufficient places for Wokingham Without pupils at Edgbarrow School, preferably at this School (it is noted that provision is included for an increase in capacity at Edgbarrow School and GarthHillCollege)</p>	<p>Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. The disposition of land uses within the site have been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped area between settlements. This matter will be addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.</p>
Policy SA5 (TRL)	<p>Object, due to the impact of sites around Crowthorne on infrastructure within Wokingham Borough and on coalescence between Crowthorne and Bracknell</p> <p>No indication has been given (especially having regard to the draft concept plans) as to how development can be accommodated on this site whilst ensuring compliance with the objectives of Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy which defines a strategic gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne.</p>	<p>Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. The disposition of land uses within the site have been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped area between settlements. This matter will be addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper. Nine Mile Ride is considered to act as an effective physical barrier to further development to the</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>The density of the development proposed and its extent within the site will not ensure the separation of Crowthorne from Bracknell</p> <p>A co-ordinated review by BFC and WBC of primary school designated areas will be required to bring the primary school proposed at this site into the auspices of a new BFC school</p> <p>The proposed new local centre at TRL should integrate with the existing residential area.</p>	<p>north that might impact on the maintenance of a gap between Crowthorne, Bracknell and Wokingham.</p> <p>Officers from the Council's Education Department are liaising with those from WBC in respect of meeting future education needs.</p> <p>The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p> <p>The proposed neighbourhood centre' is located near Old Wokingham Road in order to raise its profile and try and serve as a link between local communities if desired.</p>
	<p>A PPS4-compliant Retail Assessment should be undertaken for the local centre proposals, which should consider the role in supporting these / the impact of these on areas within Wokingham (i.e. Pinewood and shops in Greenwood Road respectively).</p>	<p>The centres which will be created to support the identified strategic housing sites will be small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance and therefore under PPS4 Annex B do not meet the definition of centres for the purposes of the planning policy statement. Therefore, it is not considered that a retail assessment is required.</p>
	<p>No indication is given of the scale and/or location of any community and recreational facilities proposed. Note that enhancing existing indoor sports provision at Pinewood Leisure Centre would make a valuable resource for the whole</p>	<p>An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will set out the requirements for the site. The updated IDP will support the Draft Submission Document.</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	community (as much of the TRL site lies within 800m of this facility)	
	WBC appreciate the site benefits, with respect to run-off and flooding, that would have resulted from the previous application to residents of Wokingham Borough	Noted. The Environment Agency did not object to the previous application on the site.
	WBC will seek contributions from development at TRL towards improved public transport between the site and Wokingham (in line with the Inspector's findings into the previous appeal)	Noted. The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
	IDP does not adequately address improvements to non-car modes of access to TRL (and the provision of developer contributions towards these)	
	Highways modelling work should take account of the impact of the new roundabout on the A329(M)	Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.
	Contributions may be sought from WBC for improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout, the CoppidBeechPark and Ride, and other local improvements	
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Contributions may be sought from WBC for improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout, the CoppidBeechPark and Ride, and other local improvements.	Such issues are the subject of further discussions.
	BFC should work with WBC to ensure non-car links from this site, in the event that a new railway station is provided either at Amen Corner or at the South Wokingham SDL	One of the main premises for the allocation of land at Amen Corner is that it should function as an extension to the built up area of Bracknell. The focus for sustainable transport will therefore be on improving links with the Bracknell Town Centre rather than with areas within Wokingham.
	Improvements to public transport here should include links to the	

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	WBC proposed Coppid Beech Park and Ride and to Wokingham Station. These improvements could be integrated with contributions from developments at the North and South Wokingham SDL's.	Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.
	BFC needs to ensure that adequate SANG is proposed to match the distribution of development proposed, and consider potential implications of large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA	Adequate SANGs to meet the distribution of development is set out in Appendix 3 of the Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment Site Allocations DPD. This has been agreed with Natural England. There are no large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA.
	The concept plan is illustrative and so BFC may look for some SPA mitigation to be delivered in Wokingham Borough – however this cannot be guaranteed. BFC should therefore be certain that adequate mitigation measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the SPA can be delivered	The policy for this site also identifies that a bespoke SANG would be required to mitigate the impact of development upon the SPA. Natural England has not objected to this.
	No indication has been given (especially having regard to the draft concept plans) as to how development can be accommodated on this site whilst ensuring compliance with the objectives of Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy which defines a strategic gap between Binfield/Bracknell and Wokingham	Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. The refinements of the former (larger) Broad Areas identified at the Issues and Options stage to smaller areas at the Preferred Option stage took account of this matter. The disposition of land uses within the site are being devised so that the areas of green space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped gap between settlements.

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		<p>Pocket Copse (which falls within the site) and Blackmans Copse would help screen the development from Binfield. In the light of further landscape evidence, revisions are being made to the concept plan in respect of the extent of the built up area on the western side of the site and the higher areas of land. This matter is addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: Revise location of built development within site.</p>
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	<p>A number of comments relating to Policy SA6 (Amen Corner South) are repeated in respect of Policy SA7. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to public transport should include links to the WBC proposed Coppid Beech Park and Ride and to Wokingham Station. These improvements could be integrated with contributions from developments at the North and South Wokingham SDL's. • BFC should work with WBC to ensure non-car links from this site, in the event that a new railway station is provided either at Amen Corner or at the South Wokingham SDL • Contributions may be sought from WBC for improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout, the Coppid Beech Park and Ride, and other local improvements 	<p>Responses to these issues are considered above, but are repeated for ease of reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the main premises for the allocation of land at Blue Mountain is that it should function as an extension to the built up area of Bracknell. The focus for sustainable transport will therefore be on improving links with the town centre rather than with areas within Wokingham. • Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.
Policy SA8	Object, due to the impact of sites in West Bracknell/Binfield on infrastructure within Wokingham	The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
(Land at Amen Corner)	Borough and on coalescence between Binfield/Bracknell with Wokingham	<p>Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p> <p>Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. These matters will be addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
Appendices	<p>Appendix 6 (Maps 29-34):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised settlement boundaries should be shown to reflect the limits of the built up areas identified in the Concept Plans and on Map 1: Key Map. 	A Proposals Map will be produced to show the allocation of the sites contained in the SADPD, which will support the Draft Submission document.
Responses to Supporting Documents	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP does not adequately address improvements to non-car modes of access to TRL (and the provision of developer contributions towards these) Proposals in BracknellForest should mirror the approach in Wokingham Borough to include funding for a community manager for the first five years Object to the general lack of information on whether adequate infrastructure can be delivered to support the growth envisaged – full details of the works required (including those outside of the 	<p>See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan"</p> <p>Adequate SANG to meet the distribution of development is set out in Appendix 3 of the Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment Site Allocations DPD. This has been agreed with Natural England. There are no large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA.</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Borough) are not included within the IDP. Specifically, there is no information on how traffic flows around the preferred sites could be affected by development.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFC needs to ensure that adequate SANG is proposed to match the distribution of development proposed, and consider potential implications of large scale developments beyond 5km of the SPA 	
Finchampstead Parish Council		
Policy SA5 (TRL)	Development would reduce the strategic gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne/Wokingham Without	Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. The disposition of land uses within the site have been devised so that the areas of green space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped area between settlements. Nine Mile Ride is considered to form a physical barrier to development further north. This matter will be addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
	Do not consider that in this economic climate the developers will be able to fund all the infrastructure requirements, and it would be a disaster if the development was built without proper facilities.	The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
	Concerns expressed regarding additional traffic on Nine Mile Ride;	

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	consider that the car will be the preferred mode of transport	Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore infrastructure issues in more detail.
	Proposed development areas in Wokingham (2,500 South of the M4, 3,500 at Arborfield Garrison and 2,500 at South Wokingham) have not been taken into account	Whilst the infrastructure listed in the IDP is considered 'necessary' for the development to go ahead, a risk classification has been used to give a rank order in anticipation of there being limited resources, and the need to prioritise contributions. The layout of the site infrastructure schedules will be amended in the submission IDP. Viability work is being carried out on the sites proposed for allocation.
	At 45 dph the density is too high, and the proportion of the site to be developed should be reduced	Efficient use of the land needs to be made and a mix of house types and sizes provided.
	If the Council felt that 975 dwellings were unsuitable in 2008 why are they proposing 50% more houses now?	The application was refused in 2008 (07/01196/OUT) and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time. The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The scheme currently being promoted is of a very different scale and nature and will be required to mitigate its impact.
	Given the impending changes to school catchments in Wokingham, until such time as a new secondary school is provided in the south of the Borough we urge BFC to ensure there are sufficient places for Finchampstead Parish pupils at Edgbarrow.	Discussions about future provision of educational facilities are taking place between the BFC and WBC.
Wokingham Without Parish Council		

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Introduction	BFC must work with WBC to ensure that the combined effects of proposed developments on the community of Crowthorne and Wokingham Without are taken into account.	The proposals have been developed in knowledge of the proposed development in Wokingham Borough and the Council will maintain dialogue with WBC Officers as preparation of the SADPD continues.
2.1.1	The Core Strategy was produced during a period of prosperity and is no longer appropriate. Review requirement in light of current political circumstances	See responses to Section 2 'Housing'. It is considered appropriate in the SADPD to plan for the level of housing required by Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy.
2.1.2	Development must be sustainable and supported by appropriate infrastructure. It must not be to the detriment of the existing community. The Parish Council has serious concerns about housing density, gaps traffic/highway issues	Noted. Noted.
Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)	Land at School Hill, Crowthorne: Impacts of this development should be considered together with the Broadmoor and Cricket Field Grove sites Concerned about traffic on Upper Broadmoor Road, Lower Broadmoor Road, and Brookers Row. Will exacerbate existing problems at the junction of Dukes Ride/High Street/Upper Broadmoor Road/Bracknell Road.	The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
	Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne Impacts of this development should be considered together with the Broadmoor and Cricket Field Grove sites.	The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	Concerned about traffic on Upper Broadmoor Road, Lower Broadmoor Road, and Brookers Row. Will exacerbate existing problems at the junction of Dukes Ride/High Street/Upper Broadmoor Road/Bracknell Road.	Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	There is confusion about the number of new homes planned as this has varied over time.	Noted - the history of the site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
	In including the site, BFBC seems to have ignored the advice of experts regarding constraints.	There are a number constraints affecting this site which have to be considered against the need for a new hospital facility. It is acknowledged that there will be harm to the significance of the registered park and walled garden. It will be for Bracknell Forest to form a view as to whether the public benefit secured by provision of the hospital is sufficient to justify the proposed development despite the harm caused to interests of acknowledged importance, and additional justification and evidence has been sought from the owners of the site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
	The Broadmoor garden farm that is destined for housing is not previously developed land.	The position on greenfield/brownfield will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
	Concerned about traffic at junction of High Street and Dukes Ride, and, roundabout at Circle Hill. Heavy traffic along Nine Mile Ride has been exacerbated by recent developments - Johnson & Johnson HQ and Jennetts Park. No account seems to have been taken of the additional traffic that will arise from the Buckhurst Farm and South Wokingham developments. The new Jennetts Park slip road will	The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	make the situation worse (incl. changing existing movements). Major improvements required to the M3 and M4 are at risk due to economic circumstances.	Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.
Policy SA5 (TRL)	There is confusion about the number of new homes planned as this has varied over time.	<p>The number of dwellings relating to this site has varied over time due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progression of the Site Allocations document through its various stages. At the Issues and Options stage the site formed part of a larger area (Broad Area 3) suggested for 1,200 -1,300 dwellings. At the Preferred Option stage, it was put forward for 1,000 dwellings. A Draft Indicative Option Working Paper published as part of a report that was considered by the Council's Executive in July 2010, suggested 1,150 dwellings on the site. - A proposal (ref: 07/01196/OUT) promoted by Legal and General through a planning application that was refused and the subject of an appeal that was dismissed in June 2009. This involved a mixed use development including up to 975 dwellings. <p>The history of the site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
	<p>The Inspector made a number of pertinent comments in respect of the appeal application that seem to have been ignored, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on local road network • Harm to the strategic gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne • The urbanisation of the countryside would be 	<p>The application was refused in 2008 (07/01196/OUT) and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The scheme currently being</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>exacerbated by the increased activity and additional highway infrastructure</p> <p>Rowan Drive and Maple Drive are not capable of supporting traffic.</p> <p>Concerned about traffic at junction of High Street and Dukes Ride, and, roundabout at Circle Hill. Heavy traffic along Nine Mile Ride has been exacerbated by recent developments - Johnson & Johnson HQ and Jennett's Park. No account seems to have been taken of the additional traffic that will arise from the Buckhurst Farm and South Wokingham developments. The new Jennett's Park slip road will make the situation worse (incl. changing existing movements). Major improvements required to the M3 and M4 are at risk due to economic circumstances.</p>	<p>promoted is of a very different scale and nature and will be required to mitigate its impact.</p> <p>The Council has modelled the impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration in the baseline situation even allowing for the additional traffic that the new development will generate (and traffic from proposed development in Wokingham).</p> <p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate how proposed transport improvements will mitigate the impact of their development and this will involve contributing in-kind and/or financially towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles.</p> <p>Viability assessments are being carried out on the proposed developments.</p>
	<p>In planning the infrastructure required, it should be recognised that the majority of the site is vacant and that there is a need to take account of the entire impact of 1,000 dwellings.</p>	<p>As far as the existing position on the site is concerned, the appeal decision refers to the older buildings having a total floorspace of over 47,000 sq.m. and states that the buildings vary in size, quality and nature.</p> <p>In addition to the above, there is also the relatively new TRL HQ building that was permitted in 2002 (01/00722/FUL). This involves 13,585 sq.m. of offices and a storage building (1,307 sq.m.). This would be retained in any future scheme.</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		This represents the baseline situation against which proposals need to be assessed.
	The proposed Local Centre is too close to Old Wokingham Road and in any event there is already a facility at Greenwood Road.	The proposed 'Local Centre' is to be re-classified as a 'Neighbourhood Centre'. As such it will be a fairly small scale facility including one or two shops to meet local needs and thereby assist in creating a sustainable development.
	Must retain gap between Bracknell and Wokingham Without.	Coalescence of settlements is an important consideration and has informed the concept plans for the urban extension sites. The disposition of land uses within the site have been devised so that the areas of green space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped area between settlements. Nine Mile Ride is considered to form a physical barrier to development further north. This matter will be addressed in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Wokingham Without Councillors		
General	Have a direct interest in the Preferred Options for Crowthorne as the effect of the TRL site would impinge on their ward. Consider that the housing on the TRL site would directly affect more housing within the Wokingham Without Ward than any within Bracknell Forest.	Noted.
How to get involved	Did not find the BFC web site easy to navigate on line. There was a coherent version on the BFC website in early October, but was not available during the consultation. There was a version	The October version of the document was that considered by the Council's Executive in October 2010 (which was approved for consultation as the Preferred Option document).

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>at the exhibitions but was marked "Reference Only" Consider this to be deliberate. Displays at exhibitions did not draw attention to other housing in Crowthorne i.e. Cricket Field Grove, School Hill, Iron Duke.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration and information has been made available about the cumulative effects of all the developments proposed in Crowthorne (and adjoining Wokingham Borough) and no recognition of Wokingham's Core Strategy which includes 4 Strategic Development Locations.</p>	<p>An electronic copy of the document as available on the Council's web site, and paper copies were available to view at the exhibitions held around the Borough. Hard copies were also available to view in local libraries and Parish Council Offices. Copies were also hand delivered to Wokingham Without Parish Council.</p> <p>Information provided at the exhibitions included a Map to show all the sites within Crowthorne (although this was not on the display board). However, a key map showing housing sites was included on the display boards and leaflets (copies of which people were able to take away from the exhibitions) which clearly indicated that there were several other sites for allocation within the Crowthorne area in addition to TRL and Broadmoor.</p> <p>The consultation on the Preferred Option was also accompanied by a press release which was included in many local newspapers and a newspaper advert in a Bracknell local newspaper.</p> <p>The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Policy SA5 (TRL)	<p>Contrary to TRL appeal decision in 2008, cannot see what has changed in that time to now be considering the site again.</p>	<p>The application was refused in 2008 (07/01196/OUT) and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time.</p> <p>Since that time, the Council has started work on the SADPD with a view to allocating sites to meet the need for growth. The consideration of this site through the LDF process ensures that the site is not considered in isolation. Due to the scale of housing that remains to be accommodated and the range of sites available, it is clear that there is a need to allocate land on the edge of existing settlements.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The scheme currently being promoted is of a very different scale and nature and will be required to mitigate its impact.</p>
	<p>Note that a local centre is proposed along Old Wokingham Road. Have concerns regarding location, proposed facilities, layout and traffic modelling of junction.</p>	<p>The proposed 'Local Centre' is to be re-classified as a 'Neighbourhood Centre'. As such it will be a fairly small scale facility including one or two shops to meet local needs and thereby assist in creating a sustainable development e.g. a 'one-stop' style convenience store along with other units such as a café, hairdressers etc.</p> <p>Access to the neighbourhood centre is shown off Old Wokingham Road so that it is conveniently located for the new community and can also provide additional facilities for the existing community, if desired.</p>

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		The road around a possible square would operate as a one-way route from south to north to ensure that no conflicts are created and that the proposed parking operates efficiently.
	<p>Note that infrastructure improvements suggested (Nine Mile Ride/Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride/Bracknell Road roundabouts), but consider these replicate the Legal & General proposals and take no account of other developments within Crowthorne or those proposed by WBC. This should have been modelled prior to the preferred option and improvements spread much wider to include Nine Mile Ride, Bracknell Road, Bagshot Road and Coral Reef roundabout.</p> <p>No indication given of how public transport would cope and compete with the additional traffic generated. Note the reference to the rerouting of 194 bus service (TRL appeal decision found measures proposed at the time less than satisfactory).</p>	<p>The combined impact of travel impacts of developments within Bracknell and the Strategic Development Locations within Wokingham are considered through the Transport Modelling work. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site, which will include improvements to public transport. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken jointly with Wokingham BC to explore shared infrastructure issues in more detail.</p>
	Due to proximity of SPA and artificial quarantine strip along south east side of site, the proposal is remote from the village of Crowthorne. Would not form a natural part of the village and would destroy the gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne.	<p>An important design principle involves the need to integrate the development with the built form and community to the west of Old Wokingham Road.</p> <p>Greenspace along the eastern side of the site will help maintain a buffer between Crowthorne and Wokingham.</p>
	TRL is to have its own primary school and be within the catchment of Easthampstead Park Secondary School. Do not want to see similar delays in the provision of	The school at Jennett's Park is now complete and opened September 2011. Provision of the school was provided in accordance with the S106 Agreement. Adverse market conditions have resulted

Adjoining Authorities' responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	educational facilities to those experienced at Jennett's Park. Would have an effect on Hatch Ride primary school. Wish to be assured that cumulative effects would not result in a revision to the catchment of Edgbarrow, as this would affect Wokingham Without.	in new homes being constructed at a slower rate, but the school has been provided as originally phased. Discussions about future provision of educational facilities are taking place between the BFC and WBC.

Table 17.3 Other Statutory Consultee Responses

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Government Office for South East (GOSE)		
	None received.	N/A
The Coal Authority		
Whole document	No specific comments to make at this stage.	N/A
The Environment Agency		
Introduction / General comments	Pleased that previous comments have been taken into account and that the environment has generally been given good consideration in the SADPD	Noted.
	Pleased that where parts of sites lie within the floodplain no residential development is proposed here, or better still that other designations such as open space or SANGS are proposed; this conforms with the sequential approach recommended in PPS25	Noted.
	Do not, in general, support the use of existing non-statutory wildlife sites as SANGS as undesirable outcomes may result, and because there is potential to create ecological improvements by using sites which are not already of ecological significance	Noted.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	Many of the sites contain small water bodies and these will require a 5m buffer zone from bank top to the whole extent of the site within which there are no structures, hard standings, footpaths, or fences and which do not include domestic cartilage. For main rivers (e.g. The Cut and Bull Brook) this buffer zone should be 8m. where it is necessary to culvert or cross a watercourse, no development should be built within 8m of the culvert and clear span bridges should be used.	Noted.
	Note that many types of SUDS involve land take which may affect the amount of site space available for development; however these may be used for other purposes e.g. open space	Noted.
	Where development is phased (on the larger sites) the surface water drainage strategy for each site should ensure that mitigation and management measures are in place for each phase to prevent flood risk from increasing from that phase.	Noted.
	Would have like a sub-objective of the DPD to include reference to surface water flooding but note that this is likely to be considered under Objectives L and I	Noted; agree that this issue will be considered under Objectives L and I.
Policies SA5, SA8 and SA9	These policies should be amended to include wording similar to that used for Policies SA4 and SA6 (noting the need to include SUDS and leave space along smaller watercourses).	Noted Action: wording of these issues will be made consistent between the policies.
Policy SA1	Land north of Eastern Road and South of London Road, Bracknell:	Noted. The requirement for investigation and remediation of

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
(PDL within settlements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that this site is likely to be contaminated due to previous use (however this is recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal) 	any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option).
	<p>Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be significant biodiversity constraints at this site which may mean the desired housing numbers are not achieved 	Noted.
	<p>Land at Battle Bridge House, Forest Road, Warfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the site is adjacent to Flood Zones for The Cut and that the results of new modelling are due in the near future. However do not consider that much of the site beyond the northwestern corner would be affected if the results indicated a wider extent of the flood zone 	Noted
Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)	<p>Bay Drive, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records show that The Bull Brook culvert runs through this site - the exact location will need to be identified and an 8m buffer zone left either side. The Council should be satisfied that the site passes the PPS25 sequential test 	<p>This site now has planning permission for 40 units (application 10/00780/FUL, approved 11 March 2011), therefore no longer needs to be included as part of SADPD. The planning application will form part of the housing commitment data.</p> <p>Action: reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA2/SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
	<p>The Football Ground, Larges Lane, Bracknell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site currently provides green space in an urban environment and future development should maintain 	OSPV will be required as part of the development proposal.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	a degree of greenery, linking where possible into an identified green network	
	<p>Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA is the main constraint to this site. SUDS will be an important consideration and could be adopted to tie in with any wider SUDS scheme created as part of the Broadmoor development 	<p>Mitigation for this will be secured through the SPA and replacement open space will be secured through the wider Broadmoor allocation (Policy SA4). Reference to SuDS to also be included.</p> <p>Action: Also refer to SuDS.</p>
	<p>Sandbanks, Longhill Road, Bracknell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk of contamination at this site (affecting controlled water sources) due to the closed landfill. This should be investigated and remediated as part of any development. The potential yield may render the site undeliverable against development costs 	<p>The requirement for investigation and remediation of any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option).</p>
	<p>Land north of Cain Road, Binfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a medium risk of pollution to controlled waters as the site is adjacent to the closed landfill. Mitigation for this, and any biodiversity, needs to be provided 	<p>The requirement for investigation and remediation of any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option).</p>
	<p>152 New Road, Ascot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackmoor Stream is culverted along New Road and no development should be built within 8m of this structure. A FRA should assess the likelihood of culverts overtopping and whether a low hazard route of access and egress would be available. The Council should be satisfied that the site passes the PPS25 sequential test. 	<p>No development is to be located within Flood Zone 2 or 3 . The requirement for implementation of any necessary mitigation measures is set out in the profile of this site (see Appendix 4 of the SASPD Preferred Option).</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No over-riding concerns with the inclusion of this site 	Noted.
	Land east of Murrell Hill lane, Binfield: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No principle objections to allocation of this site but note that biodiversity and SUDS will be important considerations 	Noted. These matters can be dealt with through the Development Management process (if and when a planning application is submitted).
	Land at Forest Road / Foxley Lane, Binfield: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the allocation but note that biodiversity and SUDS will be development considerations 	Noted. These matters can be dealt with through the Development Management process (if and when a planning application is submitted).
	Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a risk of contamination at this site (affecting controlled water sources) due to the closed landfill, and caution that the deliverability and achievability of the site may be determined by the findings of the contamination study. Inclusion of the site could potentially lead to longer term improved land quality if contamination is found to have spread from the landfill 	The requirement for investigation and remediation of any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 5 of the SADPD Preferred Option).
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	Impacts upon the SSSI/SPA are being adequately dealt with through the on-going involvement of the EA, NE and other conservation bodies. There are a number of water bodies on the site which should be retained, enhanced, and provided with a 5m buffer zone to development	Noted.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	Request amendment to wording of point 15 to read: "...No increase in surface water run off rates and volumes ". This point could also be revised to encourage betterment in surface water run off rates and volumes in Owlsmoor (where there are historic records of what potentially may be surface water flooding) if technically viable	Mitigation for this will be secured through the SPA and replacement open space will be secured through the wider Broadmoor allocation (Policy SA4). Action: Amend point 15 to include reference to 'volumes'
	Green Infrastructure should be added to this policy as a necessary infrastructure requirement, given the proximity of the site to the SPA and the additional development proposed at TRL	Noted. Action: include green infrastructure required within policy.
	There is a culvert running across the north eastern corner of the site and the opportunity should be taken to reduce potential incidents of flooding (which may result from this becoming blocked or its capacity exceeded) along Kentigern Drive, to ensure that access to the development via this route is not cut off by flooding	Noted.
	The SUDS requirements for this site will need to be delivered before significant development of the allocation occurs	Noted.
Policy SA5 (TRL)	Development adjacent to the Bagshot Heaths SSSI and Thames Basin Heaths SPA will need to mitigate for any impacts on these wildlife sites	Some ecological surveys have already been carried out and the results of these and further work will be a significant consideration in the layout of the development in order to minimise impact. There are two main ways in which the developer will need to offset the developments impact on biodiversity. Firstly, a significant amount of open space (4.3ha per 1000

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		residents) will be provided that will include passive greenspace. SANG will also be needed (at least 8ha per 1000 residents) in accordance with standards set by Natural England to steer pressure away from the neighbouring SPA. Such areas will provide a mixture of habitats for wildlife.
	<p>There may be potential for surface water flooding in the areas of built development. The water bodies on the site should be retained, enhanced and provided with a 5m buffer zone.</p> <p>Welcome the requirement to provide Green Infrastructure but suggest a requirement for SUDS infrastructure (similar to point 15 of Policy SA4) is added to this policy.</p> <p>At the planning application stage water features (water courses and overflow routes) should be identified and buffer zones provided. The water course could, ideally, be de-culverted or at least no development permitted within 8m of it.</p> <p>The SUDS requirements for this site will need to be delivered before significant development of the allocation occurs</p>	<p>The consistency of approach to infrastructure requirements in the policies is being addressed and the wording of the policies for the urban extensions are likely to be revised.</p> <p>Action: revise approach to key infrastructure requirements within policy.</p>
	There may be potential for some land contamination on this site given its previous use as a transport research laboratory	Further investigative work will be required prior to the planning application stage.
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Inclusion of the Blackman's Copse non-statutory wildlife site in the proposed SANGS should not detrimentally affect the ecology of the site, through increased recreational pressure. Monitoring of the Copse should take place to ensure the	The Council's Ecologist is involved in discussions about the location of built development in relation to Ancient Woodland and areas of wildlife value.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	integrity of the site is not harmed; and if it is provision should be made through conditions or S106 to provide additional SANGS off-site or promote alternative use	
	There are a number of water bodies on the site which would be retained, enhanced and provided with a 5m buffer zone	Noted
	Welcome inclusion of a SUDS requirement and protection of the watercourse (points 18 and 19). Generally happy with the proposed layout in terms of flood risk	Noted
	The SUDS requirements for this site will need to be delivered before significant development of the allocation occurs.	Noted
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	There are a number of small watercourses that traverse the site and there should be an emphasis on maintaining a natural network for biodiversity and keeping a green corridor running south west to north east through the site (this should be indicated on the Illustrative Concept Plan)	Noted. This can be included on an updated concept plan.
	Whilst development would probably be better located away from the watercourses which traverse the site (i.e. in the north-west part), the developable areas shown are acceptable as point 21 of the policy states that spaces will be left along the watercourses	Noted.
	If it is necessary to remove the series of drains and ponds which currently exist on the area identified for low density housing, these should be created elsewhere on the site as mitigation. Otherwise, we are keen that these be retained, enhanced and provided with a 5m buffer zone	Noted. A drainage solution including de-culverting, SUDS provision and buffer zones to water courses is a requirement in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	The SUDS requirements for this site will need to be delivered before significant development of the allocation occurs	Noted.
Policy SA8 (Amen Corner)	Inclusion of the Rigg's Copse non-statutory wildlife site in the proposed SANGS should not detrimentally affect the ecology of the site, through increased recreational pressure. Monitoring of the Copse should take place to ensure the integrity of the site is not harmed; and if it is provision should be made through conditions or S106 to provide additional SANGS off-site or promote alternative use	This is agreed and the management plan for the SANG which includes Riggs Copse will take account of the existing biodiversity and wildlife value of the Copse.
	This site is shown as having a number of previous industrial uses and hence there is potential for land contamination here	The site is required to assess and mitigate any contamination issues as set out and required by the Amen Corner SPD.
	The need to include SUDS measures in the development has not been mentioned. This should be added or alternatively the SPD for Amen Corner (Principle AC4) could be referenced	There is a requirement to provide SDS's in the Amend Corner SPD. However it is agreed that reference should also be made in Policy SA8. Action: Amend Policy SA8 to include reference to the integration of sustainable drainage systems.
	Generally happy with the layout proposed although the potential railway station is located on an attenuation pond overflow and has the potential to flood from surface water. In its current location it will need to satisfy the sequential test, although it could be regarded as essential infrastructure. Alternatively, moving the station to the east would reduce this risk substantially	This is a consideration at a more detailed level. This will therefore be a consideration should a scheme come forward.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	A buffer zone of 8m is required to The Cut and the Bull Brook rivers, which cross this site (more if tall development	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	is proposed). There are also a number of open waterbodies which we would wish to see protected	and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Inclusion of the Beggar's Roost adjacent to Strawberry Hill non-statutory wildlife site in the proposed SANGS should not detrimentally affect the ecology of the site, through increased recreational pressure	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	The wording of the policy should be amended to require SUDS infrastructure, as there is as yet no SPD for Warfield and this may not be adopted before the development comes forward	This is agreed. Action: An additional bullet point has been added to Policy SA9 which reads as <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems.
	The policy should make reference to the proposed Warfield SPD	This is agreed. Action: Additional wording has been added to Policy SA9 which reads "as Detailed applications will be required to also comply with the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document and other relevant guidance unless otherwise agreed with the Council".
	Generally happy with the layout proposed as the green corridor to the east is close to an area susceptible to surface water	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	flooding. This green corridor could follow the surface water overland flow route (to prevent it being obstructed by development)	and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Responses to Supporting Documents	Phase 1 Ecological surveys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is expected that appropriate ecological surveys will be undertaken prior to the development of detailed plans, to identify important flora, fauna and habitats in the site, identify any impacts of the scheme on these, demonstrate how adverse impacts will be avoided and propose any mitigation or enhancement measures and management responsibilities 	Noted.
	Infrastructure Delivery Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the policy on water resources and water efficiency. Would like to see this evidence transposed into local policy. It is unclear what impact growth will have on sewerage treatment facilities and receiving watercourses. BFC need to ensure future housing development helps to achieve the aims of the Water Framework Directive, prevents further deterioration and protects and enhances the aquatic environment. Might be worth including regional SUDS provision. 	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan''
English Heritage		
General	Response to previous consultation dated 14 April 2010 remains valid, where they referred to the importance of alignment with the Core Strategy Spatial objectives and policies: <i>Objective 1 - to maintain and</i>	Noted.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p><i>improve the built and natural environment, and to avoid or mitigate the effects of new development upon the natural and historic environment, and Core Strategy Policies CS1 and CS7. PPS5 highlights the importance of the evidence base and the need for it to be sufficient to adequately inform the plan making process. Section 2 of the associated practice guide refers to the fact that the historic environment should be considered as more than designated assets and that where information on locally significant heritage assets exists, this should be used. The South East Plan draws attention to the value of Historic environment Records and characterisation as a tool to assist decision making, and such information should be drawn upon to refine consideration of areas proposed for development on the LDF.</i></p>	
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	<p>The site is constrained by a number of environmental and historic designations which will need to be addressed in addition to considering the potential harm to non-designated locally important features in compliance with PPS5. The designated heritage assets within the area under consideration are the main hospital range, including the chapel/hall (block 5), Forest House (Grade II Listed), and the estate also includes a designed registered landscape (Grade II). The registered historic park and garden is identified as being at risk on the 2010 Register of Historic Assets at Risk as a result of development proposals. Where assets are at risk of loss, delay or other threats, plans at local levels should consider how best to preserve them (PPS5, Policy HE3.4).</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there will be harm to the significance of the registered park and walled garden. It will be for Bracknell Forest to form a view as to whether the public benefit secured by provision of the hospital is sufficient to justify the proposed development despite the harm caused to interests of acknowledged importance, and additional justification and evidence has been sought from the owners of the site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>A conservation management plan is required, which is referred to in Policy SA4, which is welcomed.</p> <p>PPS5 Policy HE9.1 states that loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, substantial harm to or loss of a garden II listed building park or garden should be <i>exceptional</i>. PPS5 requires that such development should be refused unless the provisions of Policy HE9.2 apply, including substantial public benefits that outweigh the loss or harm. In this case, harm can be identified with respect the walled kitchen garden forming part of the registered area.</p> <p>English Heritage consider that the walled garden lies at the heart of the designed landscape. The sheer size of the walled garden, its focus for the therapeutic work if the asylum, its uniqueness and unusual position in the heart of the estate contribute its particular significance, with the physical relationship of the garden to the rest of the site is of historical illustrative value. English Heritage understand that detailed consideration is being given to various options in accommodating residential development within the walled garden, the least damaging of which would appear to be one retained the northern third as open scape, restored to conserve its historical illustrative value.</p>	
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	In last consultation drew attention to the Grade II* Newbold College Registered park and Garden (formerly Moor Close) and that it was on the 'at risk' register. Concern remains for potential impact upon its setting arising from development	The extent of the Preferred Option for the Blue Mountain site does not include allocation of or development from the Moor Close historic Park and Garden. (This was identified at the earlier

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	of Blue Mountain (Policy SA7), and there is no indication of any measures as to how to consider how to address the threats in line with PPS5 (Policy HE3.4).	Participation (Issues and Options Stage) as a potential Broad Area for development).
Policy SA11(Royal Military Academy)	<p>Note provisions within the policy to sustain and where possible enhance heritage assets within the site and for setting of heritage assets within or adjoining the site not to be harmed. As the setting of heritage assets may extend for some distance, it is inappropriate to limit those outside the site to 'adjoining'.</p> <p>PPS5 (Policy HE10.2) draws attention to the appropriateness of Local Planning Authorities identifying opportunities for changes in the setting to enhance or better reveal the significance of a heritage asset rather than just safeguard harm.</p>	<p>The objective is to protect the setting of any heritage assets that could be affected by development on the RMA site. The wording could be beneficially amended to better reflect this and to seek opportunities to enhance the settings of heritage assets or better reveal their significance.</p> <p>Action: delete point i and replace with:</p> <p>i. The site's heritage assets are sustained and, where possible, enhanced and the setting of any heritage assets, either within or outside the site, are safeguarded from harm and, where possible, enhanced or changed to better reveal the significance of the heritage asset.</p>
Appendix 4: Map 20 & 21 (Cricket Field Grove & School Hill)	Requirement in respect of maps suggest that the development of the two sites require respect for the setting of the historic park and garden, whereas the sites are within it.	This point is considered in the Background Paper to the Draft Submission SADPD.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Comments on Draft Sustainability Appraisal	See responses to Draft Sustainability Appraisal.	See responses to Draft Sustainability Appraisal.
Highways Agency (HA)		
General	The HA will continue to comment on technical work as and when produced by BFC and will comment in more detail on the specific sites at the next round of consultation	Noted. Further technical work on modelling has been sent to the HA for comment.
Responses to 'Housing'	<p>Paragraph 2.4.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that the SADPD identifies a number of sites which were not allocated in the Core Strategy, the HA will require evidence that the impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) can be accommodated (i.e. new modelling) 	<p>The level of housing, and the principles for its location are the same as proposed in the Core Strategy and therefore the overall impact of the SADPD on the SRN should not be significantly different. There may be localised impacts due to the disposition of the major sites.</p> <p>Up-to-date modelling of the baseline year and forecast scenarios to 2026, including key strategic routes to the SRN, have been sent to the HA for comment. The submission IDP will contain any relevant information to emerge.</p>
Policies SA4 and SA9 (Broadmoor & Warfield)	Where areas of poor accessibility are identified, such as at Broadmoor and Warfield, the HA will look at what modal splits can be achieved and corresponding mitigation measures.	Noted. Up-to-date modelling of the baseline year and forecast scenarios to 2026, including key strategic routes to the SRN, have been sent to the HA for comment.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	Reference should be made to the need to mitigate the impact of the development on the SRN (including M4 J10)	The case or justification is not yet fully established. Therefore in this interest of achieving robust and sound policies, the text in the policy:

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		<p><i>A comprehensive package of on- and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport,</i></p> <p>could also mean improvements to the SRN is justified and proved. Therefore no amendments to the policy is required. Additional text in the supporting text should be provided</p> <p>Action include additional text in the supporting text referring to the potential needs for contributions towards the SRN</p>
Responses to supporting documents	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments set out in letter dated 3rd August remain pertinent (with particular respect to mitigation measures at M4 J10) • Seek confirmation that the IDP will be updated to reflect the results of Bracknell's updated transport model. • Interested to know how local road network improvements will affect the SRN, as well as potentially examining the HA's own M4 J10 improvement scheme in the model. • The IDP notes the importance of improvements to M4 J10 and M3 J3, but the HA requests more work is undertaken by BFC on a mechanism for cost apportionment and scheme delivery. To deliver, it 	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan''

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>is essential for partners to 'sign up to it'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest collaborating with partners, particularly Wokingham Borough Council. 	
Natural England		
Policies SA4-SA9	Text on phasing needs to note that a SANG has to be in place and available for use before the first new dwelling is occupied	Action: Amend text to reflect SANG has to be in place before first dwelling is occupied.
	The proposed wording “a package of additional measures to manage any additional recreation pressures on the SPA” is too vague and should instead mirror the wording in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (i.e. specifically mention strategic access management and monitoring)	<p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
Policy SA11 (RMA)	Correction: Broadmoor to Bagshot Woods and Heaths Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: amend text to refer correct reference.</p>
Secretary of State for Transport		
	None received.	N/A
Police Authority (Thames Valley)		
	None received.	N/A
South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)		
	None received.	N/A

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
South East England Partnership Board (SEEPB)		
	None received.	N/A
Telecomms		
T-Mobile	None received.	N/A
Orange	None received.	N/A
3	None received.	N/A
O2	Holding response; distributed to appropriate internal contact, no subsequent response received.	N/A
Vodaphone	None received.	N/A
Berkshire East Primary Care Trust		
Policies SA4 - SA9	Note that most of the 13 GP practises in the Borough have little or no capacity and therefore where the major new developments proposed reach the planning application stage, the PCT would wish to be consulted to establish whether new or improved facilities are required (in addition to improvements to public transport to link the developments to the Healthspace).	The Council will continue to work with the PCT to ensure their needs are considered. At the time of writing, justification to require developer contributions has not been received, however the IDP will remain a 'live' document that can be updated when this information emerges.
	PCT expects that the planned new Bracknell Healthspace will largely serve existing residents of the Borough and those who will live in the planned new major developments. It therefore requests that major developments planned in the SADPD make appropriate contributions towards completion of the Healthspace (in addition to financial contributions sought towards improvements to public transport accessibility).	Financial contributions will be sought to improve public transport connectivity where feasible from new development. Improving accessibility to Bracknell Town Centre is a priority.
Policies SA6 - SA9	These policies should allow for “one potential new [health] facility (or replacement of existing)” as the PCT is	Because of the uncertainty, although it can not be put into policy, if a requirement is

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	not yet able to confirm whether new local healthcare facilities will be required on any of these sites (in addition to services offered by existing GP surgeries and the proposed Healthspace).	identified, the IDP can be updated accordingly.
Responses to Supporting Documents	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the Borough's GP surgeries have little or no capacity in their current premises to accommodate an increase in population. The PCT would want to speak to developers of individual sites to ensure s106 contributions in land or financial assistance to mitigate impact. At this stage it is proposed that the Health space will accommodate the growth in population from the proposed developments at Amen Corner, Blue Mountain, Warfield and the TRL site in Crowthorne. However should additional capacity be required elsewhere, the PCT may need to consider a new facility or the replacement of the existing Binfield Surgery. It is anticipated that the Broadmoor development would require an extension to the existing Heath Hill Road Surgery. It would be expected that financial contributions would be made from developments to the completion of the Health space (to plug funding gaps) and towards improvements at Heath Hill Road Surgery. Securing good access from new developments to the HealthSpace in Bracknell town centre by public transport is an essential part of the delivery of primary care services. 	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan''
Electricity - Scottish & Southern		

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	None received.	N/A
Gas - British Gas		
	None received.	N/A
Thames Water		
General	<p>No objection in principle to allocation of sites for development. There may however be capacity issues to the existing waste water treatment capacity and sewerage networks. Recommend adding the following to relevant site schedules:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>	<p>See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan''</p> <p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
Policy SA1 (PDL within settlements)	<p>Adastron House, Crowthorne Road, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted
	<p>Garth Hill School, Sandy Lane, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.
	Land at Battle Bridge House, and Garage, Forest Road, Warfield <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted
	Peacock Bungalow, Peacock Lane, Binfield <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted
	Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted
	The Depot, Old Bracknell Lane West, Bracknell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	Action: add additional requirement to profile of site: “Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.
	Albert Road Car Park, Bracknell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be 	Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years</p>	<p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
	<p>The Iron Duke, Waterloo Place, Old Bakehouse Court, High Street, Crowthorne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Land north of Eastern Road and south of London Road, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
<p>Policy SA2 (Other land within settlements)</p>	<p>Bay Drive, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	<p>Noted</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>The Football Ground, Larges Way, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
	<p>24-30 Sandhurst Road, Crowthorne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.
	<p>Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
	<p>Land at School Hill, Crowthorne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Sandbanks, Longhill Road, Bracknell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>
	<p>Land north of Cain Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.
	<p>152 New Road, Ascot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	<p>White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.
	<p>Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years 	<p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.
	Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not envisage any concerns with waste water capability 	Noted.
	Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious concerns regarding waste water provision for this site. Recommend that development is constructed at an alternative location, otherwise detailed investigations will be required which may take a number of years (during which discussions with the LPA and developer will be necessary) 	Action: add additional requirement to profile of site: “Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.
Policies SA4 - SA9	Note that the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the development and investigations into the impact of the development will be required. In the event of upgrades being required these may have a lead in time of up to 3 years.	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan"
Policy SA10 (Phasing & Delivery)	Support inclusion of this policy and wish to work closely with BFC regarding phasing of infrastructure with development	Noted.
Responses to 'Other Considerations'	Paragraph 5.3 'Infrastructure': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support inclusion of this paragraph Note that the extent of improvements to waste water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Noted. The IDP will remain "live", so will be periodically

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>infrastructure are not currently known hence why they are not included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers will need to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity to accommodate development, and agree improvements where necessary. It is essential that any improvements are in place ahead of occupation of the development 	<p>updated when new information emerges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. This will be made clear in the IDP.
Water Undertakers		
Three Valleys	None received.	N/A
South East Water		
General	<p>Would like to see reference to the IDP as a 'live' document that will be regularly monitored and reviewed in consultation with delivery providers - this will introduce flexibility if there are delays to delivery or changes to infrastructure requirements</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Action: A new paragraph will be inserted (Para 5.3.8) that will read: The IDP will be a "live" document that will be periodically monitored and reviewed in consultation with relevant statutory agencies and delivery organisation. Information may be subject to change as new information emerges.</p>
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	<p>Object. Wish to see a further criterion added to Policy SA9 states that the requirements as set out in the IDP should be met by new development, which would ensure that the criterion would ensure consistency with policies SA4-SA7. If the policy is worded to refer to the SPD rather than the IDP (as in the case of policy SA8), then the forthcoming SPD should include an appropriate cross reference to the IDP if it is the Council's</p>	<p>The intention is for Infrastructure Schedule to be included in the IDP and Warfield SPD.</p>

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	intention that the IDP schedule for Warfield is to be retained and kept up to date.	
Policy SA10 (Phasing and Delivery)	Support the policy which recognises the release of housing will need to be managed in order to ensure the scale and timing of development is well co-ordinated with new infrastructure.	Policy has now been deleted in order to provide additional flexibility in line with emerging Government policy.
Para 5.3.8	Would like to see section 5.3 of the Plan amended to include a statement to the effect: "the IDP will be a "live" document that will be regularly monitored and reviewed in consultation with the relevant statutory agencies and delivery organisations".	Agreed. Action: A new paragraph will be inserted (Para 5.3.8) that will read: The IDP will be a "live" document that will be periodically monitored and reviewed in consultation with relevant statutory agencies and delivery organisation. Information may be subject to change as new information emerges.
Responses to Background Documents:	<p>IDP & IDP Schedule for Warfield:</p> <p>Generally supportive of IDP. It makes adequate provision to identify and secure the necessary improvements and enhancements to water supply infrastructure for identified development. SEW reiterate the importance of being regularly consulted and updated on the implementation of the Plan.</p> <p>Most of the schedules for the urban extension sites acknowledge that both upgrades to local water supply infrastructure is likely to be required and that new homes should be delivered with a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/head/day, but the Warfield schedule does not identify water efficiency</p>	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan'

Other Statutory Consultee responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	standards to be achieved, which should be amended for consistency with other schedules.	
Homes and Communities Agency		
	None received.	N/A

Table 17.4 Non-Statutory Consultee Responses

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)		
General	Disappointed that despite previous comments made on the Participation Document, the vast majority of the sites selected are in areas where without mitigation there would be an adverse impact upon the integrity of the Thames Basins Heaths Special Protection Area. Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan states that priority should be given to directing development away from these areas.	Whilst BBOWT are raising concerns, Natural England, who are the statutory body on this matter, have not objected to the Council's approach (see comments from Natural England).
Policy SA2 - 24-30 Sandhurst Road (SHLAA site 68)	Appears that part of this site is within 400m of the SPA. It must therefore include a requirement that " <i>No net residential development within the 400m buffer to the SPA</i> ", if it is to comply with the Delivery Framework and the Appropriate Assessment is to be able to conclude that no adverse effect on the SPA under Habitat Regulations.	A small corner of the front garden of No. 30 Sandhurst Road is within the 400m buffer to the SPA. Action: A note will be added in the next version of the SA DPD to ensure that all developments comply with the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA4(Broadmoor)	We note Natural England's comments in their letter of 6 December 2010 in relation to more detail in the policy on	For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>the package of SPA measures. While we agree that access management and monitoring should be specifically included, there are other parts of the package that will also be required e.g. car parking provision, provision and management of the SANG in perpetuity, monitoring of visitors on the SANG etc. We therefore propose the following amended wording:</p> <p><u>“A package of additional measures including access management and monitoring measures to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area, <i>which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.</i>”</u></p> <p>This is also relevant for policies SA6 to SA9.</p>	<p>the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
<p>Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA5):</p> <p><i>On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths Special Protection Area. <u>The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA. Details of SANG ownership, contributions to management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</u></i></p>	<p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
<p>There should be a requirement within the Policy for a biodiversity management plan to be provided to</p>	<p>Further detailed survey work will be required prior to the submission of any planning</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	ensure protection and enhancement of the important species and habitat that the site currently supports.	application. This should identify mitigation measures required including whether or not there is a need for a biodiversity management plan.
Policy SA5 (TRL)	<p>BBOWT appeared at the Inquiry in support of the Council's refusal of a scheme on TRL in 2008.</p> <p>Do not consider that the Concept Plan for the site addresses of the Secretary of State or appeal Inspector's reasons for dismissing the appeal in terms of SANG design. For this reason, suggest Map 3 is removed from the Site Allocations DPD (as despite being described as "illustrative", it will be used by the developer as a tacit endorsement of its latest proposals, which BBOWT do not consider pass the strict tests of in the Habitats Regulations.</p>	<p>The concept plan is clearly listed as illustrative and does not intend to address all the Secretary of State or appeal Inspector's detailed reasons for dismissing the appeal in terms of SANG design.</p> <p>Action: Policy SA5 has been amended to state that avoidance and mitigation measures will need to satisfy the Habitats Regulations and the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
	<p>The Appropriate Assessment supporting this DPD reaches a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA based on a list of mitigation measures that will be required (Table 5.3). This includes provision and management of the SANG in perpetuity, transfer of the SANG to the Council (or another suitable solution) and timing of completion of the SANG. As this has been an issue in the past at this site with this developer, Policy SA5 should clarify the position to prevent the same issues arising in the future:</p> <p><i>"Point 11. On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths</i></p>	<p>Action: Policy SA4 - SA9 have been amended to state that avoidance and mitigation measures will need to satisfy the Habitats Regulations and the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p><i>Special Protection Area. The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA. Details of SANG ownership, contributions to management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</i></p> <p>This is also relevant for Policies SA4-SA9.</p>	
	<p>Suggest an amendment to wording of Policy SA5 to include access management:</p> <p><i>"Point 12: A package of additional measures to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area. This will include access management and monitoring measures on the areas of the SPA adjacent to the development, which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA."</i></p>	<p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	<p>Welcome the other biodiversity protection set out in para.19.</p> <p>Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA4):</p> <p><i>"A package of additional measures including access management and monitoring measures to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area, which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA."</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA5):</p> <p><i>On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths Special Protection Area. <u>The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.Details of SANG ownership, contributions to management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</u></i></p>	<p>Action: Policy SA4 - SA9 have been amended to state that avoidance and mitigation measures will need to satisfy the Habitats Regulations and the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
Policy SA7 (Blue Blue Mountain)	<p>Welcome the other biodiversity protection set out in para 21-22.</p>	Noted.
	<p>Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA4):</p> <p>"A package of additional measures <u>including access management and monitoring measures</u> to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area, <u>which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.</u>"</p>	<p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>
	<p>Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA5):</p> <p><i>On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths Special Protection Area. <u>The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.Details of SANG</u></i></p>	<p>Unlike the Broadmoor and TRL sites, this site is located well away from the SPA and it is not therefore clear why SANG provision significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 people would be justified. The provision of SANGs must be in accordance with current policy (SEP and Core Stratgey DPD) and other relevant guidance.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<i>ownership, contributions to management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</i>	For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of management of the SANG by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA8 (Amen Corner)	Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA4): "A package of additional measures <u>including access management and monitoring measures</u> to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area, <u>which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.</u> "	For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
	Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA5): <i>On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths Special Protection Area. <u>The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA. Details of SANG ownership, contributions to management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</u></i>	Unlike the Broadmoor and TRL sites, this site is located well away from the SPA and it is not therefore clear why SANG provision significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 people would be justified. The provision of SANGs must be in accordance with current policy (SEP and Core Strategy DPD) and other relevant guidance. For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of management of the SANG by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	Do not oppose to the principle of development at this site, but do oppose a layout that would result in the loss of deterioration of a Local Wildlife Site or priority BAP habitat, for example it appears from the concept plan that part of Brickworks Meadows Local Wildlife Site will be lost to housing.	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA4): “A package of additional measures <u>including access management and monitoring measures</u> to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area, <i>which will be secured for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.</i> ”	Strategic access management and monitoring measures have been included in the next stage of the document as well as any other SPA avoidance and mitigation measures that are required to satisfy the Habitats Regulations and the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
	Suggest the following amended wording to the Policy (in line with comments made on SA5): <i>On-site bespoke SANG to significantly exceed 8ha per 1000 people to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the ThamesBasin Heaths Special Protection Area. <u>The SANG must be provided and managed for the duration of any impacts on the SPA.</u>Details of SANG ownership, contributions to</i>	Unlike the Broadmoor and TRL sites, this site is located well away from the SPA and it is not therefore clear why SANG provision significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 people would be justified. The provision of SANGs must be in accordance with current policy (SEP and Core Strategy DPD) and other relevant guidance.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<i>management costs and the timeframe for delivery will be secured prior to grant of any planning permission.</i>	For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of management of the SANG by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
	Recommend that the following is included as a new point 9: "Buffering, protection and enhancement of Local Wildlife Sites and BAP Priority habitat."	This text is agreed subject to minor changes. Action: Add an additional bullet point to Policy SA9 which reads as: Buffering, protection and enhancement of Local Wildlife Sites and other important habitat.
Responses to Background Documents: Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment:	Tables 4.1 and 5.1, Paragraphs 3.5 and 2.2: Given the close proximity of large developments allocated in the Site Allocations DPD to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, we do not consider it sufficient to only address those potential impacts in these paragraphs. Other impacts that should be included (as identified in Table 10 of the Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment) are: urban effects (including vandalism, fire, motorbikes, BMX and other anti-social activities), enrichment from fly-tipping garden waste, predation by cats, reduction in quantity or quality of supporting habitats e.g.	The Site Allocations DPD Appropriate Assessment is a strategic assessment which specifically considers impact on the SPA as a result of the increased housing numbers set out in the DPD. If these sites come forward for development, a more detailed Appropriate Assessment will be carried out at the planning application stage, where appropriate, and in consultation with Natural England. These more detailed Appropriate Assessments will need to consider other potential impacts such as those listed in

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>for foraging nightjar, hydrology, and noise, light and air pollution. Many of these were identified in Allison Hulbert's Proof of Evidence dated October 2008 for the Council at the TRL appeal (paragraph 8.3) and are also issues that need to be addressed at the BroadmoorHospital site.</p>	<p>Table 10 of the Core Strategy Technical Background Document (2007).</p> <p>Action: Tables 4.1 and 5.1 have been amended. The scope of this Appropriate Assessment and the potential requirement for a further more detailed Appropriate Assessment at the planning application stage has been made clearer in the Introduction.</p>
	<p>Table 3.1 and Paragraph 3.10:</p> <p>The estimated increase in population from developments within 400m and 5km should be 7152 people (3096 x 2.31 = 7152 (rounded up)). An estimate of developments within 5km, population and visits should be made for the windfall sites as it is not reasonable to assume that all 480 dwellings over the plan period will be outside the 5km zone. The estimated increase in visits to the SPA should then be recalculated.</p>	<p>The Council has taken account of windfall sites as outlined at the end of Section 5. These are developments of less than 10 dwellings and even if they all fall within 5km of the SPA, they will be able to be allocated to SANGs in the south of the Borough where the Council has spare capacity. In the Submission SADPD the figure for windfall sites is much lower than in the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Action: The figures in Table 3.1 and para. 3.10 and 3.13 have been recalculated.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 5.14:</p> <p>This should make clear that there may need to be discounts as a result of nature conservation interests too such as nightjar foraging areas.</p>	<p>There should be an ecological discount on SANGs if they have features that could be adversely effected by an increase in recreational disturbance.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Action: This has been added to paragraph 5.14.
	<p>Table 5.2:</p> <p>Given this site supports foraging nightjar, the fourth point in this table should be reworded to read <i>“Levels of existing visitor use and Annex I bird use on the SANG will need to be discounted to protect current access and use.”</i></p>	Action: Table 5.2 has been reworded to state that there should also be an ecological discount on SANGs if they have features that could be adversely effected by an increase in recreational disturbance. This change has also been made in tables 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 for the other urban extensions.
	<p>Paragraph 1.3:</p> <p>Reference to the Delivery Plan should be the Delivery Framework</p>	Action: Noted and amended.
	<p>Paragraph 1.8:</p> <p>There is no reference to national planning policy “described above”</p>	Action: Noted and amended.
	<p>Paragraphs 1.10, 1.14, Table 8.1:</p> <p>“Competent Authority”: Reference should be to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010</p>	Action: Noted and amended.
	<p>Paragraphs 1.12, 1.14 and 1.15:</p> <p>These should refer to the relevant subsections in Regulation 102 which deals with land use plans. References to projects should be removed except when considering in combination effects</p>	Action: Noted and amended.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Paragraph 1.13:</p> <p>Where does the term “reasonably foreseeable” originate? We cannot locate this in PPS 9 Circular or the EC Managing Natura 2000 Sites guidance</p>	<p>This wording has been deleted and replaced by reference to paragraph 102 (4) of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 2.6:</p> <p>This now needs updating in light of the Cala Homes decision though it is probably worth referring to the situation both with and without the South East Plan to ‘future proof’ the assessment</p>	<p>Appendix 2 of the Site Allocations DPD and Section 2 of the Site Allocations DPD Background Paper sets out the situation in the Borough with regard to housing numbers.</p> <p>Action: Update made.</p>
	<p>Table 2.1:</p> <p>There is new condition assessment information on the Natural England website which slightly updates this information as at 1 November 2010</p>	<p>Action: Noted and amended.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 2.27:</p> <p>“Ecological Requirements” and Appendix 2: Should reference be made to “reduction <u>in</u> displacement of birds”</p>	<p>Action: Noted and amended.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)		
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	<p>Development is shown on the concept map (Map 4) to go up to the boundary with Wokingham. This means that development would take place in the strategic gap.</p>	<p>The developable area is a small part of the gap and located where the gap is most influenced by urban Bracknell.</p>
	<p>The visible separation of settlements plays an important role in protecting the countryside and preventing urban</p>	<p>It is currently not possible to see one settlement from the other across the ‘gap’ due to landform and vegetation.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>sprawl. The separation should be significant so that the separation is clearly visible.</p>	<p>Although the A329 (M) forms part of the gap, it is supplemented by adjacent open rural land. A gap would still be maintained between Wokingham and Bracknell.</p>
	<p>The importance of the gap is supported by Para 115 of the Core Strategy 'one of the functions of the countryside is to help preserve the physical and visual separation of the settlements by protecting the rural areas between them.'</p>	<p>In recognition of the topography of the site, the disposition of uses within the site (as shown on the concept plan), has been amended so that the highest land, adjacent to the Borough boundary remains as greenspace.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend concept plan to show land within south west corner of site adj to London Road as greenspace. Make consequential changes to extent of built up area in the north western sector of the site.</p>
<p>Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)</p>	<p>Object to the re-location of Bracknell Football club, this development would be inappropriate for the reasons of noise, traffic, land taken for car parks and especially light pollution.</p> <p>A new stadium is likely to attract frequent use probably every night during week and at weekends. An alternative site which will have less impact on the countryside should be found.</p>	<p>The site proposed for the new ground is visually very well contained and is already occupied by a floodlit driving range. There is good access from the site directly to the Northern Distributor Road which will minimise the impacts of traffic accessing the football ground on the local road network.</p> <p>Relocation of the club will also enable the redevelopment of the existing site close to Bracknell Town Centre for high density housing, reducing the need for additional greenfield allocations.</p>
<p>Friends, Families & Travellers</p>		

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
Whole Document	The Site Allocations document does not contain any reference to the needs of Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople.	See comment below - the SADPD does not seek to allocate specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision.
	<p>The incomplete but released SE panel report considers that the figures set out in draft South East Plan Policy H7 have been significantly underestimated, concluding that there was a need for 33 Gypsy and Traveller pitches to 2016 and 9 Travelling Showpeople plots (the draft Policy H7 identified for a 15 pitches and 2 plots).</p> <p>Therefore consider that whatever evidence base is accepted, there is an established need, which is unlikely to be met without allocations, and that the Council should accept the conclusions of the SE Panel report as the best tested evidence available.</p> <p>Recent advice from the Government is that local authorities determine the level of provision required, and develop strategies for bringing land forward in DPDs. The SADPD should therefore commit the council to make allocations in line with this advice and Circular 01/06.</p>	<p>Draft Policy H7 of the South East Plan is considered to represent the most robust and justified figure, based on the evidence currently available. Since 2006 planning permission has been granted for 14 pitches in the Borough and it is therefore clear that the target is likely to be met by dealing with provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites through the planning application process and applying Core Strategy Policy CS18.</p> <p>The Government has recently published a draft PPS on Planning for Travellers for consultation. This indicates a more localised assessment of need. Given the uncertainty regarding national guidance, it is not considered prudent to plan for provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites beyond 2016 in the SADPD; instead the situation will be considered as part of the Core Strategy Review when account can be taken of new national guidance.</p>
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)		
Responses to 'Housing'	<p>Paragraph 2.4.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Express disappointment that all of BFC's proposed sites lie within 7km, and 3 are within 5km, of the SPA - contrary to South East Plan Policy NRM6 which seeks to direct development away from the SPA 	All but the very northernmost parts of the Borough lie within 7km of the SPA, and this is mostly countryside and designated Green Belt. The SADPD has sought to allocate sites adjacent to the Borough's most sustainable settlements (Bracknell and

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Crowthorne) which by their nature will fall within 7km of the SPA. Mitigation for the impact of these developments on the SPA is proposed. Natural England have only made a few minor amendments to the SADPD up to this stage.
Policies SA4 - SA9	These policies include a requirement to provide "a package of additional measures to manage any additional recreational pressures on the SPA", which should be expanded to refer to the need for contributions towards monitoring (of visitors and birds) on the SPA itself	For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	Given the proximity of the SPA to this site it is considered a highly sensitive location for housing. Further, detailed work is required but it is considered that a successful scheme can be brought forward to deliver the housing and protect the SPA Recommend flexibility within the policy regarding the scale of housing proposed, by adding wording to the effect that the total number of houses delivered may be lower if this is the maximum level which can be mitigated against	The Council recognise that this site is close to the SPA. According to the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, it is required to take account of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development in consultation with Natural England. Action: Make reference in the policy to the Habitats Regulations.
Policy SA5 (TRL)	Disappointed that the Council proposes to allocate this site as it appears no further work has been carried out to demonstrate that it can support the level of housing proposed,	The Council recognise that this site is close to the SPA. The Council's Core Strategy DPD and Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy allow the provision of new housing

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>since the previous appeal was dismissed</p> <p>Do not consider that the measures proposed are sufficient to ensure there will be no adverse impact on the SPA and therefore object to the inclusion of this site. Recommend that an alternative site be sought</p>	<p>beyond 400m from the SPA. The site will not have any dwellings within the 400m buffer and will have an on-site bespoke SANG significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 new population. The site has passed an Appropriate Assessment on this basis, in agreement with Natural England, notwithstanding further iterations of the Appropriate Assessment throughout the planning process. The site also fall within the criteria of Core Strategy DPD Policy CS2 which sets the sequence for allocating new sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Inspector at the appeal did not rule out this site for future development and it is previously developed land. According to the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, account must be taken of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development. This is outlined in Policy SA5. The rationale for the selection of sites can be found in the Background Paper to the SADPD.</p>
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Suggest amendment to wording of policy to ensure bespoke SPA mitigation is provided at a ratio of 'at least' 8ha per 1,000 population	Action: Policy has been amended to include 'at least'.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	Suggest amendment to wording of policy to ensure bespoke SPA mitigation is provided at a ratio of 'at least' 8ha per 1,000 population	Action: Policy has been amended to include 'at least'.
	The Illustrative Concept Plan (Map 5) does not indicate how much SANG will be provided to the north of the site;	SANG will need to be well in excess of 2 ha in order to comply with the standard. However, it is

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	preference is for a SANG to be at least 2ha in size	agreed that the minimum size of a SANG (for it to be able to qualify as a SANG) should be 2 hectares. This is set out in the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA8 (Amen Corner)	Suggest amendment to wording of policy to ensure bespoke SPA mitigation is provided at a ratio of 'at least' 8km per 1,000 population	Avoidance and mitigation for this site has been agreed through the adoption of the Amen Corner SPD (March 2010). Any alternative mitigation to that preferred must pass an Appropriate Assessment. Action: Policy has been amended to include 'at least'.
	Understand that the avoidance and mitigation measures as set out in the Amen Corner SPD are not altered by the SADPD and therefore have no further comment to make.	
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	Suggest amendment to wording of policy to ensure bespoke SPA mitigation is provided at a ratio of 'at least' 8km per 1,000 population.	Action: Policy has been amended to include 'at least'.
	The Illustrative Concept Plan (Map 5) does not indicate how much SANG will be provided to the north of the site nor does it distinguish between SANG and other open space. Note that preference is for a SANG to be at least 2km in size.	The Concept Plan just shows open space across the site. The Warfield SPD in its chapter on Green Infrastructure makes it explicit the SANG requirements of which the preferred solution is on-site provision. However some of which may be provided off-site subject to passing an Appropriate Assessment. It is agreed that the minimum size of a particular SANG should be 2 ha to make it functional. Please see the final Warfield SPD for further detail.
	Would wish to see good footpath connections and parking facilities provided in association with the SANG to improve its attractiveness and effectiveness	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Policy SA11 (RMA)	Concern that this policy has not been fully appraised in the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment of the SADPD as, depending on the nature, scale and design of employment there is the potential for impact on the SPA.	As stated in SA11, development on this site will be suitable if it does not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Development on this site may require a detailed Appropriate Assessment at the planning application stage, in consultation with Natural England. This more detailed Appropriate Assessment may need to consider other potential impacts such as those listed in Table 10 of the Core Strategy Technical Background Document (2007). Action: A paragraph of explanation has been added to the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
Sport England		
General	Generally welcomes the attention paid to sport and recreation related issued within the Site Allocations DPD, and that the Council has LID SPD which contains specific reference (Chapter 4) relating to open space and outdoor recreational facilities.	Noted.
	The Site Allocations DPD needs to clearly set out the links to relevant policies in other DPDs such as the Core Strategy and Developer Contributions SPD, as these documents are key to providing new open space, sport and recreation facilities, and should be uses in	Noted. Action: Include more cross-referencing within documents.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	parallel with each other when planning for new development and additional population are planned.	
Policy SA1 - Garth Hill School	<p>It is understood that the Garth Hill/Wick Hill Masterplan was approved in 2003, and includes the Garth Hill School site. One of the objectives was to improve the playing fields, sports facilities and open space provision, however page 57 of the Site Allocations DPD only states there should be 'provision of on-site open space'. Clarity is sought as to whether this proposal is related to the Masterplan.</p> <p>The site includes existing playing fields and tennis courts.</p> <p>Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss facilities for sport unless an equivalent replacement in terms of quality and quantity and accessibility of the loss of a facility is unavoidable, or unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant, and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore if the site comes forward for development in the future, the applicant will need to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included in the policy allocation for the site.</p> <p>Regarding the playing field, oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or would prejudice the use of all or any part of a playing field, or land last used as playing field,</p>	The redevelopment of Garth Hill School (planning application 08/00759/3) secured associated new open space/playing fields for the school. This site would not be building upon any of this open space.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>unless the judgement of Sport England, one of five specific circumstances applies. Development which would lead to the loss of all or part of a playing field, or would prejudice its use would not normally be permitted as it would permanently reduce the opportunities for participation in sporting activities. Government planning policy and policies of Sport England have recognised the importance of such activities to the social and economic well being of the country.</p>	
Policy SA2 - Football Ground	<p>It is understood that the football club is to be relocated on Land at Blue Mountain. In order to comply with Sport England's Playing Field Policy Exception E4, there must be a like for like replacement in the loss of the football pitch, which seeks that a replacement is of equivalent or better quality and quantity, in a suitable location, and made available prior to the commencement of development.</p>	<p>Relocation of the club will also enable the redevelopment of the existing site close to Bracknell Town Centre for high density housing, reducing the need for additional greenfield allocations.</p> <p>Land at Blue Mountain (Policy SA5) includes a football ground, and is being promoted by the owners as a new ground for Bracknell Town FC.</p>
Policy SA2 - Cricket Field Grove	<p>The site includes a playing pitch, pavilion and bowling green.</p> <p>Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss facilities for sport unless an equivalent replacement in terms of quality and quantity and accessibility of the loss of a facility is unavoidable, or unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant, and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore if the site comes forward for development in the future, the applicant will need</p>	<p>This site is within the ownership of Broadmoor Hospital. Policy SA4 (Broadmoor), would provide replacement pitches lost through the redevelopment of Cricket Field Grove. In addition, Policy SA4 would secure a range of other facilities which would be publicly available: contributions towards new community facility at TRL, contribution towards built sports facilities, open space of public value, on-site bespoke SANG, and in-kind provision of equipped play areas. This will be set out in further detail in the Draft</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included in the policy allocation for the site.</p> <p>In order to comply with Sport England's Playing Field Policy Exception E4, there must be a like for like replacement in the loss of the football pitch, which seeks that a replacement is of equivalent or better quality and quantity, in a suitable location, and made available prior to the commencement of development. Also require further clarity as to where the relocation of the recreation ground will be.</p>	<p>Submission Background Paper and updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will support the Draft Submission document.</p>
<p>Policy SA5 (TRL)</p>	<p>There are three existing tennis courts locations towards the north west of the site.</p> <p>Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss facilities for sport unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant, and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore if the site comes forward for development in the future, the applicant will need to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included in the policy allocation for the site.</p>	<p>Existing tennis courts are in private use, and it is not considered appropriate that these facilities should be reprovided.</p> <p>The TRL development would secure a range of other facilities which would be publicly available: on-site multi-functional community facility, contributions towards built sports facilities (which could be provided as part of the multi-use community facility), open space of public value, and in-kind provision of equipped play areas. The TRL development will deliver a significant amount of publicly useable space in the form of a bespoke on-site area of open space for mitigation against the SPA.</p> <p>This will be set out in further detail in the Draft Submission Background Paper and updated</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will support the Draft Submission document.
Policy SA5 - point 3	The policy includes provision of a 2-form entry primary school. Sport England expects this to include playing field provision, which should be stated in the policy. Any new playing fields should be made available for use by the wider community.	The primary school will also require land in addition to the school buildings for use as playing fields. This will be set out in further detail in the Draft Submission Background Paper and updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will support the Draft Submission document.
Policy SA6 - Amen Corner North (point 12)	The document states there will be contributes towards improvements to local built sports facilities, which is supported. A list of facilities that are being considered for funding should be provided for clarity. Open Space for formal sport should also be included.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Draft Submission document is being updated which will include details relating to open space requirements for the site. This will include provision of a bespoke Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to mitigate the impact of the development upon the SPA together with provision of equipped play areas and contributions local built sports facilities (which could be provided as part of a multi-use community facility). At the time of writing a specific list is not available. When information emerges, the IDP will be updated accordingly.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	The site includes a golf course and driving range. Having consulted with the English Golf Union, it is clear they would support the retention of the site as a golf course, particularly with regards to community engagement.	Evidence is being sought on the level of golf provision in the area. The proposals for the site include a new ground for Bracknell Town FC which will provide the club with enhanced facilities and greater capacity to provide for community football. It will also include extensive areas of fully accessible

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss facilities for sport unless an equivalent replacement in terms of quality and quantity and accessibility of the loss of a facility is unavoidable, or unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant, and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore if the site comes forward for development in the future, the applicant will need to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included in the policy allocation for the site.</p>	<p>open space and SANG which will provide enhanced opportunities for informal recreation. This will be set out in further detail in the Draft Submission Background Paper and updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will support the Draft Submission document.</p>
Policy SA7 - Point 15	<p>The document states there will be contributions towards improvements to local built sports facilities, which is supported. A list of facilities that are being considered for funding should be provided for clarity. Open Space for formal sport should also be included.</p>	<p>Noted. The open space will be allocated to informal and formal recreation uses in accordance with Council policy. Further information is being gathered on the potential for shared community sports facilities with the football club and the proposed schools.</p>
Policy SA7 - Point 18	<p>Supports the provision of public open space and playing fields of a high standards in order to mitigate the loss of land previously designated as Open Space of Public Value.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Policy SA8 - Amen Corner (Point 8)	<p>Requires more details on the "package of additional measures" to manage any additional recreational pressures in the SPA.</p>	<p>For clarity it is proposed to cover the issue raised of access management and monitoring of the SPA by cross referring to the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Action: Include reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Policy SA8 - Amen Corner & Map 6	<p>This site includes an existing playing field and driving range.</p> <p>Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss facilities for sport unless an equivalent replacement in terms of quality and quantity and accessibility of the loss of a facility is unavoidable, or unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant, and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore if the site comes forward for development in the future, the applicant will need to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included in the policy allocation for the site.</p> <p>Regarding the playing field, oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or would prejudice the use of all or any part of a playing field, or land last used as playing field, unless the judgement of Sport England, one of five specific circumstances applies. Development which would lead to the loss of all or part of a playing field, or would prejudice its use would not normally be permitted as it would permanently reduce the opportunities for participation in sporting activities. Government planning policy and policies of Sport England have</p>	Open space provision, including loss of the playing field and driving range has already been accepted through the adoption of the Amen Corner SPD (March 2010). The SPD includes Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space to mitigate the impact of the proposals upon the SPA, together with active and passive open space provision.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses:		Response
Summary of main issues raised		
	recognised the importance of such activities to the social and economic well being of the country.	
Policy SA9 - Warfield (point 6)	Supports the provision of community and recreational facilities, including open space. When designating sport and recreation facilities, it is important that these are accessible, enhance amenity and increase awareness as well as being supported by infrastructure such as changing rooms and floodlighting. (Further information is available in Sport England's active design guidance).	Support is noted.
Para 5.3.2	Supports the reference to the Core Strategy and LID SPD, as these documents are key to providing new open space, sport and recreation facilities, and should be used in parallel to each other when new developments are planned.	Support is noted.
Para 5.3.3	Supports the clear link between Site Allocations DPD and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and asks to be consulted on the preparation of the document.	Support is noted.
Para 5.3.6	Supports the inclusion of open space and outdoor recreation facilities and built sports facilities in the term 'infrastructure'.	Support is noted.
Theatres Trust		
Whole document	No specific comments to make at this stage.	N/A.
SE Berkshire Ramblers		
Policy SA4 & Map 2 - Broadmoor	Object as development is too close to the SPA. SANG should be extended to include reservoirs at Butter Bottom.	The Council recognise that this site is close to the SPA. According to the Conservation of

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Crowthorne FP8 which is used by Three Castles Path and Ramblers Route is not marked on the map. Suggested link onto Foresters Way is likely to have a detrimental impact upon the paths.</p> <p>Bracknell Forests Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan (2006) identifies the need for a bridleway link between Crowthorne RB12 and Sandhurst BR20. Instead of upgrading FP8, a new bridleway closer to Foresters Way should be created, with the northern end between reservoirs at Butters Bottom and Foresters Way.</p> <p>Cyclists should not be encouraged to use FP8, and instead should use South Road and Lower Broadmoor Road with a cycle way created between Kentigern Drive and Devil's Highway (Crowthorne RB12).</p>	<p>Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, it is required to take account of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development in consultation with Natural England. This is outlined in one of the documents issued to support the DPD - the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>A new road from Foresters Way would cut across this footpath route, however, the crossing point would need to be carefully designed.</p> <p>In terms of this access road becoming a main link to Crowthorne, this will be for access to the hospital and re-used Listed Building only, and will not be a through route into Crowthorne with the possible exception of buses. It would also provide an access route for construction traffic.</p> <p>As stated in the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP3), para 18.4, "Public Rights of Way (PRoW) should be duly considered in the site layout of new development for interlinking services and settlements to mitigate its impact on the highway network. This includes protecting the character of the path network and avoiding paths being absorbed within estate roads. This is particularly important in light of increased traffic volume and speed and the need to provide more attractive alternatives to the private motor vehicle for short journeys".</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		Policy TP9 of LTP3 states that the Council will endeavour to protect and maintain the PRow network in accordance with legislative duties and powers, and seek opportunities to enhance the network by creating, reclassifying and / or improving paths to provide new linkages and circular routes.
Policy SA5 & Map 3 - TRL	<p>Pavement along Bracknell Road (B3348) is designated as a cycleway, this should be removed and an alternative route created through the SANG with connections to the southern ends of South Road and Woodenhill.</p> <p>There should be a connection to Hatch Ride rather than just a pedestrian link.</p>	The draft Submission Policy will include means to secure a comprehensive package of on and off site transport measures to mitigate the impact on roads, to encourage sustainable modes of transport, and to protect and enhance public rights of way and recreational routes.
Policy SA7 & Map 5 - Blue Mountain	Golf course was originally created to provide a green area between Bracknell and Binfield, why has policy changed?	The need for additional land for housing and the promotion of the site for development by its owners have led the Council to consider the relative merits of developing this site in light of the alternative sites available as set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper.
	Wrong location for Bracknell Football Club, too close to Binfield football ground, a new site should be sought within Bracknell Town Council area.	The site proposed for the new ground is visually very well contained and is already occupied by a floodlit driving range. There is good access from the site directly to the Northern Distributor Road which will minimise the impacts of traffic accessing the football ground on the local road network. Relocation of the club

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		will also enable the redevelopment of the existing site close to Bracknell Town Centre for high density housing, reducing the need for additional greenfield allocations.
	Binfield FP10 has been wrongly signposted as a shared cycleway/footpath. A separate cycleway should be provided. Wood Lane should continue to be a through way for cyclists and pedestrians.	The draft Submission Policy will include means to secure a comprehensive package of on and off site transport measures to mitigate the impact on roads, to encourage sustainable modes of transport, and to protect and enhance public rights of way and recreational routes.
Policy SA9 & Map 7 - Warfield	Neighbour centre wrongly located is the A3095 is to be re-routed along Warfield BW8 (Avery Lane) to Harvest Ride to avoid Newell Green. Provision should be made to reroute Warfield BW8 along The Cut (there are already proposals to extend Warfield BR26 to the east and should be further extend to Cabbage Hill with a suitable crossing of the B3034 to connect to BR24 (Hazlewood Lane).	This is agreed and the centre will be relocated. detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
The British Horse Society		
Whole document	Recommends consideration is given to the needs of equestrians when planning and designing public open space	All proposals will be expected to protect and enhance existing Public Rights of Way. This will including looking at the relationship of the existing network to the sites and the potential for providing further routes. The SANGs required in connection with the urban extensions offer opportunities to create a range of new routes on what is currently private land.
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	Would prefer to see footpaths upgraded to bridleways wherever possible. The possibility of creating a new network of bridleways or multi-user tracks with links to Crowthorne Woods should be considered.	
Policy SA5	There are opportunities for extensive riding tracks within the TRL to provide	

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
(TRL)	a much needed link onto the Devil's Highways. The green route proposed also Nine Mile Ride and Old Wokingham Road should be accessible to horses, and could link with possible new riding track around Jennetts Park country Park.	
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Point 17 - supports the proposal to protect and extend the bridleway network at Amen Corner North, and would like to be consulted on future plans.	Noted.
Jehovah's Witnesses living in Bracknell Forest Council area		
Para 5.3.6 (list of infrastructure requirements)	Wording of the paragraph is inconsistent with document as a whole as it excludes recreational facilities. Also suggested that community facilities is amended to include the term "faith groups", which would then be in line with PPS1, page 8.	It includes open space and outdoor recreation (2nd bullet) and built sports facilities (5th bullet). It is agreed that the list of user groups for Community Facilities (7th bullet) could usefully be expanded to include faith groups. Action: Add faith groups to the user groups for community facilities in paragraph 5.3.6
Policy SA8 (Amen Corner North)	Support policy as it recognises the need for community and recreational facilities which will contribute to the sustainability of the community.	Support is noted.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	Support policy as it recognises the need for community and recreational facilities which will contribute to the sustainability of the community.	Support is noted.
Glossary	Defines recreational facilities and this includes places of worship. PPS1 states that "Plan Policies	Noted.

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	should...Take into account the needs of all the community, including particular requirements relation to ...religion..."	
Open Spaces Society		
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	Concerned regarding impact upon the Three Castles Path, particularly in relation to the new junction and access road linking the hospital site onto Foresters Way. Question whether implications of traffic movements upon this link road have been properly considered and whether it would become a main link to Crowthorne. Proposals would be contrary to requirement in the policy to ensure the "protection and enhancement of public rights of way include the Three Castles ramblers route". Plans/future proposals should highlight where the new road would cross this path.	<p>A new road from Foresters Way would cut across this footpath route, however, the crossing point would need to be carefully designed.</p> <p>In terms of this access road becoming a main link to Crowthorne, this will be for access to the hospital and re-used Listed Building only, and will not be a through route into Crowthorne with the possible exception of buses. It would also provide an access route for construction traffic.</p> <p>As stated in the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP3), para 18.4, "Public Rights of Way (PRoW) should be duly considered in the site layout of new development for interlinking services and settlements to mitigate its impact on the highway network. This includes protecting the character of the path network and avoiding paths being absorbed within estate roads. This is particularly important in light of increased traffic volume and speed and the need to provide more attractive alternatives to the private motor vehicle for short journeys".</p> <p>Policy TP9 of LTP3 states that the Council will endeavour to protect and maintain the PRoW network</p>

Non-Statutory Consultee Responses: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		in accordance with legislative duties and powers, and seek opportunities to enhance the network by creating, reclassifying and / or improving paths to provide new linkages and circular routes.

Table 17.5 Responses from local amenity/residents groups

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Binfield Village Protection Society (BVPS)		
1.2.1	Do not believe that there are benefits that outweigh the dis-benefits of the developments proposed in Binfield.	The Site Allocations Development Plan Document Background Paper sets out the reasoning behind the policy designations and site allocations in the SADPPD
2.1.1	The housing requirement is based upon old statistics that need updating. Furthermore, the economic downturn, the new Government and proposed legislation need to be taken into account.	The Council is no longer working to the old Regional Strategy figures and is using the lower numbers from the adopted Core Strategy. There will be an opportunity to undertake a review of development requirements through a review of the Core Strategy. This review will take into account any new legislation and Government advice. In the meantime, it is important to maintain progress on the Site Allocations DPD in order to secure a supply of land for housing.
2.1.4	Development should be spread more fairly across the Borough - refer to representation from Tetlow King in respect of Issues and Options Consultation (promotion	Other possible sites were considered during the process and were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage. The findings in relation to all sites are set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	of site at Lower Broadmoor Road/South Meadow).	<p>The delivery of infrastructure is more difficult if development is spread across the Borough. Due to environmental constraints and availability of land, there are limited options for a more dispersed approach.</p> <p>The site referred to in the representation by Tetlow King refers to land at South Road, Lower Broadmoor Road & South Meadow, Crowthorne (SHLAA site 205) which was excluded from the SHLAA because it is within 400m of the SPA.</p>
Policy SA1	All sites listed are considered suitable	Noted.
Policy SA2	All sites listed are considered suitable	Noted.
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	<p>Land East of Murrell Hill Lane, South of Foxley Lane, Binfield</p> <p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is outside the settlement boundary and abuts open countryside. Development would threaten the gap between Binfield, Bracknell and Wokingham; • Concern about the impact on fauna and floral; • Murrell Hill Lane is a pedestrian/cycleway and forms part of the Bracknell horse riders and walkers circular route; 	<p>The matters raised by BVPS reflect comments made by local residents. These matters are addressed in the responses to Table 2.8 'Residents Responses to Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)'.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murrell Hill Lane (including at the junction with London Road) has a rural character and provides access to Popes Meadow; • A number of planning applications have been submitted on this site. The last one was dismissed on appeal in 2000 as it was considered to be a harmful extension of Binfield into the rural surroundings; • The proposal would lead to loss of green space that would not be compensated for by the provision of SANG; • The proposal would harm the visual character of the area; • The site should form part of a potential Conservation Area; • The site is not sustainable as the Primary School is over capacity (4 rather than 2 FE in 2 year groups), the surgery requires access by car, the nearest railway station is in Bracknell, bus services are inconsistent and the road system would require costly improvements; • Development will exacerbate the threat of flooding; • Natural England has written to the Council (30-03-10) stating that the delivery of open space is an essential 	

<p>Responses from local amenity/residents groups:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>part of the development proposal process. The use of this open space conflicts with that statement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BFBLP Inquiry Inspector commented on Policy R1 in respect of its contribution to recreational needs, character and appearance; • Strong policies exist relating to the protection of rural areas - Berkshire Structure Plan (2005), BFBLP, CS, CAA SPD and possible Conservation Area; • The site should be designated as a park for the village using sources of funding such as S106. 	
<p>Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield</p> <p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 letters have been sent to the Council objecting to the planning application for 22 houses on the site (10/0070/OUT). Objections cross referenced to SADPD PO; • Application is premature. Should not encourage developer led development; 	<p>The matters raised by BVPS reflect comments made by local residents. These matters are addressed in the responses to Table 2.8 'Residents Responses to Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)'.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous outline application was dismissed on appeal on 6th Jan 1997. The decision letter referred to the fact that the site was outside the settlement boundary and that the building of houses would give a hard edge to the village and impact on the relationship of the settlement with the landscape; • Reference made to further appeal that was dismissed in respect of a proposal at Crix, Forest Road (03/00420/OUT). Objections put forward to that proposal are relevant to this proposal. Contrary to BFBLP policies EN8 and H5. Vehicular access onto Forest Road would be dangerous. Impact on properties in Roughgrove Copse. Impact on medical educational and transport facilities. TPOs required. Highlight the fact that the proposal was not considered to comply with N Bracknell Local Plan definition of rounding off; • Flooding of property in Foxley Lane; • Contrary to Policies CS1, CS2, CS6, CS7 and CS23. 	
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to page 24 of the Core Strategy that deals with the importance of gaps. Also 	The matters raised by BVPS reflect comments made by local residents. These matters are addressed in the responses to Table 2.15 '- Policy SA6 (Land at Amen Corner North) - Residents Responses'

<p>Responses from local amenity/residents groups:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>contrary to Policy DP7 of the Berkshire Structure Plan (2005);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site prevents the coalescence of Binfield, Bracknell and Wokingham; • Reference made to an appeal decision letter relating to a proposal to extract sand and gravel (1994). The Inspector did not consider that the benefit of obtaining aggregate outweighed the protection of the strategic gap which was an issue of acknowledged importance; • Development proposed in Wokingham Borough exacerbates the position. Bracknell Forest Council should have tried to get the proposals modified; • The MPs for Bracknell, Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham are concerned about coalescence; • Reference made to the Executive Summary of the ENTEC Report 2006. Attention is drawn to the need for more detailed analysis of any applications, guidance about the accommodation of development in the character areas, appropriate wider consultation and care to ensure that capacity assessments do not preclude appropriate well designed development; 	

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to comment when there are no plans showing what the development might look like. Doubt that it will improve the openness of the landscape; • Whilst the items of infrastructure listed are welcomed (comment is made on risks of proceeding), this is not relevant as don't support the principle of releasing the land. 	
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	Single ownership of the site seems to have been considered the most important factor.	The availability of the site and the owner's intentions to develop it are considerations in the allocation of sites. As set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper, they are not the only (or even the most important) considerations and the merits of the site have been considered against those of realistic alternatives.
	The proposal is premature, particularly in view of changed economic and social circumstances.	The proposal cannot be considered premature in light of the Council's lack of a five year land supply against the adopted Core Strategy Housing target.
	Contrary to the Core Strategy.	The proposed sites have been identified in accordance with the criteria set out in the Core Strategy, particularly Policy CS2.
	The proposed development involving housing, educational facilities and sports facilities will fill in any gap between Bracknell and Binfield. Currently acts as an important green lung.	The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
<p>Loss of OSPV.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Outside the settlement boundary and therefore contrary to the Berkshire Structure Plan (2005), BFBLP and Core Strategy.</p>	<p>these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another. While the Council does have planning policies to protect defined gaps the Site Allocations DPD will provide new policies and form a new part of the planning policy framework. This means that the potential development of this site is not being considered in isolation against existing policy, but in relation to the relative merits of developing it compared to alternative locations.</p> <p>In order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focused on the southern part of the site where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. The Northern part of the site will be allocated as public open space (to include mitigation land to avoid adverse impacts on the Special Protection Area to the south of the Borough). This will ensure that an undeveloped gap remains between Binfield and Bracknell. It will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p>	
<p>Adverse impact on character of Binfield.</p> <p>Loss of community cohesion and identity.</p>	<p>The Blue Mountain proposal is designed as an extension to the urban area of Bracknell and as such is not considered to have a significant impact on Binfield's identity as a village or its community cohesion.</p>	
<p>Impact on Listed Buildings and conservation areas.</p>	<p>The layout for the Blue Mountain site shown in the Concept Plan provides for vehicular access directly onto the northern distributor road which links directly to the strategic highway network. This will minimise the impact of traffic from the site on the local road network,</p>	

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		particularly on the roads through Binfield Village where the majority of the local historic buildings are located.
	Impact on wildlife. There are also badgers on the site.	The area proposed for development is predominantly a golf course rather than a natural or semi-natural landscape. As part of the proposals extensive areas of open space, including land to mitigate the impact of development on the Special Protection Area in the South of the Borough, will be provided. This will provide an opportunity to improve the nature conservation value and biodiversity of the retained open space. The provision of private gardens within the development will also provide feeding opportunities for birds.
	The site is within 5km of the SPA and further information is required on the amount of SANG.	The proposed development site, being within 5km of the TBH SPA is required to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) in accordance with the required standard. This is included within the development proposals. Developers are also likely to be required to contribute towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring on the SPA itself in order to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation.
	Very concerned about plans for a new football ground for Bracknell Town Football Club. There are already 2 football clubs in the village and public transport and the road system are inadequate. Also concerned about pollution.	Bracknell Town FC have been seeking a site for a new ground for several years. Their existing site does not have capacity to meet the FA requirements for the league level the club wants to develop or for the community football facilities the club would like to provide. The site is being promoted as a new home for the club by the site's owners with the backing of the club and was promoted in this manner in their response

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		to the Site Allocations Participation Document February 2010 (Options Stage) The proposed layout provides for vehicular access to the proposed football ground directly from the Northern Distributor Road. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes requirements for improved bus links, particularly to the town centre.
2.6.3	Concerned about reference to sites outside settlement boundaries as object to the inclusion of such sites.	The SHLAA has demonstrated the need to allocate sites beyond the existing settlement boundaries.
4.1.1 and 4.1.2	The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre should be given priority. Housing should be included in the 1st phase of any scheme.	The regeneration of the town centre is a clear Council priority and is important to support the quality of life of existing and future residents and the sustainability of the Borough's community. The viability of housing and other uses in the town centre in the current market has made it very difficult to make progress on the scheme. The first phase which is currently under construction is a new food store.
5.1.1	Want to be consulted about any changes to settlement boundaries	The production of this and any other DPD that proposes changes to settlement boundary changes to the Proposals Map will be subject to consultation in accordance with the regulations and with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
Blackwater Valley & Sandhurst Action Group		
Whole Document	The SADPD Preferred Option background paper logically and unemotionally deals with each of the options in turn and draws on a wide range of evidence and gives a clear background to the	Noted

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	requirement and has a very logical site selection methodology which applies equally to the Infrastructure Development Plan. Considered the process to be unbiased and objective.	
SA4 & SA5 - Broadmoor & TRL	From a Sandhurst perspective, concerned regarding the impact of additional development at Broadmoor and TRL and the local road network and upon the A321, although on page 24 of the IDP it sets out that 'improvements to the highway network will be crucial in facilitating identified development'. These necessary funded improvements to the local highway network are appropriately considered, and the delivery of the planned infrastructure will be watched with interest.	The concerns are noted and the package of junction capacity improvements and other works is being prepared using an advanced transport modelling package.
Chavey Down Residents Association		
General	Pleased to see that Chavey Down is recognised as a unsustainable settlement.	Noted.
Policy SA2 - Sandbanks (SHLAA 137)	<p>The site needs to be viewed in context with Palm Hills , Dolyhir and Fern Bunglaow (SHLAA ref 122 & 300)</p> <p>The land boundaries of these three sites (Sandbanks, Palm Hills, Dolyhir and Fern Bungalow) are not clear as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two of the sites have overlapping land • All the land boundaries in the north west corner appear incorrect and need checking 	Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities (of 122/137 & 300 combined) will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	(boundaries for Sandbanks appear correct)	Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).
	<p>Landscape & Character:</p> <p>London Road marks an important boundary between high density housing of new estates to the south and rural villages to the north. Densities to the north of London Road are much lower (Locks Hill/Long Hill Road average density of 8dph, and Birch Lane 2dph), with much of the land north of London Road designated as worthy of inclusion in the Landscape and Character Assessments.</p> <p>This land should retain its own distinct character, 35dph is not acceptable. There are inconsistencies in relation to the assessment of this site compared to others. Page 81 of Landscape Study says the area is “an important part of a narrow and fragile gap” and that “any development would need to reflect the built form along London Road and Long Hill Road”, then land adjacent to Red Tile Cottage (site 238) has a suggested capacity of 6 (to reflect the character of the area), and assessment of Broad Area 8 states “Development along London Road is characterised by individual houses in large plots”.</p> <p>Housing will need to be carefully designed to reflect the north development.</p>	Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work (Kirkham, August 2011) has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Highways: Previous planning application for three dwellings withdrawn before a formal decision was made which was refused for refusal by the Highway department (05/0033/FUL and 06/00024/FUL). The junction of Lily Hill Road and Long Hill Road is already acknowledged as an accident black spot, add extra junctions onto Long Hill Road will make matters worse.</p>	<p>To make this development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport, and pedestrian /cycleway improvements. A Transport Assessment will also be required to assess the impact of the proposal upon the local road network.</p>
	<p>Contamination: Borough record of the contents of the London Road tip do match those of local residents. Doubts if the level of remedial work needs to make the site suitable for housing would be viable. The water table was breached and contains leachate, the Council is urged to insist upon full contamination, leachate and land studies for the sake of future residents.</p>	<p>The requirement for investigation and remediation of any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option). This will be restated in the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper)</p>
Policy SA3 Palm Hills & Dolyhir (SHLAA 122 & 300)	<p>The site needs to be views in context with Sandbanks (SHLAA ref 137)</p> <p>The land boundaries of these sites (Sandbanks, Palm Hills, Dolyhir and Fern Bungalow) are not clear as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two of the sites have overlapping land • All of the land boundaries in the north west corner appear incorrect and need checking (boundaries for Sandbanks appear correct) 	<p>Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities (of 122, 137 & 300 combined) will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).</p>

<p>Responses from local amenity/residents groups:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Landscape & Character:</p> <p>London Road marks an important boundary between high density housing of new estates to the south and rural villages to the north. Densities to the north of London Road are much lower (Locks Hill/Long Hill Road average density of 8dph, and Birch Lane 2dph), with much of the land north of London Road designated as worthy of residents in the Landscape and Character Assessments.</p> <p>This land should retain its own distinct character, 35dph is not acceptable. There are inconsistencies in relation to the assessment of this site compared to others. Page 81 of Landscape Study says the area is “an important part of a narrow and fragile gap” and that “any development would need to reflect the built form along London Road and Long Hill Road”, then land adjacent to Red Tile Cottage (site 238) has a suggested capacity of 6 (to reflect the character of the area), and assessment of Broad Area 8 states “Development along London Road is characterised by individual houses in large plots”.</p> <p>Housing will need to be carefully designed to reflect the north development.</p> <p>Previous planning application refused on ground of impact upon character and appearance of the area at Dolyhir (3 houses, application 05/00392/FUL)</p>	<p>Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work (Kirkham, August 2011) has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>Highways: As with Sandbanks, Long Hill Road is unsuitable to take additional junctions, combined traffic from these sites would have to exit to London Road.</p>	See comments related to Sandbanks (SHLAA 137) above
	<p>Contamination: Borough record of the contents of the London Road tip do match those of local residents. Doubts if the level of remedial work needed to make the site suitable for housing would be viable. The water table was breached and contains leachate, the Council is urged to insist upon full contamination, leachate and land studies for the sake of future residents.</p>	See comments related to Sandbanks (SHLAA 137) above
Policy SA9 - Warfield	<p>The policy relates to sustainable mixed use development. Would like to see provision made for elderly. Query whether "modern, contemporary architectural style" (as set out in page 13 of Warfield SPD) is appropriate for the area. 50 allotments is insufficient, 200 are required especially if parts of the development are at 50dph (i.e. no gardens).</p>	<p>These are detailed matters which have been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Comments on Background Documents: Background Paper</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 21, para 2.2.16: in light of revision of PPS3 this paragraph should be amended so there is no minimum density. • Page 27: pleased to see clarification on the current position of Gypsy and Traveller provision. • Pages 32 & 33 (site 246 - Warfield Park): Pleased to see the preservation of 400 year old Chavey Down Farm and the important role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response in Table 3 Responses to 'preferred Option Background paper' • Noted • Noted • Noted • Action: This comment will be added to the SHLAA site survey proforma

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>associated land plays in biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 63 (site 251 - Mushroom Castle): the house (named Mushroom Castle) is not the origin of the history of the area. All old maps show this was an ancient settlement which escaped enclosure. People populated the area with shack and occupied them overnight to prevent enclosure, hence the "mushrooming" of the area. • Page 83 (site 125 - land adjacent to Claverton): Would like to see the potential presence of rare green flowered helleborines listed (hence the Nature Reserve marker). • Pages 187 & 188 - impact upon biodiversity: Pleased that Chavey Down Pond, Wildlife Heritage Site and Ancient Woodland Buffer have been properly recognised • Pages 176 & 177 - impact upon landscape: Current vulnerable views from Long Hill Road and London Road together with woodland character should be protected and maintain the separation of settlements and green gaps. • Pages 177 - impact upon character: would like to emphasis that development along London Road is characterised by "individual houses in large plots" which 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work (Kirkham, August 2011) has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper. • See comment above • See comment above

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>must be borne in sites fr 137, 122 and 300.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 178 - impact upon biodiversity: would like to see the potential presence of rare green flowered helleborines listed (hence the Nature Reserve marker). • Page 179 - impact upon resources: Borough records of the contents of London Road tip do not match those of local residents, query whether remediation works would not be viable 	
Comments on Background Documents: IDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 77 - Table 4.25: Would like to see a hospital before extension to Easthampstead Park Cemetery and Crematorium. • Page 23, Table 4.2: Welcome improvements planned for the Green Oaks / Mercedes / Baldocks roundabout and would ask that residents be consulted at an early stage. • Page 82, Table 4.26 - allotment provision: more provision is needed in the North, especially as there is a 5 year waiting list in Winkfield. 50 plots allocated in the Warfield SPD is small, at least 200 are needed. • Page 89 - SANGS: for the purposes of SANGS, Lily Hill Park has been declared at capacity by Natural England (see application 09/00019/OUT) for mitigation for the town centre redevelopment. The only 	11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan"

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	capacity left therefore is in the small cluster.	
Comments on Background Documents: Draft Sustainability Appraisal	See comments on the Draft Sustainability Appraisal.	See comments on the Draft Sustainability Appraisal.
Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
Comments on Background Documents: Master Planning Support	Do not consider that the summary of the Crowthorne workshop event in relation to Broadmoor and TRL (page 35 and 36) adequately reflect the discussions that took place. Consider that points and objections raised by the group was subsequently ignored/not addressed. Also pointed out statements made by Urban Initiatives clearly indicate that they never visited or passed through the site, which raise serious concerns about the accuracy of other statements within the document. Also set out they consider BFC have ignored expert opinion (as the documents sets out page 40 that Broadmoor site should not be selected because of the very limited options for development available on this heavily constrained site and the specialist requirements of the replacement hospital), therefore how can they (or others) trust BFC to have made the correct choices in the preferred option. Request BFC to re-examine and correctly represent the sustainability issues of all the sites.	It is not clear which points CVAG consider have been ignored. Urban Initiatives visited all the sites as part of their work and produced a large number of photographs of them, a selection of which were included in their presentations at the workshop events. The sustainability of the sites is fully explored in the Sustainability Appraisal which supports and informs the SADPD work.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	The need for housing and infrastructure needs to be re-assessed in view of a changed economic environment	There will be an opportunity to undertake a fundamental review of development requirements through the review of the Core Strategy. Meanwhile it is important to maintain progress on the Site Allocations DPD in order to secure the supply of land for housing
	The housing requirement should be more evenly distributed across the Borough.	Where suitable and available smaller scale sites have been identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process these have been included as part of the overall housing provision. These sites are located throughout the Borough. However, these sites (and others within the urban area) are not sufficient to meet the Borough's housing requirements. In addition, It is not always easy to provide the necessary infrastructure that would be triggered by a number of small scale developments scattered through out the Borough. This means that in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2, the Council has proposed extensions to the Boroughs most sustainable urban areas.
	It is wrong that the Council should be spending residents money on a consultation that is opposed by residents, and elected representatives on the Parish Councils.	The process for preparing the Site Allocations DPD is set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 as amended. The process consists of an engagement stage and a formal consultation stage prior to submission of the document to the Secretary of State. This process of consultation must be adhered to by the Council in order to remain transparent and accountable to the local community.
Policy SA4 (Broadmoor)	Impact on local and strategic road network	To make this development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport, and pedestrian

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		/cycleway improvements. A Transport Assessment will also be required to assess the impact of the proposal upon the local road network.
	The fact that the air quality in Crowthorne High Street breaches Government guidelines needs to be taken into account.	<p>An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been declared in Crowthorne due to elevated air pollution levels. As part of the local air quality management process, an Action Plan is being produced which will include a number of practical measures which will help improve local air quality in line with the Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>The impact of any planning applications for particular proposals, on pollution levels will need to be taken into account. In some circumstances the developer may be asked to offset pollution that may result from their development. This could include funding towards public transport, pedestrian/cycleway improvements or even paying for monitoring equipment.</p>
	If housing is to be used as enabling development for the Hospital, the Council should secure a guarantee that the Hospital will remain in Crowthorne	The Council cannot control the future operation of facilities owned by the West London Mental Health Trust. However, the intention to remain in Crowthorne has been demonstrated by the submission of an application for a new hospital and access road.
	The site did not receive good sustainability rankings in relation to the consideration of the 8 sites	This is accepted and is due to the constraints (particularly heritage issues) that affect the site. Any proposals will need to demonstrate how they intend to mitigate these concerns.
	Need to reduce the number of dwellings to a level that can be supported by infrastructure	The development will be required to mitigate its impact.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Policy SA5 (TRL)	The reasons that the Council gave in defence of their position at the Inquiry relating to the TRL appeal have not changed, for example, impact on local road network, inappropriate development in the countryside and prejudicing the strategic gap.	<p>The application was refused in 2008 (07/01196/OUT) and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The Inspector's comments have been taken into account in so far as is possible, whilst accommodating the Borough's development needs.</p>
	The TRL proposal would result in a minimal physical gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell. Other elements of the proposal re-enforce the loss of the gap. This includes the fact that children from the development would attend Easthampstead Park School and references to the integration of the various local communities including Hanworth and Crowthorne.	<p>It is not proposed to allocate land north of Nine Mile Ride for development, thus helping to maintain a gap between Crowthorne and Wokingham. The north western corner of the site would remain undeveloped as open space. Furthermore, a 50m green route will be indicated along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Nine Mile Ride. Further consideration has been given to the location of uses within the north east corner of the site in order to retain a buffer between the settlements of Crowthorne and Bracknell. The potential depot site has been moved. The aim is to retain an area of wooded landscape character devoid of development between the two settlements.</p> <p>Do not consider that the fact that the site falls within the Designated Area of Easthampstead Park School adversely affects the physical and visual separation of settlements.</p> <p>Action: Amend illustrative concept plan to include further detail on extent of green route along Nine Mile Ride and adjust disposition of uses in north east corner of site.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>The level of detail provided about improvements to the local road network is too vague to allow constructive comment and there is a failure to consider the combined affect with Wokingham's developments.</p>	<p>The Council has modelled the impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration in the baseline situation even allowing for the additional traffic that the new development will generate (and traffic from proposed development in Wokingham).</p> <p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate how proposed transport improvements will mitigate the impact of their development and this will involve contributing in-kind and/or financially towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles and therefore pollution levels.</p>
	<p>Major improvements are required to the strategic road network including the motorways but there are significant risks attached to these proposals.</p>	<p>Developer contributions might be sought towards the improvement of the relevant M4/M3 junctions if the HA can produce the evidence to justify this alongside the developers Transport Assessment and Bracknell Forest's Transport Model.</p>
	<p>Need suitable provision for health services on the TRL site or in Crowthorne. Reliance on a Bracknell facility that is not currently available and would need to be accessed by a bus service that could not be guaranteed in perpetuity is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the IDP's production, so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be. Where improvements to infrastructure are necessary, the service provider has to the best of their knowledge stated what</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		mitigation measures would be required. In some instances there has been insufficient information to allocate budgets; however funding streams have been identified, with an indication as to whether developer contributions would be required.
	The fact that the air quality in Crowthorne High Street breaches Government guidelines needs to be taken into account.	An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been declared in Crowthorne due to elevated air pollution levels. As part of the local air quality management process, an Action Plan is being produced which will include a number of practical measures which will help improve local air quality in line with the Air Quality Objectives. The impact of any planning applications for particular proposals, on pollution levels will need to be taken into account. In some circumstances the developer may be asked to offset pollution that may result from their development. This could include funding towards public transport, pedestrian/cycleway improvements or even paying for monitoring equipment.
	Need to reduce the number of dwellings to a level that can be supported by infrastructure	The development will be required to mitigate its impact.
	An exit poll was carried out at the Council consultation events in Crowthorne. Over 90% of those surveyed did not consider the developments to be good for Crowthorne.	Noted
Keep West End Green		
SA9	At a full Council meeting in Oct 2006 it was decided that there	The Full Council meeting in October 2006 approved the Submission version of the Core Strategy DPD and included an

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	should be no new development intrusion into Cabbage Hill.	additional resolution to that recommended as follows: " <i>That in approving the submission Core Strategy DPD the Council recognised the burden to fall on Warfield and Binfield Parishes to help meet the Government's housing numbers and committed to protect the area, ensuring any development will be sympathetic and appropriate to its semi-rural nature, whilst enhancing existing, important local open spaces.</i> " Evidence included with the Submission Core Strategy DPD also approved by the Council at this meeting included the Major Locations For Growth Background Paper which clearly showed that indicatively that some development could go in Cabbage Hill depending on where the line of where Cabbage Hill begins is. The rationale for promoting some development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Map 7 on page 22 shows major intrusion into Cabbage Hill to the west of Cabbage Lane and extends well beyond the line of existing houses. The concept plan on page 22 should be amended to reflect the Council decision of October 2006.	The Concept Plan is being revised as part of the Warfield SPD process. Therefore, this is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Housing density - it has always been understood that there would be a mix of housing densities within the area. Map 7 shows low density across the entire site apart	The Concept Plan is being revised as part of the Warfield SPD process. Therefore, this is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	from a small area around the Local Centre. Housing densities should be revised to mitigate the need for intrusion into Cabbage Hill. Higher densities should be applied to the east of the site.	the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
	Map 7 and Map 34 are contradictory - Map 7 shows intrusion into West End Lane whereas Map 34 shows "open space of public value" at West End Lane and Cabbage Hill with no planned development.	<p>Map 34 does not show any Open Space of Public Value designations. It is proposed to remove the OSPV designation from the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map through the SADPD, due to inconsistencies. Core Strategy Policy CS8 will still apply.</p> <p>The designations affecting Cabbage Hill shown on Map 34 are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designation relating to policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is the intention to ensure development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations when the extent of the built development becomes clearer.</p>
	<p>West End can be protected from development by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the density and size of the developments at sites in Binfield, and Crowthorne, thus reducing Warfield's burden of new housing • Increase the density of housing to the east of the proposed new local centre and extension of the A3095 (Maidenhead Road) in Warfield, (this is an area of Warfield that is already widely 	<p>Taking each bullet point in turn:</p> <p>Bullet Point 1 : The capacity of other sites are/have been assessed as part of the SADPD process. It is not good planning to just up the numbers on these sites just because objectors to another site do not want as much housing on another site. Therefore this point is disagreed.</p> <p>The other two bullet points are detailed matters which have been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	<p>developed and is of no landscape significance) the proposed development of land at West End can be mitigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferably any development should take place only at the southern end of the lane in the area of Park Farm and with the axis of development being along the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill bordering Harvest Ride. 	<p>consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
Northern Arc Action Group		
General	<p>Object to the current plans which would lead to saturation in three areas of the Borough (Binfield, Crowthorne and Warfield).</p>	<p>Other possible sites were considered during the process and were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage. These included sites in the southern part of the Borough, such as Broad Area 1: South West Sandhurst. The findings in relation to all sites are set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation.</p> <p>The Council can only consider land that is genuinely available.</p>
	<p>Request the Borough re-evaluate the negative impact this development programme will have on the wider community of the Borough</p>	<p>The Government has stated that it is important for Councils to continue to plan for growth in their areas. The draft NPPF makes it clear that the Government's key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. The Ministerial foreword to the document states that sustainable development is about positive growth. The Government wishes the Council to press ahead without delay in preparing an up-to-date development plan. The Council must therefore continue to progress the SADPD to deliver the housing which is needed in the Borough.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
How to get involved	<p>The online consultation process - disenfranchised those without a home computer. The documents are too complex and long for people to respond at work.</p> <p>The document is poorly designed and there is too much technical language.</p> <p>The documents were too long and complex to comment on.</p>	<p>Information was available in a variety of formats. Comments were accepted that were sent in via e-mails and letters. The Council must follow Regulations that govern the process of producing Development Plan Documents. As a result, it is agreed that some of the documents become long and include technical terms. However, to try and address some of these concerns, leaflets and Q and A sheets were produced for the Preferred Option and Exhibitions were held where officers were available to explain the process.</p>
	<p>The provision for people without Internet access to engage in the process is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>By promoting the consultation primarily online, the council disenfranchised those without a home computer.</p>	<p>The Council endeavours to use a variety of means of communication. The Preferred Option was not wholly reliant on the Internet or other electronic means of communication. Paper copies of documents and questionnaires were made available at the exhibitions, Parish Council Offices, the Council's Offices and in libraries around the Borough. A number of officers were available at the exhibitions to talk through issues and answer questions.</p> <p>Consultation responses were accepted if they were not made online and this was made clear in the consultation material.</p>
	<p>Town and Country was not delivered to everyone in the Borough this is especially true for residents of Warfield. In addition the very few people read the public notices in the free newspapers therefore the Council has failed in its duty to make the majority of residents aware of the consultation.</p>	<p>The Council is aware of issues surrounding the delivery of Town & Country and has passed the information to the relevant Department. Town & Country is also available at Council Offices, Bracknell Library, Council sports centres, Coral Reef and the Look Out.</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	The deliver of Town and Country is poor and many residents either did not receive it or received it after the exhibitions.	
Status of Documents	The Council has not clarified the status of the Warfield consultation.	In view of the consultations on Warfield SPD which took place at the same time as the Warfield SPD, a policy statement status was issued to clarify the position between the two documents, which was placed both on the Council's web site and consultation portal during the consultation period.
	The Council rejected Warfield Parish Council's invitation to hold the same type of open exhibition sessions in Warfield as took place in Binfield and Crowthorne	Exhibitions were focused on Crowthorne and Binfield as these are the locations most affect by the growth proposals in the SADPD. The latter merely allocates sites at Warfield and Amen Corner South, the principle of development at these locations having been agreed through the Core Strategy. A number of meetings/exhibitions were held at the time of the progression of the Core Strategy.
	Infrastructure should be delivered before the construction of the housing can begin	It is not practical or viable to expect all infrastructure to be delivered before construction begins. Triggers are normally included within S106 Agreements relating to housing completions.
	The Inspector who led the public examination on the Core Strategy thought it important to retain Blue Mountain as GAP between Binfield and Bracknell (See sections 120 and 121 of the Inspectors report)	Successive governments have made it clear that gaps should not be used as a tool to prevent the growth needs of an area being accommodated. They are therefore subject to review. The disposition of land uses on the Concept Plan relating to Blue Mountain shows green space in the northern sector of the site to help maintain a buffer between settlements.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Background Paper	The Council should be using more up to date population projections. They do not take account of the current economic climate including the banking collapse and austerity measures.	The most recent household projections (published by CLG in 2010) suggest a higher housing requirement than currently being planned for. As the plan period runs until 2026, it is necessary to plan for a full range of economic conditions.
	Object to sites in and around Binfield as they will conflict with the Character Areas Assessment and the rural setting of Binfield will be lost	Since the Issues and Options stage, the Council has pulled proposals from development back from Binfield so that a rural setting is maintained. The Council has published a Character Area Assessments SPD which aims to identify areas with distinctive and positive character or where development pressures may come forward. It contains recommendations should be taken into account in the compilation of development proposals.
	The Council should wait until the new Census is completed this year; the Council has a duty to update its housing projections before it goes ahead with the plans.	The results of the Census will not start to become available until the Summer of 2012.
Para 2.1	Consideration should be given to land being offered for development in the south of the Borough.	Other possible sites were considered during the process and were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage. These included sites in the southern part of the Borough, such as Broad Area 1: South West Sandhurst. The findings in relation to all sites are set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation. The Council can only consider land that is genuinely available. New sites that have become available during the

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		process are being considered and may help contribute to providing some flexibility.
	The Council should be redeveloping brownfield sites, starting with some of the empty commercial premises, office blocks and waste ground around the town centre.	The search for sites has been based on the SHLAA and the sequence set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. Other sources of evidence such as responses from consultations and the results of technical studies have also fed into the process. In terms of location, Bracknell Town Centre is the first priority (where approx 1,000 dwellings are planned) followed by other brownfield sites in urban areas that are considered genuinely available for development. However, there are insufficient brownfield sites within defined settlements to meet the Borough's housing requirement and therefore urban extensions are proposed to the Borough's most sustainable settlements (Bracknell and Crowthorne). Some of the urban sites include those that have been in employment use.
Policy SA3 (Edge of settlement sites)	Land east of Murrell Hill Lane and south of Foxley Lane; and land at the junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane are inappropriate in this part of Bracknell Forest as they would effect the rural setting of Binfield.	It is not considered that the development of these sites would have a significant effect on the rural setting of Binfield which is primarily dependent on the rural land to the west of Foxley Lane and Murrell Hill Lane. The two sites concerned relate well to the village of Binfield.
Policy SA6 (Amen Corner North)	Object as Binfield would merge with Bracknell Object as the proposals would be contrary to Council Countryside planning policies	In order to help preserve the identity of Binfield the Concept Plans have been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to maintain an undeveloped gap between Binfield and Bracknell.

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
Policies SA6 and SA7 (Amen Corner North & Blue Mountain)	<p>Amen Corner North and Blue Mountain proposals are inappropriate in this part of Bracknell Forest as they would effect the rural setting of Binfield.</p> <p>The proposals should be considered with Amen Corner South proposals. The proposals would be unsustainable over development of of a rural village whose infrastructure would be swamped.</p>	<p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 these will include extensions to existing settlements which inevitably, in some cases, fall within part of an existing gap between settlements. While the Council does have planning policies to protect defined gaps the SADPD needs to allocate sites to accommodate growth and redefine settlement boundaries. The potential development of these sites is not being considered in isolation but against existing policy, but in relation to the relative merits of developing them compared to alternative locations.</p> <p>In order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focused on the southern parts of the sites where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. Green space (to include mitigation land to avoid adverse impacts on the Special Protection Area to the south of the Borough) will ensure that undeveloped buffers remains between Binfield and Bracknell. They will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p>
	<p>The proposals would be detrimental to Binfield's individual traditional rural character and should be protected as outlined in the Councils Character Area Assessment. The proposals conflict with the Councils Character Area Assessment.</p>	<p>In order to help preserve the identify of Binfield the Concept Plans have been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to maintain an undeveloped gap between Binfield and Bracknell.</p> <p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		<p>location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another.</p> <p>The Character Area Assessment SPD makes it clear that there is a need to find additional sites for new development. It states that this will inevitably have an impact on some of the character areas detailed in the SPD. It also states that the SPD is therefore not to be seen as a tool to stifle or resist development proposals, but as a tool to</p> <p>inform change and guide future development.</p> <p>The sites lie outside of the Binfield study areas. The SPD identifies certain positive characteristics of the sites which, with sensitive design can be retained such as having open space on the northern parts of the sites to retain a defined edge to the village and the potential to retain hedgelines etc.</p>
	<p>The proposals conflict with council Policy CS9 which protects local and strategic gaps.</p> <p>The proposals conflict with council policy EN8 which protects Countryside for its own sake.</p>	<p>Policies EN8 and CS9 mostly relate to the control of development within land outside of settlements. The SADPD proposals would, due to the need to allocate land for housing to meet the Borough's needs, result in land proposed for development being taken out of the countryside and included within a settlement. The policy approach for this process is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.</p> <p>Local gaps are not defined on the Proposals Map</p>

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	There is not sufficient capacity at Binfield surgery to accommodate the proposed growth.	The infrastructure delivery plan identifies the infrastructure requirements for health services and identifies potential sources of funding for these. The PCT envisages a new health space serving some of the needs of residents in this area. There are also on-going discussions about the expansion of Binfield Surgery.
	Bracknell Forest Council should be building affordable starter homes rather than executive style homes and they should be located close to the railway station, buses and town centre.	The Council does not build homes. There is no proposal for 'Executive Homes' on the Blue Mountain site. This reference was in one of leaflets put out by a local amenity group. The Council will seek an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to help create a mixed sustainable community. The SADPD, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 does prioritise housing sites within or highly accessible to the town centre.
Policy SA7 (Blue Mountain)	The 'education village' at Blue Mountain is totally unacceptable as it would add to the built environment of a key green field site. An 'Education village' at Blue Mountain is unacceptable as it would add to the built environment	A new secondary school is needed in the north of the Borough to meet needs arising from a number of new developments (Amen Corner, Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain and Warfield and a number of smaller sites) and from the population already resident in the area. There are no suitable and available sites for a facility to serve this catchment within the existing built up area.
	The Blue Mountain site is designated as Open Space of Public Value would conflict with Policy CS9 as the policy 'will protect land outside settlements for its own sake, particularly from development that would adversely affect the character, appearance or function of the land.	The selection of sites has been carried out with regard to the sustainable development principles set out in Policy CS1 and are the result of testing through the Sustainability Assessment process. The allocation is in accordance with Policy CS2 which allows for the allocation of extensions to defined settlements. This will result ultimately in a change in the designation of the site with the

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	Object as the proposals would be contrary to Council Countryside planning policies	developed areas becoming within a settlement. This will also occur on the other greenfield allocations as the Proposals Map is updated with the adoption of Development Plan Documents.
	Object as Binfield would merge with Bracknell	<p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another. While the Council does have planning policies to protect defined gaps the Site Allocations DPD will provide new policies and form a new part of the planning policy framework. This means that the potential development of this site is not being considered in isolation against existing policy, but in relation to the relative merits of developing it compared to alternative locations.</p> <p>In order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focussed on the southern part of the site where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. The Northern part of the site will be allocated as public open space (to include mitigation land to avoid adverse impacts on the Special Protection Area to the south of the Borough). This will ensure that an undeveloped gap remains between Binfield and Bracknell. It will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p>
	The impact on local infrastructure would be too great and it would not be able to cope. The mitigation	The Council is doing all within its powers to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided through the

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	proposals put forward are not sufficient, the development should be spread fairly and evenly throughout the Borough.	preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and initial work on establishing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging regime.
	<p>The Blue Mountain Golf Course is an important amenity for Binfield and Bracknell, it makes no sense to remove an exiting successful sports facility from this site.</p> <p>The proposals for Blue Mountain do not meet PPG17 requirements. Binfield residents have not been consulted on the proposals for Blue Mountain Golf Course by the developer. Far from supporting the proposals, many local residents are known to us to be vehemently opposed to them. Nor can the land and buildings be considered surplus to requirements.</p>	<p>The proposal is being put forward by the site's owners. The Council supports the proposal as providing a sustainable location to meet the Borough's development needs and to enable the development of the existing Bracknell Town FC site for high density housing close to Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>Evidence is being prepared on the level of golf provision in the area.</p> <p>The mix of development and open space on the site will include a new football ground with community football facilities, further sports opportunities through facilities sharing with the proposed schools and extensive areas of fully accessible public open space for informal recreation.</p>
	Object to the relocation of Bracknell Town Football Club to Binfield, another team is not needed in Binfield as the village already has two successful teams.	The proposed relocation of Bracknell Town FC would allow the club's existing site to be redeveloped for high density housing close to Bracknell Town Centre. The club has over a number of years pursued a range of alternative sites. The Blue Mountain site has a number of advantages including the potential to share an access route with the proposed schools, an existing, floodlit and visually contained location in the form of the driving range and the potential for synergies in the provision of sports facilities with the planned schools.
	The traffic, noise and floodlights would be a noticeable disturbance	The vehicular access route to the proposed new ground would be shared with the proposed new schools and

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	to residents of a largely quiet rural area.	would come off Temple Way to the south of the Blue Mountain site and along the western edge of the proposed new residential development. This is well away from the Binfield FC site and would avoid football related traffic needing to pass through Binfield village. The main pitch is proposed to be located in the same area as the existing floodlit driving range.
	As the ground share arrangement with Wokingham Town FC would continue it would bring regular home match traffic to the site every week in the football season, this is unacceptable.	It is the principle of the use of part of the site for a football ground that is the main planning issue. The vehicular access route to the proposed new ground would be shared with the proposed new schools and would come off Temple Way to the south of the Blue Mountain site and along the western edge of the proposed new residential development. This is well away from the Binfield FC site and would avoid football related traffic needing to pass through Binfield village.
	There are existing traffic congestion problems on London Road and Forest Road and adding extra vehicles to these roads would bring the village to a dangerous gridlock, the minor mitigation measures put forward by the Council would be ineffective.	Policy SA7 includes a package of transport measures which will include highway improvements to increase junction capacity on the B3408 and the capacity of Coppid Beech roundabout together with contributions towards improvements to junctions along the A329 and A322 and to junction 10 of the M4 and A329(M). There are also proposals to ensure a direct bus service to Bracknell Town Centre. The proposed improvements are subject to capacity testing using transport modelling techniques.
	A primary school on Blue Mountain is not a satisfactory solution as it would either mean a long walk or the generation of more traffic for	It is envisaged that there would be good pedestrian access from the north of the site, but not vehicular access to encourage sustainable transport

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	children from the core of the village, or those living in Temple Park would have to cross the busy Temple Way. The proposed primary school at Amen Corner South would be far a more suitable location	choices. The proposals also include improved pedestrian/cycle crossings to the south to improve links to Temple Park and the town centre. A primary school is proposed at Amen Corner in addition to the one proposed for Blue Mountain.
	The secondary school appears to be delivered too late in the time frame to support the proposed Warfield and Amen Corner South proposals.	The feasibility of the proposed Secondary School is the subject of a separate study commissioned by the Education Department
Policies SA7 and SA9	The secondary school would be better located close to the majority of pupils at Warfield rather than on Blue Mountain.	A new secondary school is needed in the north of the Borough to meet needs arising from a number of new developments (Amen Corner, Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain and Warfield and a number of smaller sites) and from the population already resident in the area. There are no suitable and available sites for a facility to serve this catchment within the existing built up area.
Policy SA9 (Warfield)	The concept plan in Site Allocations is not the same as the area detailed in the Core Strategy	The Core Strategy DPD gives an indication of the broad location of development and the site is allocated through the SADPD.
	A huge toll has already been taken on the originally green fields of Warfield, now a substantial amount of the remaining green field sites are proposed for another 2200 homes, the largest concentration in the preferred Option, this is unacceptable when brownfield sites are available.	The land was identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy document which was adopted in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public. This was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council's preferred strategy for development comprises both brownfield (e.g. Bracknell town centre, Staff College and Crowthorne Business Estate) and

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
		greenfield (e.g. Warfield and Jennetts Park).
Binfield Village Protection Society, Crowthorne Village Action Group and Northern Arc Action Group		
<p>A survey of local residents was undertaken jointly by the BVPS, CVAG and NAAG, to which c.1,600 individuals responded. This asked questions in relation to the Council's consultation process on the Preferred Option, whether the Council should be using more up to date data, whether the Council should be building in the countryside, whether the Council should look to build on empty office sites and whether development should be spread around the Borough. Although received after the close of the SADPD PO consultation, the issues raised are summarised below and a Council response provided.</p>		
How to get involved	Notification of the consultation by the Council was poor	Notification was carried out in a variety of ways including via adverts and e-mails.
	Despite the vast majority of residents having access to internet at home, more than half of respondents did not find the Council's consultation portal easy to use and as such did not use it to submit comments (or did not submit comments at all)	A variety of means of responding to the consultation were offered. Ways of improving the consultation portal are being sought, including the design of the consultation page.
Paragraph 2.1.4	78% of residents want to see development spread more evenly around the Borough	Potential sites for housing have been considered through the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2, the SHLAA process and through sustainability assessment. In total over the plan period (taking into account existing completions and outstanding commitments as well as the proposed strategic allocations in Binfield, Crowthorne and Warfield) the majority of development - nearly half - would be delivered in Bracknell Town with around a fifth in each of Binfield, Warfield and Crowthorne.
Paragraph 2.1.1	Most people think that the data used for the Council's housing target is out of date and should be	The plan period extends to 2026 and it is not therefore appropriate to base plans around a continuation of the current

Responses from local amenity/residents groups: Summary of main issues raised		Response
	reduced to reflect the economic recession	downturn. Recent household projections support the need to plan for at least the number of new homes planned.
	The local infrastructure cannot support the population increase.	All proposed developments will be expected to mitigate their impact. The IDP will list infrastructure requirements.
	Old empty office blocks (brownfield sites) should be developed first, instead of greenfield sites	The priority sequence for allocating land in the SADPD accords with that set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. In preparing the SADPD consideration has been given to the potential reuse/redevelopment of existing office floorspace. Some existing employment sites have been allocated for residential development.
	Residents overwhelmingly want to protect local countryside and gaps between settlements	This will be carried out in so far as it is possible after meeting development needs.

1 Responses to 'Introduction'

General comments

Comments logged under this section mainly relate to the scope and content of the SADPD itself. The responses on these points are summarised in the table below.

Table 1.1 Responses to Introduction

Residents responses 1.1 Purpose and Structure of document: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Section 1.1	
There is little evidence that the Council is working sufficiently closely with Wokingham BC.	The proposals have been developed in the knowledge of proposed developments in Wokingham Borough. Officers from both Councils have met and exchanged data and considered the impact of proposals on infrastructure, including transport and education. Discussions are continuing on the provision and delivery of infrastructure. The Background Document contains further details on joint working.
The document should consider the housing needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople given the evidence of need within the Borough, and indicate where these needs can be met	The SADPD does not seek to allocate sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Draft Policy H7 of the South East Plan is considered to represent the most robust and justified figure, based on the evidence currently available (15 permanent pitches). Since 2006 planning permission has been granted for 14 pitches in the Borough and it is therefore clear that the target is likely to be met by dealing with the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites through the planning application process and applying Core Strategy Policy CS18
Proceeding with the proposals as outlined would be unlawful and contravene human rights.	The preparation of the SADPD was identified in the Council's Local Development Scheme, a three year work programme for the preparation of local development documents that make up the Bracknell Forest Local Development Framework. The SADPD has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulation 2004 as amended. This process includes the

Residents responses 1.1 Purpose and Structure of document: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>consideration of the SADPD by an independent Inspector at a public examination who will test whether the document is 'sound'.</p> <p>Running parallel to this is Bracknell Forest Council's own political/committee process, which is required to consider and ratify the SADPD at key stages of the preparation process e.g. consultation and ultimately the plans final adoption. The SADPD is also being considered by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Commission which is designed to ensure that decision making in Bracknell Forest is efficient, transparent and accountable, and that the best decisions are taken.</p>
<p>All references to revocation of the South East Plan should be deleted to reflect the current legal position.</p>	<p>The South East Plan currently forms part of the Development Plan for Bracknell Forest.</p> <p>In November 2010, following a judgement in the case brought by Cala Homes, the Chief Planner wrote to all Local Planning Authorities and the Planning Inspectorate advising that they should still have regard to the Government's intention to abolish Regional Strategies through the Localism Bill and that this was a material consideration in planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>A legal challenge was mounted to the Chief Planner's letter but this was dismissed by the Court on 7 February 2011. That decision was appealed in further litigation and the appeal was dismissed on 27 May 2011. This confirms that the proposed abolition of Regional Strategies can be regarded as a material consideration by Local Planning Authorities and inspectors when deciding planning applications and appeals. The weight to be given to it will be a matter for the decision maker.</p>

Residents responses 1.1 Purpose and Structure of document: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>In relation to development plans Regional Strategies remain part of the development plan until they are abolished by the Localism Bill currently going through Parliament.</p>
<p>Do not understand why a Conservative Local Authority is disregarding Conservative policy. The plans do not represent the current approach and thinking. John Howell (Private Secretary to the Minister for Decentralisation and Localism) quoted re Localism Bill.</p> <p>The impact of the new Government's policies need to be considered before major decisions such as these are taken - decisions should therefore be delayed.</p>	<p>Localism forms a key part of the Coalition Government's new planning system. However another key objective is to deliver a step-change in housing provision from the low levels seen under the previous Government.</p> <p>Greg Clarke's Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011) states: Local planning authorities should therefore press ahead without delay in preparing up-to-date development plans, and should use that opportunity to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that this country needs. They should make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth, taking full account of relevant economic signals such as land prices.</p> <p>The draft NPPF makes it clear that Local Plans are key to delivering development. At para 109, it states that Local Plans must meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. Paras 49-52 deal with Neighbourhood Plans. Para 50 states that the ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.</p>
<p>The Councils Sustainable Community Strategy declares it has a 'single purpose: to improve the quality of life for local people.' The development proposals will not improve the quality of life for residents.</p>	<p>The document contains a number of priorities. The priority of 'Enjoyng life' does refer to a high quality of life. However, this has to be balanced against other priorities which include 'Sustainable development'. This priority includes the ambition of aiming to ensure that housing meets local demand in terms of numbers of houses and</p>

Residents responses 1.1 Purpose and Structure of document: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	flats, affordability and choice for everyone. A further priority is 'Sustaining a vibrant economy'.

Table 1.2 Responses to Objectives and Sub-Objectives

Residents responses Para. 1.2 Objectives and sub-objectives: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Broadly support the objectives of the SADPD given the need for additional housing in the Borough	Noted
The SADPD document will not help deliver the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. One of the core themes of the Core Strategy is to maintain independent and vibrant communities.	<p>A 'Vision' is set out at the beginning of the Core Strategy. This makes it clear that the area will continue to grow, but in a sustainable manner. The Core Strategy promotes the principles of sustainable growth. The importance of the area as a business centre is mentioned together with the need for further new homes. The creation of sustainable communities is advocated.</p> <p>The Core Strategy spatial objectives also refer to housing and employment growth and the need for any development to be accessible.</p> <p>Within the overall strategy of growth, there is an acknowledgement of the role that smaller towns and centres play in providing local services and reducing the need to travel. The SADPD accords with this approach and seeks to improve infrastructure in certain centres close to the proposed developments.</p>
How will the needs of communities be fulfilled when the need is based on a target (sub objective A(i))?	The sub objective refers to the housing target that is set out in the Core Strategy (10,780 new homes). The use of a target is required so that progress in delivering the new homes can be monitored. The new homes are in part required to meet natural increase within the local population and the fact that people are living longer.

Table 1.3

<p>Developer / landowner responses Para. 1.2 Objectives and sub-objectives:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The basis of the SADPD is to apply the principles of the Core Strategy policies in allocating land uses. Do not consider that this objective will be met with regard to Policies CS7, CS16 and CS17.</p>	<p>In assessing planning applications relating to allocated sites, regard will be paid to the degree to which the design of the development meets the design criteria set out in Policy CS7 (character, biodiversity, connectivity, open spaces etc.), the housing needs of the community as set out in Policy CS16 (range of dwellings and house types) and incorporates affordable housing in respect of qualifying sites (Policy CS17).</p>
<p>One objective of the SADPD is to deliver affordable housing. Whilst the allocated sites set out a requirement for affordable housing its difficult to see how this will be "substantially lower than market price". Suggest provision of affordable housing through the expansion of the Warfield Mobile Home Park.</p>	<p>Affordable housing will be required on sites proposed for allocation for residential development in accordance with policy (PPS3 and the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan Policy H8. The Housing Strategy also informs the approach).</p> <p>Affordable housing will include affordable rent (subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent) and intermediate housing (for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent but below market levels).</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to suggest that homes on the Warfield Mobile Home Park are affordable in the long term.</p>
<p>Support sub-objective A(i) as delivery of additional housing sufficient to meet the Borough's housing needs is central to achieving the objectives of the Core Strategy and Government policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Objective J - To maintain high and stable economic growth - should be added with a sub objective J (i) to ensure that the designated employment areas remain sufficiently flexible in order to accommodate and positively promote sustainable growth.</p>	<p>This matter is covered by the policies applying to the defined employment areas that are set out in the Core Strategy - particularly CS20.</p>

2 Responses to 'Housing'

General comments

A summary of those representations made in relation to the approach to housing (section 2.1) and broad comments relating to the identified sites (sections 2.2 - 2.5) are shown below.

The majority of representations summarised below objected to the total number of dwellings being planned for in the Borough to 2026 (10,780), as set out at paragraph 2.2.1. These mainly centred on whether the need for the proposed housing was justified, or required now given the Coalition Government's localism agenda.

Table 2.1 - Housing (General) - Residents' Responses

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Section 2.1	
<p>Irresponsible for Officers and the Council's Executive to pursue a strategy that doesn't take account of the base data upon which housing numbers are founded.</p> <p>The Government has scrapped housing requirements so do not understand why the Council is insisting on implementing this policy.</p> <p>The parameters used to come up with the figure of 10,780 dwellings were influenced by the political objectives of the last government and are therefore now wrong.</p> <p>The growth planned for the South East is exceptionally high. We ought to be challenging some of the numbers of new homes put forward rather than trying to solve the UK housing issue by using Bracknell Forest as an easy option.</p>	<p>Advice from Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base.</p> <p>The draft NPPF states (para 28) that Local Planning Authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing requirements, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to require over the plan period and meet the household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change. Para 109 also states that Local Planning Authorities should use an evidence-base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full requirements for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>The latest household projections were published in November 2010 and are based on the 2008-population projections. They</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>replace the 2006-based household projections released in March 2009. The household projections are produced by applying projected household formation rates to the population projections published by the Office for National Statistics. The assumptions underlying national household and population projections are demographic trend based. The estimated increase in households for Bracknell Forest between 2006 and 2026 is 12,000. This is slightly above the number of new homes being planned for over the same period (10,780). However, it is believed that the estimates may slightly over estimate household formation because they do not take account of the fundamentally different economic environment.</p> <p>On that basis, the Council is continuing to plan for 10,780 new homes as the amount set out in the adopted Core Strategy under Policy CS15. This was examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based.</p> <p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism under which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed to commence in 2012 (see Council's LDS) when the housing requirement will be re-assessed. Such a review will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p> <p>In the meantime, in accordance with Government policy, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including the allocation of strategic sites through the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p>
<p>Surprised that plans for development have not been reviewed since the Issues and Options Consultation, given that the Government no longer require Councils to meet centrally-driven housing numbers.</p>	<p>The Council has reviewed the number of houses being planned for since the Issues and Options stage from 12,780 to 10,780.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>National and regional housing strategies are in a state of flux and until such time as these are clarified it is foolhardy to formulate development plans.</p>	<p>This followed a letter from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2010 telling Council leaders that the Coalition Government was committed to rapidly abolishing Regional Strategies and returning decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils. In July 2010, the Government's Chief Planner issued guidance following the revocation of Regional Strategies. This included a paragraph about housing numbers. It offered Local Planning Authorities the chance to revise their housing requirements to the level of provision submitted to the original Regional Spatial Strategy examination (Option 1 targets), supplemented by more recent information as appropriate.</p> <p>For Bracknell Forest, the Option 1 target was the figure upon which the adopted Core Strategy is based. The Council decided to pursue this option.</p> <p>It is true that national planning policy is in a state of flux, but, the Government has issued various statements and draft advice that are material considerations. There is a clear presumption in favour of development and to progress Local Plans. The Government's key housing objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes.</p>
<p>The proposals should address the need for centrally located affordable housing / the housing proposals should be concentrated in a more central location.</p>	<p>A significant number of new homes are planned for Bracknell Town Centre, including an element of affordable housing. However, to help meet the Borough's development needs, a number of urban extensions are also required in locations that help support the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>The results of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and subsequent monitoring show that it is not possible to accommodate the necessary development to meet the Borough's needs in the urban area</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	of Bracknell or other defined settlements. It is therefore necessary to use available land on the the edge of defined settlements.
Increasing the supply of housing will drive down prices which could be detrimental to the area.	It is doubtful that the number of new homes proposed will have such an impact on the housing market. House builders are unlikely to build new homes if demand and therefore prices decline significantly. Development must be viable in order to proceed.
Paragraph 2.1.1	
Bracknell has had more than its fair share of development. Cannot see the need for additional housing.	<p>The Bracknell Forest SHMA shows that the number of households increased by 28% between 1981-1991, 16% between 1991 and 2001 and 9% between 2001 and 2008. This reflects the popularity of the area as a place to do business and reside in.</p> <p>The level of development planned is in accordance with requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The household projections indicate that there is a need to provide more housing due to a large increase in single households.</p>
<p>Object to building housing to meet needs arising from immigration; no residents in Binfield or within the Borough want additional housing</p> <p>The pressure for development arises from the increasing population caused by immigration. The new Government is capping immigration and therefore the driver for housing.</p>	<p>Population and household projections show that there is a need for new homes in Bracknell Forest. This growth is due to a range of factors including natural increase, people living longer and internal and international. This is dealt with in more detail in the Background Paper.</p> <p>The Government has made it clear that Local Planning Authorities should meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing in their housing market area having regard to household and population projections that take account of migration and demographic change.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The expectation that 9,000 new homes will be required for lone households is unrealistic, as they cannot afford to purchase them.</p>	<p>The 2008 based household estimates show an increase of 9,600 households involving one person households and lone parent households between 2006 and 2026.</p> <p>It is agreed that affordability is an issue in Bracknell Forest. The SHMA suggests that in 2010, assuming that a household requires a minimum of a 10% deposit to access a mortgage and can borrow 3x their household income, a household would need a minimum income of £54,750 to purchase a lower quartile property.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS16 and BFBLP Policy H8 requires a proportion of affordable homes to be provided within qualifying developments. In common with many other areas in the locality, more housing need is evident than can be addressed through the delivery of new affordable housing. The Council therefore has to prioritise those who are to be assisted. For the remainder who are unable to access home ownership on the basis of their household incomes, the private rented sector plays an important role.</p>
<p>Object to proposals for over 14,000 units in the area - each will produce an average of two cars per household which will attempt to use the already overcrowded roads. The infrastructure will be unable to cope.</p> <p>Object to all house building in the Borough because traffic is already impossible on roads in the Borough (specifically the A329(M), Hatch Ride and Old Wokingham Road)</p> <p>Object to all house building in the Borough: the traffic is already stationary at rush hour on the A329(M) and developments planned in Crowthorne, Jennett's Park, Finchampstead and Sandhurst will make this worse.</p>	<p>10,780 new homes are being planned between 2006 and 2026. 1,834 had already been completed by 1st April 2011 and a further 2,456 had planning permission and 2,961 had been agreed in principle.</p> <p>The Council has created peak hour versions of the Bracknell Forest Multi-Modal Transport Model (BFMMTM) that include planned and windfall development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Borough. The models look at a number of highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all of the developments that are envisaged up to the year 2026. The Council has also had discussions with the Highways Agency about improvements required to the SRN.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>One of the criteria for taking sites forward in the SADPD has been the extent to which they relate to Bracknell and the availability of (or potential for) public transport and sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Schedules of infrastructure requirements for each of the urban extensions to settlements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as well as within the adopted and draft SPD's for Amen Corner South and Warfield respectively. Mitigation for the impacts of other proposed development, including transport and highway impacts, is contained within Limiting the Impact of Development SPD.</p>
<p>This area could do with less homes rather than more - all local services and amenities are over utilised - schools, shops and roads.</p> <p>The level of housing is unsustainable and fail to see how any future level of investment would enable Binfield and Warfield to cope with the increased volume of vehicles and other community needs.</p>	<p>Developers will be required to mitigate the impact of their developments. This will include contributing towards improving existing services and facilities where there is a need. Requirements will be set out in the IDP. The Council has worked with service providers to produce the IDP.</p>
<p>Given that employment opportunities are shrinking/stagnating in the current economic climate do not see that housing is needed.</p> <p>There are insufficient local employment opportunities in Bracknell and companies are not investing here - the number of new homes required is inaccurate.</p> <p>The massive amount of development proposed will make Bracknell more unattractive, so employers will not want to locate here and the town centre will never be redeveloped.</p> <p>In the current economic climate, the Town Centre regeneration will not take place, so the need for new housing is not as great.</p>	<p>The Annual Business Inquiry statistics indicate that there were 64,294 jobs in 2006. By 2008, there were 62,685 (workplace based). It is agreed that there has been a slight decline in jobs in the Borough. However, the number of jobs still exceeds the number of households in the Borough (around 47,000 households in 2008). The SHMA refers to economic forecasts carried out by Oxford Economics that indicate that employment in Berkshire is expected to recover to previous peak levels from 2013 onwards. As far as unemployment is concerned, in March 2011, the Borough had a total of around 1,600 claimants which was 2.1% of the working age population. Whilst unemployment has increased since March 2008, it is still low. 2% is a rate typically associated with full employment.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Data driving the housing targets is outdated and an independent assessment of housing needs should be performed</p> <p>The housing requirement is based on 2006 data, well before the banking collapse, recession and unemployment; and therefore need revising.</p> <p>It is wrong to plan for the number of houses in the Core Strategy - they are based on out of date projections. The base data for the Core Strategy and SADPD should be adjusted.</p> <p>Queries what assessment of demand for housing has been done. Employment is declining and houses are difficult to sell. New housing will attract people to the area rather than meeting the needs of the local economy.</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre continues to be a key priority for the Council. There remain a significant number of major employers in Bracknell and it is envisaged that the Town Centre regeneration scheme will create a more positive image and facilitate new employment opportunities. Waitrose is currently building a new store in the Town Centre which will create additional employment. The Town Centre Regeneration scheme is beginning to proceed but in phases rather than all at once.</p> <p>The Council must plan for a balance of growth in housing and employment over the plan period, to allow for people to live and work in the Borough should they choose and to seek to reduce levels of in- and out-commuting in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's Employment Land Review has concluded that there is a significant over-supply of employment space (in the form of offices) in Bracknell, and in light of this the SADPD does not propose any major new allocations of land for employment use.</p> <p>The latest household projections were published in November 2010 and are based on the 2008-population projections. They replace the 2006-based household projections released in March 2009. The household projections are produced by applying projected household formation rates to the population projections published by the Office for National Statistics. The assumptions underlying national household and population projections are demographic trend based. The estimated increase in households for Bracknell Forest between 2006 and 2026 is 12,000. This is slightly above the number of new homes being planned for over the same period (10,780).</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism under which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed to commence in 2012 (see Council's LDS) when the housing requirement will be re-assessed. Such a review will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p> <p>The plan period extends to 2026 and it is not therefore appropriate to base plans around a continuation of the current downturn. The Government's top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. The Government wishes Local Planning Authorities to press ahead without delay in preparing up-to-date development plans, and should use that opportunity to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that this country needs (Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth 23rd March 2011).</p> <p>Evidence suggests that new homes are selling in Bracknell Forest e.g. at the Jennetts Park development. The Borough has experienced similar peak to trough house prices as in the wider Housing Market Area. Prices have recovered by 22% since the trough in the Borough towards the end of 2008.</p>
Appreciate need for housing as more homes are required, and this area is desirable in terms of employment and having a pleasant environment in which to live.	Noted.
The Council's Planning Dept is driving the requirement for housing with no consideration of the community's wishes (which are for no further population expansion or new housing development).	The Government has stated that it is important for Councils to continue to plan for growth in their areas. The draft NPPF makes it clear that the Government's key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. The Ministerial foreword to the document states that sustainable development is about positive growth. The Government

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>wishes the Council to press ahead without delay in preparing an up-to-date development plan. The Council must therefore continue to progress the SADPD to deliver the housing which is needed in the Borough.</p> <p>The views of the community have been sought throughout the preparation of the document and have been taken into account in selecting the proposed sites. Sustainability appraisal of the potential sites has been undertaken, and an extensive and robust evidence base has been gathered. These various inputs have been used to inform the Council's selection of the most appropriate sites for development.</p>
<p>Concern at political motivations for allocating sites - Binfield is now outside the parliamentary constituency and motivations of Councillors on the BFC Executive.</p> <p>Presume that the Council's motivation to press ahead with the new developments is financial now that the housing targets are no longer being forced on us.</p> <p>The 8 initial sites for development have been arbitrarily reduced to 4 by unelected council officials - this decision was only narrowly upheld by Councillors</p>	<p>The Government's top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy (Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth 23rd March 2011). The Government has made it clear that Local Planning Authorities must produce Local Plans that address strategic priorities such as housing and economic development requirements.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS3, the Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to identify land for housing across the Borough and assess the developability and deliverability of sites. An assessment against the locational sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2 has then been carried out. As there is insufficient land available within the defined settlements to accommodate the level growth needed, it has been necessary to look at available land that would form extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements. The choice of</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>sites has also been informed by responses received to consultations and technical studies.</p> <p>Decisions on the key stages of the SADPD have been taken by the Council's Executive. The SADPD is also being considered by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Commission which is designed to ensure that decision making in Bracknell Forest is efficient, transparent and accountable, and that the best decisions are taken.</p>
<p>New homes are not required in these financial times as when they are built they do not sell. They therefore remain unoccupied (as in Southern Ireland). It is not necessary to invest in new homes at this time.</p> <p>The 7,154 dwellings already allocated will not be taken up in the timescale originally planned, therefore the number of additional new homes needs to be reduced.</p> <p>Why are so many houses being planned when there are still homes for sale at Jennett's Park, and when the infrastructure promised has yet to materialise?</p>	<p>As discussed above, population and household projections show that there is a need for new homes in Bracknell Forest which arises from a number of sources e.g. people living longer and the balance of migration to and from the Borough.</p> <p>The current economic downturn has had an impact on the rate of development of the housing sites in Bracknell Forest, including Jennett's Park and the Parks. However, a significant number of dwellings on these sites have been completed and occupied. At 31st March 2011, 620 homes out of 1,350 had been completed at Jennetts Park and 378 homes out of 730 at The Parks. Neither site has a large surplus of completed and unoccupied dwellings.</p> <p>The JennettsPark infrastructure (for example the Primary School and Community Centre) is being delivered in accordance with the trigger points in the legal agreement. This was some time after the commencement of the development due to the slow down in the housing market which meant the trigger points in terms of the numbers of units completed were not hit as early as had originally been anticipated.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The problem is too many people not a lack of housing: the answer is to subsidise emigration and tax childbirth as the South East is already overpopulated	This is a matter of national policy which is outside of the remit of Bracknell Forest Borough Council. It is therefore not addressed in the SADPD
Note that every site needs to come forward to achieve the number required. No flexibility.	<p>Throughout the process of preparing the SADPD the Council has been talking to land owners and developers and we are confident that the identified sites are deliverable. Further sites will be proposed in the Draft Submission document to provide an element of flexibility.</p> <p>Action: Propose additional sites for allocation in order to incorporate some flexibility.</p>
The proposals are not in accordance with paras 55 and 71 of the Core Strategy.	<p>The representation does not make it clear how the proposals would not accord with the stated paragraphs. Paragraph 55 is Policy CS1:Sustainable Development Principles. Regard has been paid to these principles in the choice of sites and any planning applications submitted in respect of the sites will be expected to meet some of the more detailed site specific points.</p> <p>Paragraph 71 relates to the broad locations for growth and refers to the preferred sequence for development (to focus development in Bracknell Town Centre and defined settlements). The Council has adhered to this sequence and progressed plans for the development of land at Amen Corner South and Warfield but it is not possible to accommodate all the necessary development with these sites alone. New urban extensions are therefore required.</p>
All new sites of a suitable size should contribute affordable homes as part of the scheme as there is a demonstrable need in the Borough.	All proposals for development will be required to conform with Core Strategy Policies CS16 and CS17 and BFBLP H8 (plus threshold in

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	PPS3). All the major urban extensions include a requirement to provide affordable housing in the wording of the policies.
<p>There is no need for this level of housing in the Borough, statistics.gov shows that 6,000 people left Bracknell last year, therefore there is a surplus of houses.</p>	<p>The most recent migration statistics suggest that around 6,700 people moved out of the Borough from mid 2008 to mid 2009 (800 international and 5,900 within the UK). During the same period however, some 6,900 moved into the Borough (1,100 international and 5,800 from within the UK. This gives a net increase of 200 for the period from migration. According to the published mid-year estimates the overall population of the Borough rose by some 1,100 people in 2009. This reflects the greater influence of birth and death rates within the population.</p>
Paragraph 2.1.2	
<p>Concern expressed at the process of site selection since the Issues and Options consultation and note that there are no Executive Members who represent the Parish of Binfield, which is bearing the brunt of the development.</p>	<p>The Council can only propose available sites. The views of the community have been sought throughout preparation of the document and have been taken into consideration in selecting the preferred sites. Sustainability appraisal of the potential sites has been undertaken, and an extensive and robust evidence base has been gathered. These various inputs plus the locational guidance in the Core Strategy have been used to inform the Council's selection of the most appropriate sites for development.</p>
<p>The Council has ignored the advice of its own experts who have stated that the area is heavily constrained with limited options for development.</p>	<p>A significant proportion of the Borough is either built up or affected by constraints. These were documented at the Issues and Options stage (Section 3 of the Participation Document). Constraints include the Green Belt, SPA, SAC, Flood Zones and Crown Land (protected by legislation).</p> <p>However, the results of SHLAA did reveal that there were a number of parcels of land available outside areas affected by constraints that could potentially be developed for housing.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Consideration of sites in isolation has lead to the siting of the vast majority of development in two areas of the Borough.	The sites considered have been driven by SHLAA. The sites have not been considered in isolation. Technical studies undertaken have included consideration of all sites. The location of possible available sites has been guided by Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy.
No sites of less than 100 houses should be allocated - these smaller numbers should be absorbed into the larger sites.	The proposed allocation of sites has followed the sequence set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy, prioritising sites within urban areas rather than assessing sites based on their size. Some of the smaller sites have a valuable role in contributing to the land supply in the short term as they do not have the same lead in times as the large sites. This is because they are not so dependent on large scale improvements to infrastructure, such as building new primary schools or providing bespoke SANG solutions.
3M building standing empty (an eyesore) could provide significant site for new homes and would attract people to live in the town.	Development is proposed on the site of the 3M building as part of the Town Centre regeneration programme.
The Council has not considered the alternatives to building on open green spaces - the conversion/reuse of unused office space.	<p>The Council has considered the use of employment sites for housing, particularly in the light of the results of the ELR. The proposals include sites that currently designated for employment use e.g. TRL, Crowthorne and Farley Hall, Binfield.</p> <p>A considerable amount of additional work has taken place on this matter since the publication of the Preferred Option, including writing to the landowners of some employment sites to assess availability. The Council must ensure that it has looked at the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of any site that it wishes to progress. Many of the employment sites in the Borough are owned by large institutions who do not wish to dispose of office buildings for accounting reasons.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>There should be greater focus on using brownfield sites in Bracknell in order to protect greenfield sites. A number of the brownfield sites are unsightly.</p> <p>The Council has not followed its own policy of prioritising brownfield sites - starting with those in the town centre</p> <p>Object to the use of greenfield sites for development in absence of evidence that assessing potential brownfield sites.</p>	<p>The Council has prioritised suitably located brownfield sites that are genuinely available for development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 and has identified a number of these to help meet development needs, including some sites around the Town Centre e.g. Eastern Industrial Area. However there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet requirements and the Council has therefore had to propose extensions to the Borough's most sustainable urban areas. One of the urban extensions involves previously developed land.</p>
<p>The Council is directing the wrong sort of development to the wrong places - the area does not need more executive housing in outlying areas with poor transport links (like Binfield); instead it needs a regenerated town centre with affordable housing close to good rail and bus links</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre continues to be a key priority for the Council and a significant number of new homes are proposed there. Other sites around the Town Centre are also being proposed for allocation. However, to accommodate the level of development required in the Borough, urban extensions are also required. These will plan for a mix of housing, including single and family households. A proportion of affordable housing will also need to be provided in accordance with policy. Transport links will be improved from/to the urban extensions.</p>
<p>Basing the strategy around the provision of public transport is fundamentally flawed as 70% of the population travel to work by car</p>	<p>One of the criteria for taking sites forward in the SADPD has been the extent to which they relate to Bracknell (being the Borough's most sustainable settlement) and the availability of (or potential for) public transport and sustainable modes of transport. The intention is to allocate sites which can most readily provide access to jobs and services by non-car modes in order to reduce reliance on the private car as much as possible.</p>
<p>Paragraph 2.1.3</p>	
<p>The impact of development proposed under CS4 and CS5 needs to be understood before further development is rushed into.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the allocation of 2,925 homes through Policies CS4 and CS5 of the Core Strategy, the Council still needs to allocate further land to meet the requirement set out in the Core Strategy for the plan period.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>This must be done quickly due to a lack of 5 year land supply (para. and the long lead ins necessary for the development of larger sites. The Council is more able to resist inappropriate applications for development, if it allocates sufficient land (para 71 of PPS3 comes into effect if there is a lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable sites - in such cases it is necessary to consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the consideration in para 69).</p> <p>PPS3 (para 53) requires Local Planning Authorities to identify sufficient land to enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, taking account of the level of housing required.</p>
Paragraph 2.1.4	
<p>Development is unfairly distributed to 2 areas of the Borough without consideration for the residents of those areas.</p> <p>The Council is locating development on its outer boundaries to reduce the impact on voters and save positions within the Council.</p> <p>Requirements of the Core Strategy must be achieved through sympathetic development across a number of areas.</p> <p>Recognise the need for housing in the Borough but so much of it should not be concentrated around Binfield (given the proposals at Warfield and in Wokingham Borough).</p> <p>Concentrating housing in this way is not sustainable; small pockets of development are more appropriate than the large scale building proposed.</p> <p>Object to the identification of new development on the edge of Bracknell, which will only develop Reading's commuter belt.</p>	<p>As outlined above, across the Borough development is prioritised within Bracknell Town Centre and the urban areas in accordance with the sequence set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. However this does not provide for sufficient housing to meet the Borough's needs, so four new major urban extensions are proposed to Bracknell and Crowthorne. These urban extensions have been identified following consideration of a number of sites that were put forward through SHLAA and justification for the selection of these sites is contained within the Background Paper. The latter also contains a pie chart showing the distribution by Parish.</p> <p>The Council must plan for a balance of growth in housing and employment over the plan period, to allow for people to live and work in the Borough should they choose and to seek to reduce levels of in- and out-commuting in the Borough. Whilst the Council can create the opportunities to live and work in close proximity, it is up to individuals to make their</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Major employers have deserted Bracknell leaving room in the town centre for residential apartments.</p> <p>The Council should build on sites in the town centre to reduce the need to travel to work by car and improve air quality.</p> <p>The majority of the housing need is for single occupancy. Most of the planned housing should be affordable starter homes and centrally located near the town centre and rail stations. Many of the sites allocated are therefore inappropriate.</p>	<p>own choices. In 2008, the number of jobs exceeded the number of households in the Borough (around 47,000 households in 2008).</p> <p>1,000 new dwellings are already planned in Bracknell Town Centre and other sites that are being proposed for allocation are on the periphery of the Town Centre e.g. Land at the Eastern Industrial Area. It is likely that most of these sites will comprise smaller dwellings. It should be noted that there is no direct correlation between household size and dwelling size - income, wealth and life stage may also have an impact on the demand for different sized homes.</p>
<p>The sites chosen are not justified on the basis of the Sustainability Assessment.</p>	<p>The findings of the Sustainability Appraisal have informed the Council's assessment of the sites for allocation, together with comments made by respondents to the consultations and Technical Studies. However, Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and forms just one part of the evidence base which must feed into the Council's consideration of sites. Further detail is contained within the Background Paper.</p>
<p>Although many of the sites will include SPA mitigation, it is believed that many of the future occupiers will be drawn to the SPA, thus affecting fauna and flora.</p>	<p>Mitigation of potential impacts on the Thames Basins Heaths SPA is critical to the progression of the urban extensions. All are planned to provide bespoke SANG and a package of additional measures (including monitoring) to manage recreational pressures on the SPA. Natural England has indicated that it is happy that the measures proposed will adequately mitigate the impact of the developments on the SPA.</p>
<p>Suggest that some smaller villages could be built into self sufficient villages (e.g. Maiden's Green) with open land around, rather than building up Binfield into a housing estate on the edge of Bracknell.</p>	<p>Extensions to defined settlements are required in order to meet the housing needs of the Borough. The more sustainable settlements (that benefit from some existing services and facilities) are prioritised in view of the extent of infrastructure that would be required if the smaller settlements were to be expanded.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Wokingham BC has agreed to develop 2,500 houses within a few miles of TRL. There has been little consultation between the Council and Wokingham BC regarding the combined effect of both developments in terms of infrastructure, social and environmental factors.</p>	<p>The proposals have been developed in the knowledge of the proposed developments in Wokingham Borough. The Council has exchanged data with Wokingham BC, including that relating to transport, that has been fed into the respective transport models. Discussions between the 2 Councils are continuing as both develop their proposals to meet their respective housing requirements.</p>
<p>The Council has made the right choice in its selection of the 4 sites. The areas chosen have more spare land and the roads will be able to cope with the increase in traffic.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Key Map</p>	
<p>The Key Map clearly shows how the open space between the villages in the Borough will be eroded - if it goes ahead Bracknell and Wokingham will join.</p>	<p>The level of development required to meet the Borough's housing requirement necessitates the allocation of land for extensions to the most sustainable settlements of Bracknell and Crowthorne. It is acknowledged that the issue of gaps is a sensitive issue and that the principle attracts a significant amount of support from local residents. However, national policy (PPS7) makes it clear that Local Planning Authorities should take a more proactive approach, indicating where development will be promoted, rather than listing areas where it will be prevented. The emphasis on needing to locate development in a sustainable way and accommodate growth means that it is necessary to review the principle of gaps between certain settlements.</p> <p>However, in recognition of the importance that residents attach to the principle, the extensions to settlements are designed to include the greenspace that is needed as part of the development (OSPV and SANG) on areas of the sites that will contribute most effectively to helping to maintain a visual and physical break between settlements and maintaining a "sense of place". Furthermore,</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	following the Issues and Options consultation, it was decided to pull development away from Binfield in order to help maintain a degree of separation.
The Key Map is misleading because it shows a large brown area around the Broadmoor site as "land allocated for new urban extension". However a Planning Officer advised that this would remain green fields for community use.	The allocation of land at Broadmoor (Policy SA4) includes land for public open space and SANG as well as built development. This is to ensure that all the green infrastructure required to support the development is delivered. It is a similar case for the other urban extensions. The hatched area within the brown areas gives an indication of the extent of the built up area.
This map conflicts with Map 7 (Illustrative Concept Plan for Warfield) in terms of the extent of built development shown on the eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill	The hatching was included to try and make it clear that not all the land shown as being proposed for allocation would be built on - a significant amount of greenspace was also being provided. It is acknowledged that there have been discrepancies between the plans which have arisen as the final form of the development is still the subject of consultation. The matter is being progressed through the SPD process.
Paragraph 2.4.1	
Object to the preferred sites in Binfield: sites should be chosen which have direct access onto the main trunk roads (i.e. A329(M), M4) not cross town roads	The justification for the selection of sites in Binfield is contained within the responses to Policies SA6 and SA7.
The SPA near Sandhurst and the ruling about no development within 5 miles, seems to be the only reason why the Binfield developments are in the Preferred Option. This land is not more important than the countryside around Binfield.	Advice from Natural England is that no residential development can take place within 400m of the SPA and that mitigation needs to be provided for any development within 400m - 5km of it. The urban extensions lie within 5km of the SPA and therefore include proposals to mitigate the impact of development. The SPA is an area regarded as being of international importance and therefore has a different level of protection to the countryside around Binfield.

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
It is sensible to exclude Winkfield as there isn't a sufficiently large site. The smaller sites have serious infrastructure limitations e.g. sewerage and road access.	Noted.
Paragraph 2.5.1	
<p>Object to consultation on detailed plans for land at Warfield when the site has not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The foothills of Cabbage Hill and around West End was not shown on original development plans for the area, so it is wrong to include the plans now without further consultation with residents.</p>	<p>Development of the land at Warfield has been agreed in principle through the Core Strategy, where it was identified as a broad area for growth. However there is a need to formally allocate the land through the SADPD. The disposition of land uses within the site is being progressed through an SPD.</p> <p>See responses to Policy SA9.</p>
Other	
The Council should force developers to build homes that generate renewable energy e.g. solar panels	The Council's policy on this matter is contained within the adopted Core Strategy and the adopted Sustainable Resource Management SPD. All proposals will need to take account of these policies.

Table 2.2 - Housing (General) - Developer Responses

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Paragraph 2.1.1	
<p>Recent court cases have found that the RSS should continue to form part of the Development Plans until revocation takes place legally. Therefore 12,780 homes should be planned for. Policy WCBV 1 refers to the promotion of sustainable urban extensions.</p> <p>The RSS is a more up to date assessment of housing need than the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the South East Plan currently forms part of the Development Plan for Bracknell Forest.</p> <p>In November 2010, following a judgement in the case brought by Cala Homes, the Chief Planner wrote to all Local Planning Authorities and the Planning Inspectorate advising that they should still have regard to the Government's intention to abolish Regional</p>

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Recent housing projections show an expected increase of 12,000 households to 2026, so the Council should be planning for at least the figure in the South East Plan.</p>	<p>Strategies through the Localism Bill and that this was a material consideration in planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>A legal challenge was mounted to the Chief Planner's letter but this was dismissed by the Court on 7 February 2011. That decision was appealed in further litigation and the appeal was dismissed on 27 May 2011. This confirms that the proposed abolition of Regional Strategies can be regarded as a material consideration by Local Planning Authorities and inspectors when deciding planning applications and appeals. The weight to be given to it will be a matter for the decision maker.</p> <p>In relation to Development Plans Regional Strategies remain part of the Development Plan until they are abolished by the Localism Bill currently going through Parliament. Advice from Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base.</p> <p>Policy CS15 is based on a locally-derived figure (the 'option 1' figure that the Government has stated may be appropriate) and the Core Strategy was found sound by an Inspector. Whilst the household projections that were published in 2010 suggest a slightly higher number of households than currently being planned for, those projections do not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. There is a possibility that they may over estimate the number of households. Consequently, the Council will continue to plan for the requirement set out in the Core Strategy but will review the position through a review of the Core Strategy (see LDS).</p>

2.2 Sites in Defined Settlements

Sites within existing settlements were divided into two categories: those on previously developed land (covered under draft Policy SA1) and those on other land within defined settlements (draft Policy SA2).

The tables below summarise the responses to Policies SA1 and SA2. In most instances specific comments were made in respect of the sites identified within the Policies.

A number of comments made in relation to the sites contained in Policy referred to the maps contained in the Preferred Option Appendices. For the purpose of summarising the main issues raised, these are summarised against the Policy.

The responses set out below make reference to:

- The Preferred Option Document: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/siteallocations/sadpdpo>
- Preferred Option Background Paper: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/1546196>
- Employment Lane Review: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/1209900>
- Core Strategy: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/corestrategy>
- Parking Standards SPD: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/parking>
- Limiting the Impact of Development SPD: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/lid>
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/shlaa>

Further rationale on sites contained within the Preferred Option Policies and sites proposed through the Preferred Option consultation will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

Table 2.3 Residents responses to Policy SA1 (Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements).

Policy SA1 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Adastron House: SHLAA ref 15	
None received.	n/a
Garth Hill School, Sandy Lane, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 46	
This site should be safeguarded for additional school capacity in the future (to accommodate children from the new developments)	The Garth Hill school site has already been redeveloped to accommodate additional need in the local area (application 08/00759/3). The new secondary school

<p>Policy SA1</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Rather than building on Garth Hill it should be expanded to negate the need to provide a school on Blue Mountain</p>	<p>proposed on Blue Mountain is to accommodate need arising from new development planned in the north of the Borough.</p>
<p>Loss of open space.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of Garth Hill School secured associated new open space/playing fields for the school. This site would not be building upon any of this open space.</p>
<p>The land is habitat to many species included the endangered species of bats and stag beetles, and birds (green woodpecker, great spotted woodpecker, lesser spotted woodpecker, wrens, nuthatches, variety of tits, robins, finches and thrush family).</p>	<p>The site is not subject to any specific nature conservation designation (such as Local Wildlife Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest etc. The profile of the site (Appendix 3 of the SADPD Preferred Option) sets out requirements in developing the site which includes the need to undertake "appropriate ecological surveys and mitigation of any impacts".</p>
<p>The density is not sympathetic to the surroundings (which is largely detached properties).</p>	<p>The rationale for the density of this set is set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 35-36). In view of the proximity of the site to the Town Centre, the density is considered appropriate. Further consideration of this site will be set out in a background paper to support the Draft Submission Document.</p>
<p>The local sewage infrastructure would need to be upgraded to be able to cope with the new dwellings.</p>	<p>Whilst Thames Water has no objection in principle to the allocation of sites, for some sites (depending on the scale of development) there may be capacity issues in relation to existing waste water treatment and sewerage networks. Therefore, recommend a requirement for necessary investigations to be undertaken in respect of sites.</p> <p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure”.</p>

Policy SA1 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Increased traffic in the area could cause danger to the children attending the school.</p>	<p>A full transport assessment will be required to assess the impact of the proposals upon the local road network, including Sandy Lane and the junctions Sandy Lane/Warfield Road/Holly Spring Lane, and taking into account new travel patterns associated with the new Garth School.</p> <p>The need for a transport assessment is included in the requirements for the site (Appendix 3 of the SADPD Preferred Option document).</p>
<p>Sandy Lane not wide enough and not capable of accommodating extra traffic/will lead to congestion.</p>	
<p>Poor access from Sandy Lane onto Warfield Road.</p>	
<p>No bus service to take pressure of roads.</p>	
<p>Battle Bridge House & Garage, Forest Road, Warfield: SHLAA ref 95</p>	
<p>None received.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Peacock Bungalow, Peacock Lane, Binfield: SHLAA ref 106</p>	
<p>Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield</p>	<p>The Council must continue to plan for housing, including the allocation of strategic sites , in order to secure a supply of land for housing. One of the main functions of the SADPD is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p> <p>The Council's promotion of sustainable growth is set out in the locational principles set out CS2 1- 4 of the Core Strategy. Priority is given to locating development within existing settlement boundaries. Peacock Bungalow comprises previously developed land within the urban area. There is an existing employment commitment on this site which has not been started. The site accords with point 2 of Core Strategy Policy CS2 and so residential development is considered acceptable in principal. The density is considered appropriate given the site location adjoining existing residential development at Wykery Copse and Jennetts Park.</p>

Policy SA1 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The site now has planning permission for 32 dwellings (10/00616/FUL, granted 6 April 2011). Therefore, it is no longer a requirement to allocate this site in the SADPD. The planning application will form part of the housing commitment data.⁽¹⁾</p> <p>Action: reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA1 of the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield: SHLAA ref 123	
<p>Object: isn't the house a listed building and what will happen to all the wildlife?</p>	<p>Farley Hall is a former Victorian residence with modern additions and is not a listed building of Architectural or Historic Interest.</p> <p>The Council has already indicated that any proposal to develop this site will need to have regard to the retention and protection of existing protected trees and to safeguarding biodiversity assets. An application for redevelopment of the site would need to address how any impacts on biodiversity will be mitigated.</p>
<p>Should be retained as office space in preference to redeveloping a large old buildings such as this.</p>	<p>The site is owned by the Crown Estate and has been used as offices for many years, and is not a listed building of Architectural or Historic Interest.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review concluded that there is a significant over-supply of offices in the Borough and proposed a strategy to plan flexibility for sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>More recently the 2011 Budget announced by the Government proposes to make it easier to change the use of offices to residential use by removing the requirement to obtain planning permission for such changes of use.</p> <p>This site is considered appropriate for residential use, being located within the defined settlement.</p>

1 For the current housing commitments, see: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/monitoring>

Policy SA1 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield	<p>One of the main functions of the SADPD is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p> <p>The Council's promotion of sustainable growth is set out in the locational principles set out CS2 of the Core Strategy. Priority is given to locating development within existing settlement boundaries. Farley Hall comprises previously developed land within the urban area. The site accords with point 2 of Core Strategy Policy CS2 (previously developed land and buildings within defined settlements) and so residential development is considered acceptable in principal. The level of development proposed on this site reflects the need to protect the landscape quality.</p>
The Depot (Commercial Centre), Old Bracknell Lane West: SHLAA ref 215	
None received.	n/a
Albert Road Car Park, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 228	
None received.	n/a
The Iron Duke, High Street, Crowthorne: SHLAA ref 286	
Increased traffic/congestion, area won't cope and will compromise safety of children walking to Edgbarrow.	<p>Any application would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005 in relation to Planning Obligations (July 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant to planning • necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms • directly related to the proposed development • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development • reasonable in all other respects. <p>Some form of Transport Assessment would also be required to address the impact of the proposals upon the local road network.</p>
Development will need to have adequate parking for residents, visitors and customers.	

<p>Policy SA1</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p>
<p>Number of houses appears high and should be reviewed and considered in relation to maintaining the existing building which is of architectural merit.</p>	<p>The Iron Duke PH is not listed as a Building of Architectural or Historic Interest. However, the site is located within the Crowthorne Conservation Area and contains protected tree. The site is also located within Crowthorne Area C of the Character Area Assessment SPD. The Iron Duke PH is identified as a local landmark and the Victorian village character of the immediate area is recommended to be kept.</p> <p>The current planning application (11/00001/FUL) for the redevelopment of the surrounding area, includes the retention of the PH in the form of change of use of the ground floor to A1/A2 use (retail/financial and professional) and creation of 2, one bed flats above. The remainder of the site could accommodate a further 12 dwellings and 4 flats. This is a reduction in the 20 units that were included in the SADPD PO. If the application is approved, it would not need to be allocated by the SADPD.</p> <p>Further consideration of this site is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: if approved, reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA1 of the SADPD Draft Submission Document, if not, any change to the number of units in the site will be reflected in the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>

Policy SA1 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Land to north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 308	
None received.	N/a
Specific Consultee Comments	
See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Bracknell Town Council, Environment Agency, Thames Water, Sport England and Binfield Village Protection Society.	See responses to specific consultee comments.

Table 2.4 Developer responses to Policy SA1 (Previously Developed Land within Defined Settlements).

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Land at Battle Bridge House and Garage, Forest Road, Winkfield: SHLAA ref 95 (owners of site)	
Support for inclusion of the site but would wish to see it redeveloped as a mixed use site (some 10 dwellings and 200sqm employment floorspace)	The submission on this site relates to a larger site than previously promoted, and now includes land that forms part of the Warfield SPD area. It is not appropriate to allocate smaller parcels of land from within the Warfield SPD area, and therefore, the allocation of the site could only relate to that as shown in the Site Allocations Preferred Option. The responses also promotes a small commercial element. In relation to the proposed commercial, the SADPD would not be seeking mixed-use development of smaller sites (the SHLAA only deals with residential use). Therefore, the commercial element has been excluded from the site area.
Submitted scheme would allow accesses into the site to be rationalised and could include an access into land to the south (identified for residential development in Policy SA9)	
Suggest minor revisions to area of southern boundary and that site could be delivered earlier in the plan period than currently envisaged.	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Despite reduced site area, consider that site could accommodate 10 dwellings net. The rationale will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>The site accords with point 2 of Core Strategy Policy CS2 (previously developed land and buildings within the defined settlement), and therefore residential development is acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Action: any change to the number of units in the site will be reflected in the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Farley Hall: SHLAA ref 123 (Owners of site)	
Support the inclusion of the site.	Noted
Provided tree survey indicating a larger developable area than currently indicated (1.5ha). Size of site within site allocations is too small and does not reflect the actual developable area of the site.	The survey provides the most up to date information regarding the developable area of the site, and will be used in calculating the number of units for the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
With a larger developable site area, and high density of 45dph (which is considered to be consistent with the mixed character of housing in the area), consider site could accommodate 68 units.	<p>The density of the scheme will be considered, and rationale will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: any change to the number of units in the site will be reflected in the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 308 (Racal House - owners of site)	
Support identification of this site for mixed use development.	Noted.
Support the inclusion of Racal House, Eastern Road, within the boundary of this site (and therefore also support the removal of the Defined Employment Area designation on Racal House).	Noted.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Consider that the estimated dwelling yield (216) is too low and should be increased to c.350 units.	<p>The location of the site in proximity to the Town Centre, means the site can accommodate a high density development, however the density of surrounding (recently permitted schemes) also needs to be considered. Rational will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: any change to the number of units in the site will be reflected in the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 308 (Apex House & Hayley House - owners of site)	
Support identification of this site for mixed use development.	Noted.
Support the inclusion of Apex House/Hayley House, Eastern Road, within the boundary of this site (and therefore also support the removal of the Defined Employment Area designation on these sites).	Noted.
Consider that the estimated dwelling yield (216) is too low and should be increased to c.350 units.	<p>The location of the site in proximity to the Town Centre, means the site can accommodate a high density development, however the density of surrounding (recently permitted schemes) also needs to be considered. Rational will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: any change to the number of units in the site will be reflected in the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 308 (Foundation House - owners of site)	
Support continued allocation of the site for employment purposes.	Planning permission (07/01139/FUL) for a 5 storey B1 office building (comprising 10,280 sqm floorspace) expired on the 22nd May

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to allocation of this land that would preclude the ability to redevelopment the site for offices (permission obtained for 10,280sqm of office building in May 2008).</p>	<p>2011. As at 22nd May 2011, no application relating to the renewal of the permission had been received, and therefore the previous application has now time expired.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review concluded that there is a significant oversupply of offices in the Borough, and proposed a strategy to plan flexibly for sustainable growth.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, taking account the availability of Foundation house, this does not affect the housing number for the wider site. It was anticipated that of the 2.9ha site, 0.9ha would be retained in employment use, and the area of the Foundation House site relates to 0.91ha.</p>
<p>Should the Council be minded to allow some flexibility for redevelopment of land parcels within the allocated area, this must ensure that this would not compromise the integrity of this as a commercial location.</p>	<p>The Council's proposal will result in the loss of part of the Eastern Industrial Estate Defined Employment Area through mixed use development including housing. However, the Council does not consider the loss to be detrimental to the Boroughs employment stock given the oversupply of office space identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR).</p> <p>The ELR concludes in para. 5.12 that proposals for housing or other uses should only be permitted where they do not threaten the integrity of the remaining 'core' of the Defined Employment Area. The remaining 'core' is defined in the ELR as the buildings to the west of Brants Bridge and south of Eastern Road. The Council included this area in the revised Defined Employment Area notation set out in the SADPD PO document.</p>
<p>The ELR recognises that London Road “has prominent office buildings and a strong identity for offices (para 5.9). It goes on to state that “Properties on London Road are especially prominent which helps support office demand” (para 5.10) and that “the</p>	<p>Para. 5.10 of the ELR also acknowledged that 'the character of the area was changing'. Para 5.12 went on to conclude that 'the area's market potential and commercial identity is being reduced by housing development' and that there was scope to consider the release</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Eastern Employment Area provides a relatively attractive location for offices, especially on the more prominent sites along the A329" (para 5.12)	of sites to other uses if they became available. This was provided such proposals didn't undermine the integrity of a defined core which included an area to the west of Brants Bridge and south of Eastern Road. The Council's proposal for Eastern Industrial Area in the SADPDPO reflected these conclusions.
	Note: subsequent to the consultation on the Preferred Option, the owners of the site have now confirmed (June 2011) that the site is available for residential redevelopment.
Land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 308 (Radius Court - owners of site)	
Confirmed availability of site.	Subsequent to the consultation on the Preferred Option. The owners of Radius Court have confirmed the availability of their site (part of site 308) for development (June 2011).
SHLAA site 243 - Loncroft, Long Hill Road (part of Warfield Park proposals) (On behalf of owner of site, S. Brant)	
Have reservations over whether density of development on site can be secured in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS1, 2 and 7 without compromising urban quality. Minimum density requirement has been removed from PPS3. The HMA indicates a requirement for 1 and 2 bedroom properties, yet market experience indicates there is an oversupply of flats in Crowthorne and elsewhere. Also need to take account of the need to provide appropriate parking (which is 'space greedy'). Therefore, considered there is no sustainable evidence base to suggest that the capacity for some sites can be achieved, therefore more land will need to be provided.	National and regional policy have previously set minimum densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (Planning Policy Statement 3 - PPS3) and 40 dwellings per hectare respectively (South East Plan). PPS 3 has since been reissued following the deletion of the the national indicative minimum density of 30 dph. The Council does not provide detailed guidance on density. The over arching policy of the Core Strategy is the delivery of sustainable development. CS1 refers to the need to make efficient use of land, buildings and infrastructure. Policy CS7 stresses the need to for high quality design.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
New suggested sites	
As there are already plans for improving Iron Duke, the regeneration of land between 67-69 Church Street and beyond 38 Sandhurst Road should also take place as this is an eyesore.	This land has not been promoted to the Council by the landowner, so therefore is not available or deliverable.

Table 2.5 Residents Responses to Policy SA2 (Other Land within Defined Settlements)

Policy SA2 Residents responses; Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
Support development of these sites	Noted
Bay Drive: SHLAA ref 17	
None received.	<p>This site now has planning permission for 40 units (application 10/00780/FUL, approved 11 March 2011), therefore no longer needs to be included as part of SADPD. The planning application will form part of the housing commitment data.</p> <p>Action: reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA2 of the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
Bracknell Football Club: SHLAA ref 19	
Unacceptable to build on a recreational facility and replace it on a greenfield site.	The existing football club site has been promoted by the site owner and is available for development. The relocated football club site forms part of the Blue Mountain Development (see responses to Policy SA7).
This site would only be available assuming development at Blue Mountain goes ahead (at this stage of the consultation is theoretically not a foregone conclusion).	
It seems bizarre to build on a football ground when health / exercise has become such an important issue	
24-30 Sandhurst Road: SHLAA ref 68	
This site with White Cairns, questions why improvements are allowed, will lead to ribbon development to the detriment of existing residential amenities.	Having reworked the capacity of the site, it is now considered that the site capacity would be less than 10 units (net), and now constitutes a small site. Therefore, this site would not need to be allocated within SADPD. Further explanation is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

Policy SA2 Residents responses; Summary of main issues raised	Response
Will need to provide adequate parking provision and ensure safe access on to Sandhurst Road.	Action: reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA2 of the SADPD Draft Submission Document.
Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne: SHLAA ref 76	
Proposal will result in the loss of a playing field. Some amenity such a playground should be provided to offset the loss.	A replacement recreation ground will be required (as set out in the profile of this site in Appendix 4, page 69 of the SADPD Preferred Option). This would be reprovided through the Broadmoor allocation (Policy SA4).
Development coupled with Broadmoor and Cricket Field Grove will overburden existing access roads (during and post construction) and impact upon resources	Additional Transport Modelling work (which will be available as part of the background evidence) considers the cumulative effect of the Borough's housing (10,780 dwellings by 2026) across the whole of the Borough's transport network. This will help to identify which road junctions within the Borough require improvements. This work will inform the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requirements for this site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper and an updated IDP which will support the Draft Submission Document.
Limited/poor road access to the site (via Lower Broadmoor Road/Chaplins Hill or Brookers Corner/Upper Broadmoor Road).	
Increased traffic and congestion/dependence upon car travel/pollution.	
Public transport is poor and unreliable.	
Development would need to provide adequate off road parking.	
Existing drainage is inadequate, will be exacerbated/increased surface run off as a result of the proposals.	Any application for redevelopment of the site would need to be accompanied by some form of Transport Assessment, to address the impact of the proposals upon the local road network. Any redevelopment would also need to provide sufficient parking in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD. The Environment Agency are generally happy with the proposed layout of Broadmoor. They highlight that a culvert runs through north east corner of the site, and should the capacity be exceeded, flooding may occur along the culvert. Deculverting the watercourse will reduce the probability of flooding.

<p>Policy SA2</p> <p>Residents responses;</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Development of the site will need to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and other drainage methods, and in line with comments made by the Environment Agency, this is currently referred to in the Preferred Option Policy wording for the wider Broadmoor site.</p> <p>Action: include reference to SuDS</p>
<p>Maps are incorrect as show a footpath at the end of Cambridge Road as a through route for traffic.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Profile refers to a site area of 1.2ha, yet the developable area is 1.53ha, is this incorrect? If correct, still a high density at 49dph.</p>	<p>This was a typographical error and should have referred to a total site area of 2.1ha (resulting in a developable area of 1.53ha).</p> <p>Action: Ensure correct site area is referred to in SADPD.</p>
<p>Impact upon local services and amenities which are already strained.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p>
<p>Land at School Hill, Crowthorne: SHLAA ref 113</p>	
<p>Development coupled with Broadmoor and Cricket Field Grove will overburden existing access roads and impact upon resources</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in</p>

<p>Policy SA2</p> <p>Residents responses;</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p> <p>A current planning application for 20 units (application 10/00820/FUL). If approved, this site will no longer need to be included as part of SADPD.</p> <p>Action: if approved, reference to this site to be removed from Policy SA2 of the SADPD Draft Submission Document.</p>
<p>Sandbanks, Long Hill Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 137</p>	
<p>Object to the proposed capacity (11 dwellings). PPS3 allows LPA's to set appropriate densities - given that densities to the north of London Road are much lower (8 dph along Locks Ride and Long Hill and 2 dph along Birch Hill) then 35 dph is too high. As proposed, 35 dph is inconsistent with the background paper which acknowledges the low density character of the area</p>	<p>Ownership disputes are not a matter for SAPDD,</p> <p>Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome of the ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).</p> <p>Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work has been undertaken which will inform the</p>
<p>Request that settlement boundary be amended to run 10m further north on Longhill Road, i.e. to correct a previous error which omitted from the settlement boundary a triangle of land which lies within the garden of Sandbanks (and which is not physically or visually separated from the rest of the Sandbanks land). Otherwise this site is unlikely to achieve 11 units.</p>	

Policy SA2 Residents responses; Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>capacity/requires of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: combine this site with 122/300 (Dolyhir/Fern Bungalow/Palm Hills), correct site area, and amend capacity of new site.</p>
<p>Access is inadequate (and previous applications for development on the site have been withdrawn for this reason in the past)</p>	<p>Detailed access designs do not form part of the Preferred Option, which would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>
<p>Full contamination, leechate and land studies should be undertaken - it is likely that the level of remediation work necessary to make the land suitable for housing will render the site unviable</p>	<p>The requirement for investigation and remediation of any land contamination is set out in the profile for this site (see Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option), and would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>
<p>Land north of Cain Road, Binfield: SHLAA ref 194</p>	
<p>Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield</p>	<p>One of the main functions of the SADPD is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p> <p>The Council's promotion of sustainable growth is set out in the locational principles set out CS2 of the Core Strategy. Priority is given to locating development within existing settlement boundaries. Cain Road comprises 'other land' within the defined settlement. The site accords with point 3 of CS2 (previously developed land and buildings within defined settlements) and so residential development is considered acceptable in principal.</p>
<p>152 New Road, Ascot: SHLAA ref 284</p>	
<p>None received.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Policy SA2 Residents responses; Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Note: An application for 24 flats was submitted in August 2011 (11/00559/FUL). If this application is approved, it would no longer need to be included in the SADPD.
Specific Consultee Comments	
See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Crowthorne Parish Council, Wokingham Without Parish Council, Winkfield Parish Council, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Thames Water, Sport England, Binfield Village Protection Society and Chavey Down Residents Association.	See responses to specific consultees.

Table 2.6 Developer Responses to Policy SA2 (Other Land within Defined Settlements)

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
Regarding development of playing fields, there may be policy constraints to consider in estimating 353 dwellings from this source	The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2, point 2 (other land within defined settlements). For some sites there will be a requirement to provide replacement facilities (see responses to individual sites, and responses to Sport England comments, contained in the Specific consultee section).
Bracknell Football Club: SHLAA ref 19 (St James Group Ltd, on behalf of owners of site)	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Representation to be read in conjunction with comments made on Blue Mountain, as this is the intended location for relocation of the football club.	Noted.
BFC need take account of housing target in the SEP (12,780) up to 2026, and must demonstrate a 5 year housing supply.	<p>Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p>
Given the sustainable location of the site (0.6km from Town Centre), consider that 190 units (154 dph) would be suitable, particularly given transition from central urban area to the west and more domestic scale housing to east and south.	Despite the proximity of the site to the Town Centre, there are highway concerns regarding the proposal to double the density/capacity of the site, in terms of accessibility issues, London Road/Met Office roundabout, parking provision, and overspill parking into an area which already suffers parking problems. This rationale will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
The proposed density of c150dph would mean flattened elements would reach 4 storeys in places, a review of surrounding area confirms there are comparable sized residential schemes in close vicinity of the site	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
setting a precedent (flatted scheme in Mount Pleasant, 3 storey houses in Farnham Close, and Celsius development rising to 7 storey in places).	
Affordable housing would be provided, but in order for scheme to be commercially viable, increased density of c.150dph required.	No viability information has been provided by the applicant to demonstrate that the viability of the site can only be achieved at 150dph.
Site is brownfield, and following successful relation of the football club, could be brought forward for residential development within the next 5 years.	It is agreed that the site is brownfield. It is noted that developer considers that the site could be brought forward at an early stage.
<p>Land at Cricket Field Grove: SHLAA ref 76</p> <p>(Charles Church - promoting site promoting site 251 - Whitegates, Mushroom Castle)</p>	
Profile refers to a site area of 1.2ha, yet the developable area is 1.53ha, is this incorrect, or should the number of houses to be delivered be reduced.	<p>There was a typographical error in the profile of this site (page 69, Appendix 4 of the SADPD Preferred Option Document).</p> <p>The site area should have read "2.1ha" NOT 1.2ha, and will be corrected in subsequent documents.</p> <p>Action: ensure correct site area is referred to in SADPD.</p>
<p>Sandbanks, Long Hill Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 137</p> <p>(Owner of site)</p>	
<p>Request that settlement boundary be amended to run 10m further north on Longhill Road, i.e. to correct a previous error which omitted from the settlement boundary a triangle of land which lies within the garden of Sandbanks (and which is not physically or visually separated from the rest of the Sandbanks land).</p> <p>Extent of ownership of the site has also been confirmed (as part of the site was shown to overlap with part of site 122 - Dolyhir and Fern Bungalow).</p>	<p>Noted: This will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date March 2011) and the Draft Submission Document Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: combine this site with 122/300 (Dolyhir/Fern Bungalow/Palm Hills), correct site area, and amend capacity of new site.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Land north of Cain Road: SHLAA ref 194 (Hewlett Packard - owner of site)</p>	
Supports residential allocation of the site for 75 dwellings.	Noted.
Also made comments on land within their ownership in relation to SA8 (land at Amen Corner).	See developer responses to Policy SA8.
<p>152 New Road, Ascot: SHLAA ref 284 (Chansom Ltd - owner of site)</p>	
Support inclusion of this site (controlled by Chansom Ltd) for residential development and welcome recognition of its suitability (given proximity of local services and facilities such as schools and shops)	Noted.
Note that the site is 0.5ha in area and comprises the former petrol filling station as well as the property at 152 New Road	Noted.
A Flood Risk Assessment has concluded that the site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 (although close to the edge of Flood Zone 2) - therefore no area of the site need be excluded from the developable area and the capacity of the site is higher than indicated.	The Environment Agency would need to endorse the Flood Risk Assessment in relation to whether the site is within flood zone 1 or 2. At present the flood area will continue to be excluded from the developable area of the site.
When calculating the capacity of the site no consideration is given to the type of residential development proposed. Pre-application discussions are underway in respect of a scheme for 18x2 bed flats and 6x1 bed flats which provides a higher number of units while respecting the character of the area. The site should therefore be allocated for a higher number of units.	The density as proposed is considered appropriate for the site. Rationale is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Note that the Borough does not have a 5 year supply of land for housing (irrespective of whether this is calculated on the SEP or the "Option 1" figure, which will compound the	Currently the Council does not have a 5 year supply of land for housing. However, the purpose of SADPD is to ensure that there is a five year supply of deliverable sites during the plan period.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>issue) and so should identify sufficient specific deliverable sites for the first 5 years of the plan period</p>	<p>Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p>
<p>SHLAA site 243 - Loncroft, Long Hill Road (part of Warfield Park proposals)</p> <p>(On behalf of owner of site, S. Brant)</p>	
<p>Have reservations over whether density of development on site can be secured in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS1, 2 and 7 without compromising urban quality. Minimum density requirement has been removed from PPS3. The HMA indicates a requirement for 1 and 2 bedroom properties, yet market experience indicates there is an oversupply of flats in Crowthorne and elsewhere. Also need to take account of the need to provide appropriate parking (which is 'space greedy'). Therefore, considered there is no sustainable evidence base to suggest</p>	<p>National and regional policy have previously set minimum densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (PPS 3) and 40 dwellings per hectare respectively (South East Plan). PPS 3 has since been reissued following the deletion of the the national indicative minimum density of 30 dph. The Council does not provide detailed guidance on density. The overarching policy of the Core Strategy is the delivery of sustainable development. CS1 refers to the need to make efficient use of land, buildings and infrastructure. Policy CS7 stresses the need to for high quality design.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
that the capacity for some sites can be achieved, therefore more land will need to be provided.	

Table 2.7

Suggested Sites - Other Land within Settlements	
<p>Part of Jennetts Park: SHLAA ref 66</p> <p>(on behalf of Persimmon & Redrow - promoters of site)</p>	
<p>Consider that should be using the SEP housing numbers (12,780 as opposed to Core strategy figure of 10,780), which requires the remaining dwellings to be found by 20026 at 5,626. PPS12 sets out that Regional Spatial Strategies form part of the Development Plan, and if guidance in one document is more up to date than another, that document should be given greater weight.</p>	<p>Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Justification for numbers as set out in the Background Paper is based on the 2006 household projections (11,000 increase between 2006-2026). Latest 2008 projections represents a 12,000 increase in households, meaning Core Strategy figure will fail to accommodate expected growth of 1,220 dwellings over the plan period.</p>	<p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p>
<p>Draft SHMA identifies a shortfall in affordable housing which will be compounded if lower housing number is progressed.</p>	<p>In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p>
<p>PPS3 advises windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply of housing. No exception local circumstances have been identified for inclusion of small windfall sites. SHLAA instead relies upon past trends. (On first site, average completions in last 6 years support 30 dwellings per year, but there is a trend of declining completion in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 due to the downturn in economy).</p>	<p>PPS3 states that an allowance for windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply unless justified. No windfall allowance is included for medium and large sites. The Council has a comprehensive set of data for permissions and completions on</p>

Suggested Sites - Other Land within Settlements

	<p>small sites, which has been analysed through SHLAA, and as a result, it is considered that a small site allowance of 30 net dwellings per year can be supported. In relation to advice in PPS3, the windfall allowance will no longer be included in the first 10 years supply (but will remain in the last 5 years supply).</p> <p>Action: amend figures to exclude small windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply.</p>
<p>Promoting part of Jennetts Park site (immediately adjacent to SHLAA site 106 - Peacock Bungalow) for 80-100 dwellings on a 2.5ha on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located within the settlement boundary. • Whilst the site is greenfield, it is sequentially preferable to all greenfield sites beyond the existing settlement boundary of Bracknell. • Site can be delivered as part of the wider planned Jennetts Park development (application 98/00288/OUT). • Jennetts Park unlikely to develop the full 1,500 dwellings anticipated projections, more realistic figure is 1,350. The proposed site will help to address this shortfall. • Site can be planned alongside Peacock Bungalow. • Site is immediately available for development, and can be developed quickly. • Site is located adjacent to proposed park and ride, which will enhance accessibility of the site, is also within Bracknell, the most sustainable settlement in the Borough. • Principle of development on the site has already been accepted (albeit for employment purposes). • Can deliver affordable housing (which would be more difficult on a smaller site). • Site is not needed for employment use. • Sufficient infrastructure in place to facilitate delivery of this site. 	<p>The permission granted for this area is not restricted solely to B1, in addition the Employment Land Review (ELR) (pg 41) shows that there will be a steady market for small and medium units. In conclusion (pg 43 of the ELR) it states that the future demand is likely to be predominately for small and medium units. Although this area at Jennetts Park does not form part of a protected employment area, there is no evidence that the small and medium sized units that would predominantly be located on the site are not needed, therefore, it is considered that the 0.5ha area of land, in accordance with the adopted masterplan (land parcel C4) would need to be retained for small business units use, should this site be redeveloped for housing (resulting in c2ha developable site area for residential).</p> <p>This site accords with point 3 of Core Strategy Policy CS2 (other land within defined settlements), and so residential development would be considered acceptable in principle.</p> <p>It is noted that the site is available. Full consideration of this site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>

Suggested Sites - Other Land within Settlements

- Any impact upon the SPA can be mitigated with SANG already available as part of the Jennetts Park development (surplus was provided).
- Development more likely to protect setting of adjoining listed building than the committed employment development. Approach already accepted in respect of proposed allocation of Peacock Bungalow.
- Site is contained by existing built development and roads, and would relate well to the recent residential development at Jennetts Park.

Site is currently committed for B1 employment use. There is no longer a need for employment in this site. The ELR recognised the need to maintain the balance between homes and jobs, and that office floor space in the Borough is heavily oversupplied, and recommends the reallocation of employment land to housing. This site does not form part of one of the established employment areas. Site adjoins Peacock Bungalow which is proposed to be allotted for housing which was similarly committed for employment development (07/00739/FUL). Site is in close proximity to other concentrations of employment such as town centre and employment development area.

Comments also made in relation to SA4, SA9, SA10, employment and retail sections.

See relevant sections of document for comments.

2.3 Edge of Settlement Sites

The table below shows a significant number of objections to the site at the junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield (in comparison to the other sites identified within Policy SA3). This is likely to be because a planning application for the site was being considered at the same time as the SADPD consultation.

A number of comments made in relation to the sites contained in Policy referred to the maps contained in the Preferred Option Appendices (Appendix 5 relating to profiles of edge of settlement sites and Appendix 9 relating to housing site settlement boundary changes proposals map extracts). For the purpose of summarising the main issues raised, these are summarised against the Policy.

The responses set out below make reference to:

- The Preferred Option Document: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/siteallocations/sadpdpo>
- Preferred Option Background Paper: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/1546196>
- Employment Lane Review: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/1209900>
- Core Strategy: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/corestrategy>
- Limiting the Impact of Development SPD: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/lid>
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/shlaa>
- Character Areas Assessment SPD: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/characterareas>
- Landscape Analysis (Kirkham, August 2011):

Further rationale on sites contained within the Preferred Option Policies and sites proposed through the Preferred Option consultation will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

Table 2.8 Residents Responses to Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
Support development of these sites	Noted.
Object to these sites as they were not identified in the Core Strategy	The sites were not originally identified in the Core Strategy, however, one of the main functions of the Site Allocations Document is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need. The use of extensions to settlements to provide additional housing rather than a new settlement follows the development principles
All edge of settlement sites should be resisted as they create precedents for further development	
Object to development of these sites as they are 'greenfield'	

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Edge of settlement sites are at the bottom of the priority sequence as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2, and therefore options 1, 2 and 3 should be exhausted before any consideration is given to extending settlement boundaries and building on the edge of settlements (option 4) should not remain an option.</p>	<p>set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. Allocation of land on edge of settlement sites would accord with point 4 of Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. The Council is giving priority to land within the defined settlement, and previously developed land, however there are insufficient sites available to meet the overall requirement.</p> <p>Points 1-3 of the Policy have been investigated, by sites being promoted through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The suitability of such sites has been considered through the earlier Issues and Options consultation. There are insufficient suitable and available sites for allocation within the defined settlement for allocation. Those identified as being suitable and available, resulted in the sites listed in Policies SA1 and SA2 of the Preferred Option Document. The rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of sites within the defined settlement was set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 34-57). The rationale for inclusion/exclusion of sites in edge of settlement locations was set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 58-87).</p> <p>Any sites to be allocated on edge of settlement locations will result in a change to the settlement boundary as shown on the Proposals Map. Therefore it is not considered that this would create a precedent for edge of settlement sites outside of the plan-led process, although it should be noted that each application would be dealt with on its own merits.</p>
<p>No indication of where the access into the site would be.</p>	<p>This matter would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield: SHLAA ref 93	
<p>It should be noted that a number of comments made about this site were in response to a planning application (ref 10/00770/OUT) that had been submitted, for example the design of the housing being out of character with the surroundings. A 'non-determination' appeal has now been lodged against this application, which will be considered later on this year (2011).</p>	<p>These detailed matters are issues for any subsequent planning application, any application would be expected to have regard to the character of the area, and would be assessed in line with relevant policies that are in place, at the time the application is submitted. An appeal on grounds of non-determination was lodged, and since been withdrawn.</p> <p>Note: A subsequent planning application for 23 dwellings was submitted in August 2011 (11/00611/OUT) and is pending consideration.</p>
<p>Query why the proposal (ref 10/00770/OUT) is being dealt with separately but at a similar time - is this in the hope that it gets missed by residents? (Also some confusion as application is for 22 houses, yet Site Allocations document indicates 31).</p>	<p>The Council cannot control when planning applications are submitted for consideration, and also require them to relate to the number of units set out in the Site Allocations Preferred Option document.</p>
<p>Impact upon existing infrastructure which is already unable to cope/insufficient infrastructure proposed to support the development (traffic, schools, health).</p>	<p>Any application would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005 in relation to Planning Obligations (July 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant to planning • necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms • directly related to the proposed development • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development • reasonable in all other respects. <p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance these policies.</p>
<p>A previous application turned down due to effect on character of the village, there has been no change since the previous appeal - what is different now?</p>	<p>A previous appeal was dismissed on this site in 1997. However, this consideration was in the context that it was not allocated for housing, and so was assessed against countryside policies, and also during a different plan period, under a different set of circumstances. Since the consideration of the appeal, more up to date landscape assessment work has been completed, with additional landscape work having been undertaken since the the publication of the Preferred Option (which will be referred to in the Draft Submission Background Paper).</p>
<p>Development would be contrary to PPG2 applying to green belts.</p>	<p>PPG2 is not application to the consideration of this site, as the site is not within the Green Belt.</p>
<p>This land is outside the settlement and within the countryside, therefore should be protected for its own sake in accordance with Policy EN8 of the BFBLP and CS9 of the BFBCS/Edge of settlement sites are at the bottom of the priority sequence as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.</p>	<p>The sites were not originally identified in the Core Strategy, however, one of the main functions of the Site Allocations Document is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p>
<p>The application is premature pending the review of the settlement boundary which is currently under consideration/will set a precedent.</p>	<p>The use of extensions to settlements to provide additional housing rather than a new settlement follows the development principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. Allocation of land on edge of settlement sites would accord with point 4 of Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. The Council is giving priority to land within the defined settlement, and</p>
<p>Should use brownfield sites first before greenfield.</p>	

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The application is premature pending the review of the settlement boundary which is currently under consideration.</p>	<p>previously developed land, however there are insufficient sites available to meet the overall requirement.</p>
<p>Would set a precedent for other greenfield sites adjoining Binfield.</p>	<p>Points 1-3 of the Policy have been investigated, by sites being promoted through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The suitability of such sites has been considered through the earlier Issues and Options consultation. There are insufficient suitable and available sites for allocation within the defined settlement for allocation. Those identified as being suitable and available, resulted in the sites listed in Policies SA1 and SA2 of the Preferred Option Document.</p> <p>Any sites to be allocated on edge of settlement locations will result in a change to the settlement boundary as shown on the Proposals Map. Therefore it is not considered that this would create a precedent for edge of settlement sites outside of the plan-led process, although it should be noted that each application would be dealt with on its own merits.</p>
<p>Loss of local rural areas.</p>	
<p>Object to the proposed development because it is on 'greenfield' land/loss of countryside.</p>	
<p>Should be considering unused office blocks and redeveloping the Town Centre instead of building in the countryside.</p>	<p>The Council must plan for a balance of growth in housing and employment over the plan period, to allow for people to live and work in the Borough should they choose and to seek to reduce levels of in- and out-commuting in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's Employment Land Review has concluded that there is a significant over-supply of employment space (in the form of offices) in Bracknell, and in light of this the SADPD does not propose any major new allocations of land for employment use. However there does therefore remain a residual need to allocate land for housing. In preparing the SADPD consideration has been</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>given to the potential reuse of existing office floorspace and some areas of employment land have been allocated for residential development, for example land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell, under Policy SA1 and land north of Cain Road, Binfield under Policy SA2. In addition it is proposed to deallocate the Old Bracknell Lane West area to allow for residential development at The Depot, and an area south of Eastern Road (along Broad Lane), and this will also make it easier for non-employment uses to come forward in this area over the plan period. There are a number of reasons why some other employment sites have not been identified including sites that form important parts of existing employment areas, sites that are poorly located for residential use, and/or sites whose owners are not interested in using them for housing.</p> <p>The regeneration of Bracknell town centre continues to be a key priority for the Council. There remains a significant number of major employers in the town and it is envisaged that the town centre regeneration will create a more positive image and facilitate new employment opportunities.</p>
<p>Will reduce the gap between Wokingham and Binfield.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the site forms part of the gap between the settlements of Binfield, Bracknell and Wokingham, as it would constitute infilling of a site which is bound by housing on its east and south sides with a dwelling on the north-west corner. It is separated from the surrounding countryside by 2 roads. The site is outside of the strategic 'gap' as shown in the Entec study (2006).</p> <p>Where the recommendations of the Character Areas SPD refer to the two gaps which help to retain the rural setting and character of</p>
<p>Proposal conflicts with the Character Area Assessment SPD which recommends that the two gaps either side of Binfield be retained.</p>	

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Binfield, this is a general principle, and does not specifically refer to Site 93 (this site) which lies outside of these gaps.</p>
<p>Object: density of housing would destroy countryside character of the approach to the village.</p>	<p>The proposals are for 33 dwellings per hectare (SHLAA site 93). This is not considered to be high density. The density proposal for this site (SHLAA site 93) is based on a reduced site area being developable (0.95ha out of a 1.3ha site) due to the existing trees on the site.</p>
<p>The density of the proposed housing is too high and would detract from neighbouring houses. In particular, despite the finger of public amenity land between the existing and proposed houses the houses would have a back-to-back nature. The houses would also be overlooked, with unacceptable loss of privacy</p>	<p>The development would be partly screened by the retention of existing tree cover around the site and could be supplemented with additional planting. Retention of trees at this site is already a requirement as set out in the profile of this site (Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option).</p>
<p>Type of housing proposed and density is not in keeping with existing detached houses elsewhere in Binfield.</p>	<p>In light of additional landscape evidence (Kirkham, August 2011), a reduced density would assist in maintaining a softer edge to Binfield at this point. A review of the density and number of units proposed for the site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: If it is considered appropriate to reduce the density and corresponding number of units on the site, this will need to be reflected in the Draft Submission version of Policy SA3.</p>
<p>Object as would involve loss of TPO'd trees</p>	<p>Any development of the site would need have regard to existing protected trees on site, and seek to retain and protect them as part of development proposals. The proposal for this site (SHLAA site 93) is based on a reduced site area being developable (0.95ha out of a 1.3ha site) due to the existing trees on the site. The tree belt along Forest Road is noted as a key characteristic within landscape</p>

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>studies and would need to be retained. This requirement is already set out in the profile of this site (Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option), however could be updated also refer to Foxley Lane and supplemented with additional planting.</p> <p>Action: amend profile of site to read:</p> <p>"Retention of important trees and additional planting along existing roadsides to preserve the landscape setting and provide visual mitigation".</p>
<p>No consideration has been given to the character of Binfield and how the new developments would affect it.</p>	<p>The impact of the character of the area has been considered. The area is not as sensitive as the wider area as a whole due to its partial enclosure within the surrounding housing in Binfield. Understorey planting along existing roads provide scope for screening, and retention of the rural character of the roads. The site is considered to relate well to the existing built form. However, in the light of additional evidence to support the SADPD and information provided on the planning application, the capacity of the site will be reconsidered. Any changes will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>The site is currently a transition landscape between the existing built form of the settlement and open countryside to the north and west. The site does not share the open rural characteristics of the landscape to the north and west. The rural character of the approach to Binfield can be protected through the retention of the existing tree buffer (exclusion from development footprint) to provide screening and a soft rural edge to the settlement boundary, therefore, it is not considered that allocation of this site would create a hard edge to the settlement. There</p>
<p>Site is strategically important as a gateway to Binfield (also partly opposite cricket ground, so has implications to the heritage of Binfield as a village).</p>	
<p>Development in this location would impact upon the perception of Binfield as a village.</p>	
<p>This development will detract from the character and landscape of the village because it will alter the appearance of the approach to the village.</p>	
<p>Would be contrary to objectives to maintain the character of the area.</p>	
<p>Would be detrimental to the rural gateway to Binfield Village.</p>	
<p>Would create a hard edge to the settlement.</p>	
<p>The proposed development would result in a loss of visual amenity / loss of a beautiful landscape</p>	

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Erection of housing in this location would be wrong on this strategic approach into Binfield as it would result in an aesthetic change to the settlement boundary (new houses, loss of protected trees).</p>	<p>are already two properties on the corner of the site, which mark the entrance to Binfield and introduces urban form to this part of Forest Road/Foxley Lane.</p>
<p>The finger of public amenity land would not provide adequate screening.</p>	<p>The implications of these matters will be considered and if appropriate the capacity/requirements of the site will be adjusted, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Document Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: If it is considered appropriate to reduce the density and corresponding number of units on the site, this will need to be reflected in the Draft Submission version of Policy SA3.</p>
<p>No consideration has been given to the local heritage of Binfield and how the new developments would affect it.</p>	<p>The Landscape Capacity Study (2010) took account of local heritage assets. Additional landscape work has also been undertaken, since the publication of the Preferred Option, which forms part of the updated evidence base (Kirkham, August 2011).</p> <p>A proposal for designation of the Wicks Green Conservation Area was consulted upon (post consultation on the SADPD Preferred Option). Subsequently a decision has been taken by the Executive Member for Planning, Transport & Economic Development (on 16th August 2011) not to approve Wicks Green as a Conservation Area (http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=1354)</p> <p>In any case, as the south side of Forest Road is already developed, it is not considered that development would impact upon the wider area.</p>

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>It will mark an obvious intrusion into the open countryside directly adjoining a designated Ramblers Route.</p>	<p>The site is contained by Foxley Lane and Forest Road, together with houses on the corner, and existing tree and hedge boundary, which all separate this site from the wider countryside.</p> <p>The development does not abut a public right of way, nor would it be visible from Angel Farm to the north. Where the Ramblers Route passes the site, it follows Foxley Lane, where it already passes housing on the eastern side.</p>
<p>Would be contrary to BFC's own Character Areas Assessment (small scale infill should respect existing building lines and boundary treatment, open landscape on either side of Binfield together with open character of Popeswood north should be retained to maintain rural setting and distinctive character of Binfield, maintain strong links with rural setting, retain key views, retain transitional character of Foxley Lane).</p>	<p>The site does not adjoin any of the Binfield-Popeswood Study areas as contained in the Character Areas Assessment SPD (March 2010). The closest character area (Binfield A) lies 0.5km to the east. Modern housing separates this site from character Area A.</p> <p>The recommendations of the SPD require the retention of the character of Foxley Lane. Development on the site can be achieved without harming the rural character west of Area A along Forest Road through the exclusion of boundary trees from the development footprint.</p> <p>This requirement is already set out in the profile of this site (Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option), however could be updated also refer to Foxley Lane and supplemented with additional planting.</p> <p>Action: amend profile of site to read:</p> <p>"Retention of important trees and additional planting along existing roadsides, to preserve the landscape setting and provide visual mitigation".</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed development will increase the likelihood of flooding in the adjacent areas</p>	<p>The Environment Agency were consulted on the Preferred Option and had no objection to the allocation of the site, although commented SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage) will be a development consideration of the site. These matters would be considered through the Development Management process.</p>
<p>Development of this site will likely lead to flooding of the A329(M) as it is lower lying than the site</p>	
<p>Development needs to consider impact of flooding/capacity of drainage ditches/surface water runoff.</p>	
<p>Construction of the development would create nuisance to local residents</p>	<p>Nuisance and disturbance is dealt with by Environmental Health legislation.</p>
<p>The footpath through Roughgrove Copse would make it into a pedestrian thoroughfare, detracting from its present secluded character</p>	<p>The Preferred Option does not include a detailed site layout, which would need to be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Many of these comments relate to the planning application (10/00770/OUT) which was under consideration during the Preferred Option consideration.</p>
<p>The footway from the site is on one side of the road only and is narrow, and therefore is inadequate in providing safe means of pedestrian access to the town centre</p>	
<p>The proposed pedestrian access through Roughgrove Copse will result in increased parking there, especially as a result of parents dropping off and collecting their children from Binfield Primary School</p>	
<p>The junction which is proposed to allow access will create more congestion and result in more accidents. The sight lines are inadequate</p>	
<p>Object as would increase congestion and risk of accidents on local road infrastructure</p>	
<p>The roads are too narrow to be able to make safe for this number of additional cars.</p>	<p>Detailed access design is not considered through the Preferred Option, and is a matter that would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Any application for redevelopment of the site would need to be accompanied by some form of Transport Assessment to address the impact of the proposals upon the local road network.</p>
<p>Coupled with site 24, increased congestion/risk of accidents/risk to local residents.</p>	
<p>Would result in increased traffic and pollution.</p>	

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Provision of improved public transport unlikely to directly benefit new residents/people that would live there would use it, more likely to use cars.	
No indication of where the access into the site would be.	
Roads around the site have dangerous access points.	
Location of site does not comply with criteria for having good public transport links/poor access to public transport.	
Development in this location would be inconsistent with the character, accessibility and provision of services in the area.	
Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield	<p>The Council must continue to plan for housing, including the allocation of strategic sites , in order to secure a supply of land for housing. One of the main functions of the SADPD is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p> <p>Where suitable sites are available in other parts of the Borough these have been identified in accordance with the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2, through the SHLAA process and through sustainability assessment. It will not be possible to accommodate the necessary development to meet the Borough's needs without using some land on the the edge of the urban areas.</p>
Object to housing in Binfield at Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain, Foxley Lane/Forest Road and East of Murrell Hill Lane, as surely the houses you have already agreed to build at Amen Corner are enough?	
Would object to this site (& site 24) if it wasn't also proposed to develop Blue Mountain and Amen Corner north.	
Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 122 & 300	
Object to inclusion of land within the garden of Forest View, Longhill Road, in this site	Upon reviewing the boundaries of SHLAA sites 137 and 122, it can be confirmed that there is an overlap between the two sites, and

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The boundaries for these three sites are not clear, and need checking - some of the proposed development appears to be within the back gardens of properties who had no idea this process was happening. Not all the land shown is therefore available for development.</p>	<p>clarification on the extent of ownership of these sites is being sought. Additionally, as result of consultation on the Preferred Option, it has been confirmed that part of site 122 is not available for development. Following the outcome ownership investigation, the site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).</p> <p>Since the publication of the Preferred Option, additional landscape work (Kirkham, August 2011) has been undertaken which will inform the capacity/requirements of the site, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: combine this site with 137 (Sandbanks), correct site area, and amend capacity of new site. In light of corrections of boundaries to the site and updated landscape evidence, any reductions in density and capacity of the site will need to be reflected in the Draft Submission version of Policy SA3.</p>
<p>Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, South of Foxley Lane and North of September Cottage, Binfield: SHLAA ref 24</p>	
<p>Impact upon existing infrastructure which is already unable to cope/insufficient infrastructure proposed to support the development (traffic, schools, health).</p>	<p>Any application would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005 in relation to Planning Obligations (July 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant to planning • necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly related to the proposed development • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development • reasonable in all other respects. <p>Core Strategy Policy CS6 relates to 'limiting the impact of development', and sets out that development alone or in-combination with other proposals will contribute to the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth in the Borough and will mitigate adverse impacts on communities, transport and the environment. The Council has an adopted 'Limiting the Impact of Development' Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007). The development of this site would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with these policies.</p>
<p>Development on this site has already been refused by the planning Inspector/no change since previous appeal decisions.</p>	<p>A previous appeal was dismissed on this site in 2000. However, this consideration was in the context that it was not allocated for housing, and so was assessed against countryside policies, and also during a different plan period, under a different set of circumstances. Since the consideration of the appeal, more up to date landscape assessment work has been completed, with additional landscape work having been undertaken since the the publication of the Preferred Option (which will be referred to in the Draft Submission Background Paper).</p>
<p>The development would destroy areas of green belt which are protected and which separate Binfield and Bracknell/Wokingham</p>	<p>The site and surrounding area does not form part of the Green Belt.</p>
<p>This land is outside the settlement and within the countryside, therefore should be protected for its own sake in accordance with Policy EN8 of the BFBLP and CS9 of the</p>	<p>The sites were not originally identified in the Core Strategy, however, one of the main functions of the Site Allocations Document is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need.</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
BFBCS/Edge of settlement sites are at the bottom of the priority sequence as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.	<p>The use of extensions to settlements to provide additional housing rather than a new settlement follows the development principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.</p> <p>Allocation of land on edge of settlement sites would accord with point 4 of Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. The Council is giving priority to land within the defined settlement, and previously developed land, however there are insufficient sites available to meet the overall requirement.</p> <p>Points 1-3 of the Policy have been investigated, by sites being promoted through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The suitability of such sites has been considered through the earlier Issues and Options consultation. There are insufficient suitable and available sites for allocation within the defined settlement for allocation. Those identified as being suitable and available, resulted in the sites listed in Policies SA1 and SA2 of the Preferred Option Document.</p> <p>Any sites to be allocated on edge of settlement locations will result in a change to the settlement boundary as shown on the Proposals Map. Therefore it is not considered that this would create a precedent for edge of settlement sites outside of the plan-led process, although it should be noted that each application would be dealt with on its own merits.</p>
Should use brownfield sites first before greenfield.	
Would set a precedent for other greenfield sites adjoining Binfield.	
Loss of local rural areas.	
Object to the proposed development because it is on 'greenfield' land/loss of countryside.	
Should be considering unused office blocks and redeveloping the Town Centre instead of building in the countryside.	<p>The Council must plan for a balance of growth in housing and employment over the plan period, to allow for people to live and work in the Borough should they choose and to seek to reduce levels of in- and out-commuting in the Borough.</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The Council's Employment Land Review has concluded that there is a significant over-supply of employment space (in the form of offices) in Bracknell, and in light of this the SADPD does not propose any major new allocations of land for employment use. However there does therefore remain a residual need to allocate land for housing. In preparing the SADPD consideration has been given to the potential reuse of existing office floorspace and some areas of employment land have been allocated for residential development, for example land to the north of Eastern Road, Bracknell, under Policy SA1 and land north of Cain Road, Binfield under Policy SA2. In addition it is proposed to deallocate the Old Bracknell Lane West area to allow for residential development at The Depot, and an area south of Eastern Road (along Broad Lane), and this will also make it easier to non-employment uses to come forward in this area over the plan period. There are a number of reasons why some other employment sites have not been identified including sites that form important parts of existing employment areas, sites that are poorly located for residential use, and/or sites whose owners are not interested in using them for housing.</p> <p>The regeneration of Bracknell town centre continues to be a key priority for the Council. There remain a significant number of major employers in the town and it is envisaged that the town centre regeneration will create a more positive image and facilitate new employment opportunities.</p>
<p>Proposal conflicts with the Character Area Assessment SPD which recommends that the two gaps either side of Binfield be retained</p>	<p>It is not considered that the site forms part of the gap between the settlements of Binfield, Bracknell and Wokingham. The existing built</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>form along Murrell Hill Lane currently separates the open countryside to the west from the settlement to the east.</p>
<p>No consideration has been given to the character of Binfield and how the new developments would affect it</p>	<p>The impact of the character of the area has been considered. Views into the site are limited, and there is potential to provide additional planting, retain existing planting, particularly along Murrell Hill Lane (which would accord with the aims of the Character Areas Assessment SPD which seeks to retain mature trees). The site is considered to relate well to the existing wider built form, with the northern part of the site semi-urban in character.</p> <p>The site abuts two of the Binfield Character Areas as set out in the Character Areas Assessment SPD (March 2010), Area B, and area A at the southerly most tip. Additional landscape work has also been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option (Kirkham, August 2011), which forms part of the updated evidence base. Area A notes that development on extant rural plots may lead to a loss of links with the rural setting, and also seeks to retain the rural character of Foxley Lane. The extent of the red line area of Site 24 (as well as the developer's concept plan for the site provided as part of their response to the Preferred Option) includes development adjacent to the SPD character areas (areas 1 & 9 of developer's plan). These could impact upon the rural character of Foxley Lane. The updated landscape evidence recommends small scale development in these areas so long as it respects existing building lines and boundary treatment, and adheres to the character description in the SPD. It also recommends omitting the small area of land adjacent to 'Semmering' (area 9 of developer concept plan). Given that this frontage area would be used to gain vehicular access to the site, is</p>
<p>Development of this site would lead to intrusion to the Countryside and would be visible from public viewpoints adjoining the site.</p>	
<p>The development would harm the character and appearance of the village and its relationship with the adjoining countryside.</p>	
<p>Would create a hard edge to the settlement.</p>	
<p>This development will detract from the character and landscape of the village.</p>	
<p>Would be contrary to BFC's own Character Areas Assessment (small scale infill should respect existing building lines and boundary treatment, open landscape on either side of Binfield together with open character of Popeswood north should be retained to maintain rural setting and distinctive character of Binfield, maintain strong links with rural setting, retain key views, retain transitional character of Foxley Lane).</p>	

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>likely that only limited development could take place in this area, other than new landscaping and the access road, and possibly one infill frontage dwelling (depending on space and character considerations). It also recommends that area 1 of the developer concept plan (eastern edge of the site adjacent to Woodies Close/properties fronting St Marks Road) includes a requirement to continue the area of SPD areas A and B into this area.</p> <p>Views from Murrell Hill Lane, a Ramblers Route, are important, but are limited. Any visual impact could be mitigated through proposals for open space and additional planting along the western side of the site (see below).</p> <p>There are already several properties along Murrell Hill Lane, which separates the settlement to the east with the countryside to the west. The existing tree buffer would provide screening and a soft rural edge to the settlement boundary, therefore, it is not considered that allocation of this site would create a hard edge to the settlement. This would also be avoided through the provision of open space alongside Murrell Hill Lane. This requirement for tree retention is already set out in the profile of this site (Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option), however could be updated also refer to additional planting, and provision of open space.</p> <p>It is considered possible to develop the site without loss of key landscape and visual features of the site, and without have a negative impact upon the setting of the adjoining area to the south or west. If appropriate the capacity/requirements of the site will be adjusted, which will be set out in the Draft Submission Document Background Paper.</p>

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Action: amend profile of site to read:</p> <p>"Retention of important trees/understorey planting and additional planting along existing roadsides, to preserve the landscape setting and provide visual mitigation".</p> <p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>"Provision of open space along side Murrell Hill lane in order to preserve character of Murrell Hill Lane and the landscape setting of the area".</p> <p>Action: amend profile of site to read:</p> <p>"Have regard to the location of the site adjacent to Binfield Areas A and B of the Character Areas Assessment Supplementary Planning Document and take account of the recommendations relating to these areas".</p>
<p>No consideration has been given to the local heritage of Binfield and how the new developments would affect it</p>	<p>There are no heritage interests specific to this site. The character of the village and heritage were considered in the Landscape Capacity Study (2010), which was also informed by the Character Areas SPD (March 2010). Character considerations are included in the profile for this site (Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option).</p>
<p>The roads are too narrow to be able to make safe for this number of additional cars.</p>	<p>Detailed access design is not considered through the Preferred Option, and is a matter that would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p>
<p>It may not be possible to achieve the necessary visibility splays to ensure a safe access to the site. An additional junction</p>	

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
serving 67 homes and the associated vehicle activity this generates could result in highway danger to the local area.	Any application for redevelopment of the site would need to be accompanied by some form of Transport Assessment to address the impact of the proposals upon the local road network.
Coupled with site 93, increased congestion/risk of accidents/risk to local residents.	
Would result in increased traffic and pollution.	
Provision of improved public transport unlikely to directly benefit new residents/people that would live there would use it, more likely to use cars.	
No indication of where the access into the site would be.	
Roads around the site have dangerous access points.	
Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield	The Council must continue to plan for housing, including the allocation of strategic sites , in order to secure a supply of land for housing. One of the main functions of the SA DPD is to allocate sites to meet the Borough's housing need. Where suitable sites are available in other parts of the Borough these have been identified in accordance with the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2, through the SHLAA process and through sustainability assessment. It will not be possible to accommodate the necessary development to meet the Borough's needs without using some land on the the edge of the urban areas.
Object to housing in Binfield at Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain, Foxley Lane/Forest Road and East of Murrell Hill Lane, as surely the houses you have already agreed to build at Amen Corner are enough?	
Would object to this site (& site 93) if it wasn't also proposed to develop Blue Mountain and Amen Corner north.	

<p>Policy SA3</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>White Cairns, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne: SHLAA ref 34</p>	
<p>This site with 24-30 Sandhurst Road, questions why improvements are allowed, will lead to ribbon development to the detriment of existing residential amenities.</p>	<p>White Cairns already contains a building on site, it is not considered that replacement of this building with a single residential block would result in ribbon development.</p>
<p>Concerned that trees would not be protected alongside (eastern) boundary with 133 Dukes Ride, which act as a buffer between the two sites. (questions why reference is made to trees along the front and western boundaries only).</p>	<p>Whilst the Preferred Option Background Paper makes specific reference to retention of trees along the road frontage and western boundary, which was to retain a soft edge to the settlement boundary. The Profile of the site contained in Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option document includes the statement "have regard to trees and adjacent to the site". Which relates to trees along all boundaries.</p> <p>However, it is considered that an additional requirement should be added for the site in relation to a tree survey, and enhancement of tree cover.</p> <p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p> <p>Appropriate tree surveys and protection of trees</p> <p>Amend existing criteria "have regard to trees within and adjacent to the site" to:</p> <p>Retention of important trees and additional planting along existing boundaries, to preserve the landscape setting and provide visual mitigation</p>
<p>Consider 16 units is too much for the site in terms of associated cars, parking, noise etc.</p>	<p>A single block would be in keeping with Character Area B of the adopted Character Areas Assessment SPD.</p>

Policy SA3 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Do not consider that flats are appropriate for this site - not in keeping with the village design statement, already too many in Crowthorne.	The rationale will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Object to the loss of OSPV on the site.	The designation does not preclude development within the OSPV.
Development would need to have regard to biodiversity.	Noted - this is a requirement for the site as set out in Appendix 5 of the Preferred Option document.
Specific Consultee Comments	
See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Binfield Parish Council, Winkfield Parish Council, Environment Agency, Thames Water, Binfield Village Protection Society and Chavey Down Residents Association.	See responses to specific consultee comments.

Table 2.9 Developer Responses to Edge of Settlement Sites

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Land east of Murrell Hill Lane and South of Foxley Road: SHLAA ref 24 (Croudace Strategic Ltd - owner of site)	
Housing numbers in Core Strategy should be seen as a minimum target, approach to housing should be flexible. Housing numbers in the SEP should be a material consideration in the SADPD (which is 2,000 homes higher than the Core Strategy of 10,780)	Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.
Non-specified small sites are windfall in accordance with PPS3, and should not be included in the first 10 years supply.	

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p> <p>PPS3 states that an allowance for windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply unless justified. No windfall allowance is included for medium and large sites. Whilst the Council has a comprehensive set of data for permissions and completions on small sites, which has been analysed through SHLAA, and as a result, it is considered that a small site allowance of 30 net dwellings per year can be supported, in relation to advice in PPS3, the windfall allowance no longer be included in the first 10 years supply (but will remain in the last 5 years supply).</p> <p>Action: amend figures to exclude small windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply.</p>
<p>Flexibility is welcomed, although considers 'weighting' in the phases which delay the large numbers to later phases is not an appropriate approach, each phase should be allocated an equal amount of development, small/medium/greenfield sites could be bought forward to the first phase to help address the shortfall.</p>	<p>Noted - this is addressed in responses to Policy SA10 (Phasing and Delivery).</p>

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to proposed phasing of SHLAA site 24 (Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, South of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield) which is not to be released for development until 2015. The completion rates expected in the early phases of the plan period are optimistic, and the Council has rightly recognised the contribution that small and medium sized sites will make to the housing land supply position. There is no reason why the site should not be released for development immediately, even in advance of adoption of the SADPD.</p>	<p>This is an edge of settlement site involving land that is currently designated as countryside. It is therefore dependent on a change in policy which is dependent on the progression of the SADPD through to adoption in 2013. It is also dependent on the provision of some infrastructure.</p> <p>However, in recognition of the need to incorporate more flexibility and respond positively to development proposals, it has been decided to remove the phasing policy (formerly SA10) from the SADPD. A housing trajectory will be included for the plan period that will set out the rate of expected delivery from all sites, including this site, taking into consideration the points made in the above para.</p> <p>It is noted that the developer wishes to commence the development as soon as is possible, possibly in advance of the SADPD. It will be up to the developer to demonstrate that any proposal meets the criteria set out in paras. 71 and 69 of PPS3 if he wishes to progress the site under the current circumstance i.e. lack of an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites.</p> <p>ACTION: Remove phasing policy. Site will remain in housing trajectory giving an indication of expected years of completion</p>
<p>Support identification of this site, and associated change to the settlement boundary, as it is well suited to accommodate housing and is well integrated with the settlement pattern of the village, would not encroach into the open countryside, or be visually dominant in the landscape.</p>	<p>Noted. Site would not be prominent in open countryside or be visually dominant in the wider landscape, subject to the proposed open space along Murrell Hill Lane (see response to residents comments, above).</p> <p>Action: add additional requirement to profile of site:</p>

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	"Provision of open space along side Murrell Hill lane in order to preserve character of Murrell Hill Lane and the landscape setting of the area".
Capacity of site in the policy (67) is considered to be less than the true capacity of the site. Master planning work undertaken indicates a capacity of 77 dwellings at 35dph on a net developable area of 2.20ha, with 0.77ha of on site open space. (see separate master planning documents provided with this submission).	The site area will be reviewed and checked which may alter the capacity of the site. This will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
Also made comments in relation to SA4, SA7, SA8, SA9 & SA10.	See relevant Policies for these comments.
Land east of Murrell Hill Lane and South of Foxley Road: SHLAA ref 24 (Charles Church - Promoters of SHLAA ref 251)	
Object to this site due to the conflict with a number of the Council's own criteria. Development on this site will result in an obvious intrusion into the open countryside, and will be evident from public view points around the site (most notable Murrell Hill Lane). The undulating countryside that currently provides an attractive setting for this part of Binfield would be lost, affecting the character/appearance of the village and its relationship with adjoining countryside. Due to single lane nature of Murrell Hill Lane, it is assumed that access will need to be taken by Foxley Lane. Additional junction serving 67 homes is likely to result in a highway danger to local area.	It is considered possible to develop the site without loss of key landscape and visual features of the site, and without have a negative impact upon the setting of the adjoining area to the south or west. See responses to residents comments on density/character set out above.
White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne: SHLAA ref 34 (Wellington College/Eagle House School - owners of site)	
Support the inclusion of the site for 16 dwellings.	Noted.

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield: SHLAA ref 93 (Owners of site)	
Qualitas Consultants Ltd have an option with Queensmere Properties who own the site (1.26ha). Supportive of the approach to housing set out in para 2.1 and Policy SA3.	Noted.
There have been significant changes in planning policy at all levels since the site was considered by Inspectors in respect of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan and an appeal.	Agreed. A previous appeal was dismissed on this site in 1997. However, this consideration was in the context that it was not allocated for housing, and so was assessed against countryside policies, and also during a different plan period, under a different set of circumstances. Since the consideration of the appeal, more up to date landscape assessment work has been completed.
The site is available, achievable and deliverable.	Noted that the site is available.
In the light of a lack of 5 year land supply, it is considered appropriate to deliver this site quickly.	
A planning application (10/00770/OUT) has been submitted in respect of development of the site for 22 units and includes all the necessary technical assessments e.g Landscape Assessment, Transport Assessment.	Noted. This site is given further consideration within the Draft Submission Background Paper, including additional Landscape work which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.
The capacity estimate needs to take account of local circumstances. The planning application proposes 22 dwellings due to the results of detailed technical assessments. There's a need to allow mitigation areas for Great Crested Newts in accordance with the Habitat Regs and retain key trees, especially those along the frontage of Forest Road. There's also a need to take account of	An appeal on grounds of non-determination was lodged in relation to this application, and has since been withdrawn.

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
highway considerations, landscape/visual impact and the character of Roughgrove Copse.	
<p>Charles Church (Promoters of SHLAA ref 251) in relation to Site 93</p>	
<p>Object to site, as it would be apparent from the two highways which adjoin the site. Proposed allocation would introduce a very apparent and result in a sudden introduction of comparatively high density housing, and will mark an obvious intrusion into open countryside directly adjoining a designated ramblers route.</p>	<p>See responses to residents comments on density/character set out above.</p>
<p>Dolyhir/Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Bracknell: SHLAA ref 122 & 300 (On behalf of owners of site)</p>	
<p>Support the inclusion of the sites 122 & 300 in SADPD Preferred Option</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>SHLAA ref 122 (On behalf of Forest View, Long Hill Road)</p>	
<p>Do not wish land to be included as part of allocation.</p>	<p>Noted. The site boundaries and associated site areas/capacities will be amended accordingly, which will be reflected in the SHLAA Monitoring Report (base date 2011), and the next stage of document production (Site Allocations Draft Submission and associated Background Paper).</p>

Table 2.10 Suggested Edge of Settlement Sites (Omission Sites)

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
<p>More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>	
<p>SHLAA site 70: The Rough, New Road, Ascot</p> <p>(On behalf of site owner, WJ Channing & Sons (Woking) Ltd)</p>	
<p>SADPD relies upon a small windfall allowance - these should not be included in first 10 year ' land supply, therefore relies upon unidentified sites should be avoided in SADPD.</p>	<p>The Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p> <p>PPS3 states that an allowance for windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply unless justified. No windfall allowance is included for medium and large sites. Whilst the Council has a comprehensive set of data for permissions and completions on small sites, which has been analysed through SHLAA, and as a result, it is considered that a small site allowance of 30 net dwellings per year can be supported, in relation to advice in PPS3, the windfall allowance no longer be included in the first 10 years supply (but will remain in the last 5 years supply).</p> <p>Action: amend figures to exclude small windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply.</p>
<p>Do not consider the site meets the five purposes of Green Belt set out in PPG2.</p>	<p>The site is located within the Green Belt. It is not proposed to make any changes to the Green Belt boundary, which would require a review of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, this site would remain within the Green Belt. The rationale for the exclusion of the site is set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (page 85) and continues to apply to this site.</p>
<p>Object to omission of this site as it would represent a logical 'rounding off' of the settlement boundary and is in a highly sustainable location with access to a wide range of facilities.</p>	<p>As this site is within the Green Belt, which the Council is not reviewing at this stage, this site does not form part of the updated landscape evidence relating to 'omission' sites.</p>
<p>The inability of the SADPD to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy without relying on windfall, represents the special circumstances justifying release of the land from the Green Belt. The site is not considered to meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2</p>	<p>As this site is within the Green Belt, which the Council is not reviewing at this stage, this site does not form part of the updated landscape evidence relating to 'omission' sites.</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

SHLAA Site 90 Land North of Tilehurst Lane Binfield (site not within SADPD Preferred Option)

(On behalf of site owner, Mr S Bedford)

This land was removed due to the changes in the housing target and the change in numbers on Blue Mountain Site rather than as a reflection of the merits of the land itself. Therefore site 90 should remain in consideration, particularly if policy SA7 is to be reviewed, revised or abandoned.

The rationale for the exclusion of this site was set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 72-73). The exclusion of the site was on the basis that it was not suitable as an edge of settlement site. The Issues and Options (Participation Consultation) consulted on larger Broad Areas, which were then refined as a result on consultation responses and other evidence. Whilst the Landscape Capacity Study (2010) identified the site has having potential for limited development adjacent to Tilehurst Lane, this was in the considered in isolation of any significant development elsewhere in Binfield, on it's own merits. The updated landscape evidence to support the Draft Submission document (Kirkham, August 2011) reconsiders the site in light of two major allocations in Binfield, it is considered that the loss of open countryside to the north of the village in addition to other planned development would result in too extensive a change to the rural setting of Binfield.

Site 90 should be reconsidered as:

- it has a large area of buildings on its northern edge (Ryslip Kennels) and therefore includes previously developed land;
- It is within easy reach of the existing cycle ways network;
- The boundary with Tilehurst Lane offers immediate access to existing infrastructure (adopted highway and mains utilities);
- Can be accessed with little or no effect on the substantial established tree screen along the boundary of Tilehurst Lane;
- Would be only minimally further from the Town Centre on foot that any development on the northern extremities of the Golf Course;

Whilst the site is available and outside of the 5km SPA boundary, this is not considered to outweigh harm of allocating this site for development.

It would extend the settlement east along Tilehurst Lane/Forest Road, and would not relate well to the existing settlement area, nor is it enclosed by other existing developments. The existing buildings (Ryslip Kennels) were taken into consideration as part of the previous Landscape Capacity Study (2010). Additional landscape evidence (Kirkham, August 2011) to support the Draft Submission document has been produced, which considers this site in further detail. The area has been identified as having key visual characteristics: open views out to the countryside and views down Tilehurst Lane, and development would block former views to these areas compromise views to

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

- Could be sensitively designed within the existing landscape without major detriment to the rural landscape to the north, which itself has been identified as not being of high visual value;
- Is outside the SPA 5km buffer;
- Is within 400m of the nearest bus-stop;
- Is possible to develop in the short term.

This site should be consider both on its own and as a practical alternative to the concentration of development on Blue Mountain Golf Course.

Church Lane. In light of the implications of other development planned in Binfield, additional development to the north of Tilehurst Lane would impact upon the rural setting of the village.

The site adjoins one of the Binfield Character Areas, which provides for a rural and distinctive character to Binfield. Land north of Tilehurst Lane provide open views out to the countryside, which provides a rural setting to Binfield Park and Binfield Manor, an rural setting to Tilehurst Lane, and a rural setting to east Binfield.

More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.

Plans showing possible layout options for the site at different densities please see pdf of submission, for the following options, based on dividing the site into 4 parcels:

- 90 (land on corner of Tilehurst Lane/Church Lane) comprising 2.372ha
- 90A (land to rear of Tile Cottage) comprising 0.632ha
- 90B (Ryslip Kennels) comprising 2.554ha
- 90C (Toll House) comprising 1.132ha

Option 1: Development Site 90 at 20dph = 47 units

Option 2: Develop Site 90 at 34dph = c 81 units

Option 3: Develop all parcels at 34dph = c230 units

Note: the developer subdivision of the site relates to 4 parcels (90, 90A, 90B and 90C) which covers the entirety of site 90 as included in SHLAA (equating to a total 6.7ha site).

Subdivision of the site into smaller parcels would not address the above concerns.

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

SHLAA Site 130: The Hideout, Old Wokingham Road

(On behalf of owner of site, Mrs M Bailey)

	<p>This representation was received in relation to paragraph 2.1.1 (housing provision for the Borough), however it relates to an edge of settlement location.</p> <p>More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>
<p>The Site Allocations DPD appears only to deal with standard housing provision, and does not identify any sites for specialist accommodation for the elderly. The Council has failed to identify any land to meet the growing needs of a large sector of the population, and for this reason is deficient.</p>	<p>It is recognised by the Council that the elderly population of the Borough is expected to increase over the plan period and Core Strategy Policy CS16 requires that a variety of housing types are planned for in the Borough. Care homes do not count towards the Council's housing provision, where they do not constitute use class C3 'residential' use</p>
<p>This site is ideally suited to deliver large scale accommodation in the form of a comprehensive specialist residential community with supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>However, it is not considered appropriate to allocate a site specifically for housing for the elderly. Homes for the elderly will</p>
<p>This form of development requires a large site to accommodate in the region of 150 units to deliver a range of assisted living facilities. If land is not specifically allocated, it is unlikely to be able to come forward through the Development Management process.</p>	<p>accommodated in the new urban extension sites, for example nursing homes at Broadmoor and a care home at TRL.</p>
<p>SHLAA site 165: Land south of The Limes, Forest Road, Warfield (On behalf of owners of site, Mr & Mrs Perfect)</p>	
	<p>It should be noted that as part of their submission, an additional site adjoining 'Land South of the Limes' has been promoted, and therefore site 165 is now larger than previously identified. This will be reflected in the SHLAA</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
	<p>Monitoring Report (base date March 2011) and the Draft Submission Document Background Paper.</p> <p>More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>
Support the concept of edge of settlement sites.	Noted.
<p>Object to the omission of this site as an edge of settlement site, with a suggested capacity of 15 dwellings on a 0.5ha site (relevant maps and site profiles within documents should be updated to include this site).</p> <p>The site should be included on the basis that it constitutes a logical rounding off development, not not be obtrusive as it is contained by a tree belt to the south and west, is reasonably located in terms of facilities and transport, could be accessed through The Limes cul de sac without and disturbance to existing occupants.</p> <p>A map should be added to Appendix 9, showing an amendment to the settlement boundary of Warfield to include land south of The Limes, Forest Road, Warfield.</p>	<p>The site did not form part of the earlier Landscape Capacity Study which was produced to support the Preferred Option (which related to 8 potential Broad Areas for development). Additional landscape evidence has since been produced to support the Draft Submission document, and considers this site (Kirkham, August 2011). Superficially, this site could be an extension of The Limes, however this would expand the settlement further south into existing open landscape between Hayley Green and Warfield Park. The Limes is considered to be out of keeping with the settlement character, and extension would compound this and increase the volume of housing south of the natural southern formed by the tree line south of North Lodge Farm.</p> <p>Whilst the development would have limited visibility from the south, west and east, it would be visible from Forest Road, and result in harm to the character of Hayley Green. Although small, this site is important in maintaining the separate identity of the settlement.</p>
The site is available and could be developed in any of the four phases of developed set out in Policy SA10.	Noted.
Comments on Appendix 2 in relation to housing numbers. The housing requirements are minimum guidelines and not targets, and	Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

it is not possible to exclude previously unmet requirements simply because the Council no longer considers them to be relevant. Previous shortfall should be addressed, or the approach needs to be explained in more detail.

There are inadequate sites to meet the housing provision. The Regional Spatial Strategy provides the housing figure guidelines, until the RSS is revoked, the Council must continue to use the RSS figure (11,139 dwellings). Any departure must be based on evidence.

Windfall sites as source of supply should not be included.

targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.

In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.

PPS3 states that an allowance for windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply unless justified. No windfall allowance is included for medium and large sites. Whilst the Council has a comprehensive set of data for permissions and completions on small sites, which has been analysed through SHLAA, and as a result, it is considered that a small site allowance of 30 net dwellings per year can be supported, in relation to advice in PPS3, the windfall allowance no longer be included in the first 10 years supply (but will remain in the last 5 years supply).

Action: amend figures to exclude small windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply.

SHLAA site 204: Land at Bog Lane

(On behalf of site owner, National Grid)

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

<p>Object to draft Policy SA3 as Bog Lane site is not included.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged in the Preferred Option Background Paper (page 84) that this site is sustainably located, and is bound on 3 sides by existing development, however this does not necessarily make a site acceptable for allocation if there are other aspects that would result in harm. In the case of this site, the sustainability of the site and the need for housing needs to be considered against other issues (such as ecology). The site will be reconsidered and assessed through the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>Proposed approach to allocation of edge of settlement sites is unsound as it is not justified effective nor consistent with national policy.</p>	
<p>The approach for identification and allocation of sites does not prioritise the location of sites in sustainable locations, close to public transport links, and does not follow the hierarchy set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.</p>	
<p>The site at Bog Lane should be allocated as it is sequentially preferable to other sites in Policy SA3 as it has superior public transport links (adjacent to Martin's Heron train station with frequent rail services between Reading and London Waterloo).</p>	
<p>The site at Bog Lane has good access to services such as Tesco supermarket and is within easy walking distance of public open space. The degree of accessibility was recognised in the Council's assessment of Broad Area 8 in the Participation Document (Feb 2010), and the site is ranked 1st out of the 8 Broad areas in the Transport and Accessibility Assessment (June 2010).</p>	
<p>In terms of suitability as an edge of settlement site, the site is bound on three side by the built up area of Bracknell, and would serve to "round off" this part of the settlement boundary.</p>	
<p>The site scored well against the assessment criteria in SHLAA, equal to or better than other sites in Policy SA3.</p>	
<p>The Site Allocations Preferred Option Background Paper (November 2010) confirms the site is sustainably located, and will form a defensible settlement boundary.</p>	

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

The Background Paper explains the woodland habitat is of ecological value, however (to our knowledge) no detailed ecological survey has been undertaken, and therefore it is premature to dismiss the site at this stage.

Whilst the development will require removal of trees, appropriate design and layout will seek to ensure existing trees and other ecologically important features will be integrated into the development as far as practicable. Loss of trees should not be seen to outweigh the benefits of the development, and could be used as a visual advantage.

A Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken by the Council to support the Preferred Option, and included this site. This was available on the Council's web site for the duration of the consultation. It is the responsibility of the land owner to undertake further detailed assessments.

SHLAA Site 207: North Lodge Farm, Hayley Green, Warfield

(On behalf of site owner, Mr & Mrs Kite)

Consider that the boundaries of the site are well defined and therefore BFC's assertion that development at this site would amount to an extension of the settlement is unfounded

The western boundary of the site is formed by an extensive hedgerow screen that forms a substantial barrier with the adjacent land. The adjacent land is open space

Southern edge of the site is well defined and screened from adjacent land by extensive tree cover and mature hedging. Beyond this lies public open space/development will not erode the narrow and rural gaps between settlements/screening will result in no adverse impact of the setting of the settlement/surrounding countryside/landscape.

Development will not erode the narrow and rural gaps between settlements.

Screening will result in no adverse impact of the setting of the settlement, the surrounding countryside/landscape.

The site did not form part of the earlier Landscape Capacity Study which was produced to support the Preferred Option (which related to 8 potential Broad Areas for development). Additional landscape evidence has since been produced to support the Draft Submission document, and considers this site (Kirkham, August 2011).

The site would extend the settlement boundary considerably to the west. Encroachment westwards would narrow the rural gap to the narrow 120m Bull Brook corridor. The existing vegetation screen would not be sufficient to mitigate the perception of encroachment and merging of settlements.

The area of open space between Forest Road is narrow and fragile. The loss of 40% of this gap to a development of housing would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and rural setting of the area.

Development on this site would have a direct impact upon the approach to Hayley Green, and on winter views from The Limes, and

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

	<p>public open space. The screening around the site will not mitigate the adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>
<p>The public footpath that runs down the western edge of the site within the open space is also a boundary feature preventing any further western expansion of the site. The balancing pond beyond by its nature and location additionally prevents encroachment of development in a westward direction.</p>	<p>The footpath does not make a material landscape or visual contribution to the rural character of the area on its own. Although the public space prevents physical merging of the two settlements, it is insufficient on its own to main the landscape and settlement character.</p>
<p>Do not agree that the character of the site is farm buildings in an open landscape; the buildings are mostly domestic in character. Buildings within the site generally occupy the southern end of the site, with much of the remainder to the front laid to lawn , which cannot be described as open space (as it is contained by existing screening which curtails long views into the surrounding countryside).</p>	<p>The site includes a large detached (former) farmhouse, its extensive grounds, a number of farm buildings, grassed areas and tree cover. The site clearly lies beyond the settlement edge form by The Limes and makes a significant contribution to maintaining the rural character and open countryside between the settlements of Hayley Green and Newell Green. The site also forms part of the rural setting of Bullbrook and its adjacent woodland enclosed lake.</p> <p>Open grounds to individual large properties and farmhouses are typical of the open countryside of the northern villages.</p>
<p>The form of settlement (described as linear) can be safeguards through sympathetic design and layout of development on this site (as at the adjacent site, The Limes).</p>	<p>Linear development can only be achieved by single plot depths along Forest Road, excluding most of the site. Ribbon development in tis location would also result in encroachment into a rural landscape and merging of settlements.</p>
<p>In the immediate vicinity of the site, the western approach to Hayley Green is characterised by tree cover lining Forest Road, with only occasional glimpse of long views, mainly to the north.</p>	<p>The western approach is characterised by this tree cover in combination with open grassland and the lack of extensive built form.</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
Views to the south are punctuated by the gap that forms the pedestrian access into the open space of Warfield Park.	Entry to Hayley Green is marked by The Limes, not the site.
Do not agree that Hayley Green is unsustainable as there are retail and other facilities both within the village and within walking distance (albeit not within a defined settlement). Also refer to Officer's report to committee for The Limes development (adjacent to North Lodge Farm), which stated that contributions towards integrated highways and transport measures would improve the accessibility of that site	Any development would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS6 and Limiting the Impact of Development SPD. Development of this site, of the scale proposed would not provide a critical mass for facilities to be provided on site, and make improvements to public transport to increase the sustainability of the settlement. Notwithstanding this, there are other factors which make the site unacceptable (see comments above).
The capacity of the site in numerical terms (relative to the size of the existing settlement) is not in itself an objection to the site. However, with the removal of minimum densities in PPS3 the site could be developed for fewer houses.	Even with fewer houses on the site, this would not address the concerns raised above.
Overall, object to exclusion of this site and request that it be allocated under Policy SA3.	See comments to issues raised above. This site will be considered in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
SHLAA sites 243, 246 and 247: Warfield Park	
(On behalf of site owners, Trustees of IRK Maclaren and Warfield Park Homes Ltd)	
Object to the exclusion of these sites from Section 2.3 of the SADPD , and feel that this is contrary to PPS3 and the Core Strategy which plan for an appropriate mix of housing (including low cost market housing)	The rationale for omission of these sites was set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 29-33). The exclusion of this site is not contrary to PPS3 or the Core Strategy, there are planning reasons why the sites are not considered appropriate for allocation, including the fact that these are not 'edge of settlement' locations, as they do not adjoin the settlement boundary
Consider the statement that 'the site is located outside of settlement boundary and would not adjoin a settlement boundary' to be flawed. Suggest the presence of 500 dwellings undermines this argument. The only reason for excluding the home park from	This is not considered to be a flawed approach. Where a site is located outside of a settlement boundary, for it to be considered as an edge of settlement site, it must adjoin an existing defined settlement boundary. The site promoted would not adjoin the settlement,

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

the settlement is to retain the site for low cost market housing. SADPD makes no exception for development on land outside settlements boundaries for low cost market housing (which cannot be located on land inside development boundaries because of the premium that such land attracts).

and would therefore not accord with the locational principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.

The SHLAA has been used to identify sufficient sites within the defined settlement, on the edges of settlement and through urban extensions. It is not proposed to allocate land within the countryside or Green Belt.

Disagree with the statement that 'the proposal would not accord with criteria for edge of settlement locations as set out in 2.7 'edge of settlement sites'. The site would result in further encroachment into the countryside'. Any edge of settlement site will result in further encroachment into the countryside. Warfield is a far larger encroachment into the countryside. Consider should take a reasonable approach and consider Warfield Park as a residential settlement, then all the suggested sites would either adjoining 1 or 2 sides. The Council should make exceptions to the normally restrictive countryside constraints enshrined in Core Strategy Policy CS9.

The point about 'encroachment into the countryside' is noted, and the use of language will be considered to avoid confusion in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

The site did not form part of the earlier Landscape Capacity Study which was produced to support the Preferred Option (which related to 8 potential Broad Areas for development). Additional landscape evidence has since been produced to support the Draft Submission document, and considers this site (Kirkham, August 2011).

As noted above the site is not within or adjoining a defined settlement, and it is not intended to redesignate the Park as settlement.

The sites lie well beyond the existing defined edge to the Park, and there is no landscape case for applying a different policy approach.

Screening of the site has been suggested by the site promoter, however this would not mitigate the landscape and visual impact of the loss of open grazing land (in the case of site 246).

In the case of sites 243 and 247 the site promoter has commented that 243 is only partly covered in trees and replacement could be provided, and that tree cover on 247 is not ancient woodland. Existing mature trees contribute to the wider landscape and the Park, and must be retained. The value of the woodland lies more broadly in its contribution to the Borough's woodland cover, its landscape locally, its role in visually separating Warfield

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

	<p>Park from Winkfield and in providing an attractive woodland setting to the Park and wider area.</p>
<p>Disagree with statement that ‘the site does not represent a special circumstance that warrants allocation of the housing within countryside e.g. does not provide low cost affordable housing’. PPS3 para 26 require LPAs to plan for provision of low cost housing, and DCLG have confirmed that park homes fall within the definition of low cost homes. Low cost construction methods, tenure limitations and unique shared financing arrangements (similar to First Time Buyers Initiative)) means they sell for substantially less than equivalent bricks and mortar market housing in the area. Homes currently sell from £90,000 for older home, up to £270,000 for higher quality new homes. Park homes provide a more affordable low cost market alternative to equivalent 2/3 bedroom houses and bungalows in the area. The SADPD does not meet the need or demand for low cost housing.</p>	<p>It is noted that policies require a a mix of housing to be provide - which would be achieved through the SADPD. All housing developments within the Borough need to provide for a range of housing types and tenures as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS16, and in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Additionally, all sites over 15 units (net) would need to make provision for affordable housing.</p>
<p>Disagree with statements relating to conflict with policy objectives relating to Warfield Park, Local Wildlife sites, river corridor areas, and loss of trees and habitats resulting in harm to wildlife and habitats contrary to Policies EN4 EN11 and EN14. These policies are broad brush conservation allocations and do not preclude development in these areas. Just because a site is included within a local wildlife designation, does not follow that every piece of land therein cannot be developed without harm to overall areas wildlife value, ecological surveys would be required. Their preferred site (site 246) would allow for park homes development on grazing farmland, which is unlikely to be of significant wildlife interest. Equally just because a site is within a</p>	<p>The approach in relation to the policy designations of the site are relevant material considerations. They are not broad brush policies as they apply to specific sites, such as local wildlife sites. It is considered that the development would result in harm. No evidence has been provided to support the promotion of these sites for additional park homes.</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
landscape designation, does not mean it cannot be developed without harm to the landscape.	
Reference made to the Community Infrastructure Levy, Limiting the Impact of Development SPD and Core Strategy Policy CS16 in relation to infrastructure. There is an urgent need for Warfield Park to update its water, gas and electricity supply to improve its energy performance and meet regulations. An extension to Warfield Park would provide an income allow utilities to be updated.	Requirements for utilities improvements at Warfield Park are a matter for the site owner, and is not something that other developments within the Borough can reasonably be expected to contribute towards. Any application for extension/intensification of Warfield Park to increase the number of units would need to be considered in relation to the Limiting the Impact of Development SPD, which may require the site owner to provide mitigation for a range of infrastructure.
<p>Looking for the Site Allocations DPD to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that park homes are included within the definition of low cost market housing • Consider the demand for low cost market housing including park homes, and the need for this type housing over the plan period • Identify sustainable locations of new park home development through extension of existing home parks or development of new home parks 	<p>See above.</p> <p>More detailed rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>
SHLAA site 243 - Longcroft, Long Hill Road (part of Warfield Park proposals)	
(On behalf of owner of site, S. Brant)	
Whilst the overall amount of windfall is small for the whole plan period, do not consider it is appropriate to include these sites in housing numbers. PPS3 advises windfall sites should not be included in calculations. Do not consider there us an evidence base to justify an exception to this.	<p>The Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p> <p>PPS3 states that an allowance for windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years supply unless justified. No windfall allowance is included for medium and large sites. Whilst the Council has a comprehensive set of data for permissions and completions on small sites, which has been analysed through SHLAA, and as a result, it is considered that a small site allowance of 30 net dwellings per year can be supported, in relation to advice in PPS3, the</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
	<p>windfall allowance no longer be included in the first 10 years supply (but will remain in the last 5 years supply).</p> <p>Action: amend figures to exclude small windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policies CS16 and CS17 refer to the need to provide housing for the whole community. Whilst allocated sites set out requirement for affordable housing, not convinced this will be "substantially lower than the prevailing market price". One way to provide affordable housing either permanently or an an intermediate solution, is through the expansion of mobile home parks.</p>	<p>It is noted that policies require a a mix of housing to be provide - which would be achieved through the SADPD. All housing developments within the Borough need to provide for a range of housing types and tenures as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS16, and in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Additionally, all sites over 15 units (net) would need to make provision for affordable housing.</p>
<p>General comments about SA3. Have reservations over whether density of development on site can be secured in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS1, 2 and 7 without compromising urban quality. Minimum density requirement has been removed from PPS3. Also need to take account of the need to provide appropriate parking (which is 'space greedy'). Whilst some of the densities of these sites are less than SA1 and SA2, consider that the development of these sites at the densities proposed would be out of character.</p>	<p>National and regional policy have previously set minimum densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (PPS 3) and 40 dwellings per hectare respectively (South East Plan). PPS 3 has since been reissued following the deletion of the the national indicative minimum density of 30 dph. The Council does not provide detailed guidance on density. The over arching policy of the Core Strategy is the delivery of sustainable development. CS1 refers to the need to make efficient use of land, buildings and infrastructure. Policy CS7 stresses the need to for high quality design.</p>
<p>Also made comments in relation to SA1, SA2.</p>	<p>See Developer responses to Policies SA1 and SA2.</p>
<p>SHLAA site 251: Whitegates, Mushroom Castle Lane, Winkfield</p> <p>(on behalf of promoters of site, Charles Church)</p>	
<p>Consider that should be using the SEP housing numbers (12,780 a opposed to Core strategy figure of 10,780), which requires the remaining dwellings to be found by 20026 at 5,626. PPS12 sets out that Regional Spatial Strategies form part of the Development</p>	<p>Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
Plan, and if guidance in one document is more up to date than another, that document should be given greater weight.	independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.
Justification for numbers as set out in the Background Paper is based on the 2006 household projections (11,000 increase between 2006-2026). Latest 2008 projections represents a 12,000 increase in households, meaning Core Strategy figure will fail to accommodate expected growth of 1,220 dwellings over the plan period.	A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.
This site should be included as an edge of settlement site, to provide the additional housing that is required (i.e. South East Plan numbers and because some of the identified sites will not come forward in the time expected)	In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.
Draft SHMA identifies a shortfall in affordable housing which will compounded if lower housing number is progressed.	The Draft SHMA is being updated and will form part of the evidence base to support the Draft Submission.
Concerns made by the Council's assessment of the site have been addressed in developer response to the Background Paper.	These relate to the suitability etc of the site, which are already summarised against SA3 (set out below).
A Transport Statement has been prepared and can be provided, which indicates access to the site from the Carnation Drive Estate.	Whilst an access via Carnation Drive may be suitable from a highway perspective, this would impact upon the grassed 'ride' between the estate and the woodland, extending the impact of the estate. It may be possible to provide a well designed solution, however, this would still result in an extension of the built form westwards.
<p>In relation to the 6 criteria used to assess the appropriateness of Edge of Settlement sites in the Background Paper, White Gates performs as follows:</p> <p>1. How relates to existing settlement boundary:</p> <p>Very well relates, adjoins the settlement on two and a half sides.</p>	Consideration of this site was set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 63-64). The site did not form part of the earlier Landscape Capacity Study which was produced to support the Preferred Option, and focused on 8 potential Broad Areas for development. Additional landscape evidence has been produced to support the Draft Submission document, and considers this site (Kirkham, August 2011). More detailed

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

	<p>rationale for inclusion/exclusion of suggested edge of settlement sites will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, this will also draw upon the additional landscape evidence which has been undertaken since the publication of the Preferred Option.</p>
<p>2. Be well related the scale of existing built up area:</p> <p>Introduction of 54 dwellings will relate well to the overall size of Winkfield Row, offering a form of development large enough to contribute affordable housing and community facilities, whilst not resulting in a significant increase in size of the village/adverse effect on character and appearance.</p>	<p>The Carnation Drive estate demonstrates how a large development can change part of the village so that its no longer shares the characteristics of the area. The proposed development of the site would become part of the Carnation Drive estate, increasing the impact of the built form on the village pattern. Trees that are important to the setting of this part of the village would be lost.</p>
<p>3. Whether the development would harm the physical or visual character of the settlement:</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisal for Winkfield Row published in 1996 confirms the site is not within the Conservation Area, ensuring the development of the site will not have an adverse impact upon the part of the village which is identified as being of greatest importance in terms of character and appearance.</p> <p>Due to the location of the site compared with surrounding built development/adjoining woodland, will only be apparent from private views adjoining the site.</p> <p>The site is set back from Chavey Down Road, and would be largely screened by Carnation Hall.</p> <p>Development of the site would not extend the built extent of the settlement to the west or south.</p>	<p>The site is not within a Conservation Area, so this is not relevant.</p> <p>The development would be visible from a number of private properties, and also users of Carnation Hall (a local community facility). The access proposed by the site promoter would be visible from the Carnation Drive estate.</p> <p>The character of the village is not solely derived from the roadside, but the pattern of the built form and landscape, which is also set out in the Character Areas Assessment SPD, March 2010 (Northern Villages, Area D).</p> <p>The limit of the development west at Carnation Drive estate has eroded the village character. The site extends a further 75m west of Conyngwood, which predates a linear development along Chavey Down Road, and retains much of its semi-rural character in its narrow lane. Long narrow gardens and vegetation do not set a precedent for further development westwards.</p>
<p>4. Whether the relationship between the settlement and surrounding character/landscape would be harmed:</p>	<p>The separation of Warfield and Winkfield is vary narrow at the northern edge of the site (200m). Although the woodland makes this</p>

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

Woodland forming part of Warfield Park (to the west) will enclose the site and form a well defined urban edge. If the site is developed, it would follow the established western development boundary of the village formed by the Carnation Drive estate, and as a result there would be no intrusion into the existing gap between Winkfield Row and Bracknell, ensuring the relationship between settlements is not harmed.

Open space could be included in the south-eastern corner of the site, to provide an appropriate transition from countryside to built form, avoiding a hard urban edge against the countryside.

gap visually robust, the introduction of an estate road and new housing would erode the separate identity of Winkfield South, and the perception of open landscape to the west of the centre of the village.

Open space in the south-east of the site is not likely to achieve this objective, and would not overcome the overriding concerns. The open land already provides a well defined edge, and is part of the character of this landscape. The site would be well enclosed by this woodland and tree cover, but this does not justify development.

5. Sustainability of any proposed site:

Whilst not identified as a sustainable settlement, Winkfield Row does contain a number facilities and services that would be available to future residents (school, village hall, italian restaurant). Regarding employment provision, the village accommodates the largest agricultural testing laboratory in the UK, village schools, employ 50 staff, , and a number of other small businesses. The village is well linked to Bracknell and Tesco supermarket in Martin's Heron, and is accessible to other settlements via bus service 162 offering 6 services a day. There is potential to accommodate a public right of way. The site is sufficient scale to incorporate additional community facilities, and scope to ensure such facilities are integrated with Carnation Hall.

Any development would be expected to mitigate its impact in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS6 and Limiting the Impact of Development SPD. Development of this site, of the scale proposed would not provide a critical mass for facilities to be provided on site, and make improvements to public transport to increase the sustainability of the settlement. Notwithstanding this, there are other factors which make the site unacceptable (see comments above).

6. Whether the development would result in a more clearly defensible, stronger more defensible settlement boundary:

The proposed development will strengthen the settlement boundary.

See comments above.

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
Mushroom Castle is no longer the only house in Chavey Down Road, and if this property and the associated land had been of such historic significance, it would have been designated as such.	The historic value of Mushroom Castle lies in its contribution to the character of the village, rather than its intrinsic historical or architectural merit. The fact that it is not designated an historic asset, does not undermine it's contribution to the character.
The development will hardly be visible from surrounding public viewpoint. This can be ensured through appropriate layout, open space across the site, including planting.	Deciduous planting would be required, which would only have a limiting affect on screening the views. A development should not have to be completely screened in order to make it acceptable.
Development will enable introduction of affordable and private housing, and community facilities.	Provision of housing and community facilities do not outweigh unacceptability of the sites in respect of other aspects.
The site is under the control of one developer, and not requiring significant infrastructure will be able to deliver in the short term future.	It is accepted that the site is within one ownership.
Land at Whitegates, Winkfield Row (SHLAA site 251) should be one of the greenfield sites to be brought forward early in the plan period as it does not require delivery of significant infrastructure and it can help to meet the Council's 5 year housing land supply requirements	Whilst the site may be able to be brought forward early, this does not outweigh other issues outlined above.
Object to Binfield edge of settlement sites (SHLAA ref 24 & 93). (These comments have been summarised in the table above, summary of responses to Developer/Landowner comments). Consider that White Gates represents a more appropriate site than other Binfield sites identified in SA3.	See responses above.
Also made comments in relation to sites in SA1, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA8, SA9, SA9, SA10 which are summarised against relevant parts of the document.	See relevant section of document for responses.
SHLAA site 285: HFC Bank, North Street, Winkfield (On behalf of site owners, HFC Bank)	

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)

Object to omission of this site; the Council acknowledges that sites outside defined settlements will need to be allocated and in comparison to those identified by the Council this site compares well and should be recognised accordingly. Site promoted on the basis it is previously developed land, for 22 dwellings.

The site is located within the Green Belt. It is not proposed to make any changes to the Green Belt boundary, which would require a review of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, this site would remain within the Green Belt. As this site is within the Green Belt, which the Council is not reviewing at this stage, this site does not form part of the updated landscape evidence relating to 'omission' sites. In any case, this site now benefits from planning permission for 22 detached dwellings (application 10/00801/FUL, granted July 2011).

SHLAA site 292 (part of): Land east of Chavey Down Road (was site 221)

(On behalf of owner of site, Meryl Development Ltd)

Housing target for the Borough should be based on the South East Plan (12,780)

Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, and which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.

In the meantime, the Council must continue to plan for housing, including through the allocation of strategic sites in the SADPD, in order to secure a supply of land for housing.

As this site effectively relates to former Broad Area 7 (Winkfield Trinage), this site does not form part of the updated landscape evidence relating to 'omission' sites. This site was

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
	considered in the Landscape Capacity Study for the 8 original possible Broad Areas, which was produced to support the Preferred Option consultation.
This site should be included as a 'new urban extension' because it is more suitable than other sites which are within/close to the 400m exclusion zone around the SPA (such as TRL and Broadmoor).	<p>Natural England have not objected to Broadmoor or TRL proposals in relation to the proximity of the developments to a SSSI/SPA.</p> <p>The Council recognise that these sites are close to the SPA. In accordance with the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, the Council is required to take account of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development in consultation with Natural England. This is outlined in one of the documents issued to support the SADPD - the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment.</p>
SHLAA site 298: Land at Yaffles, Warfield Street, Warfield	
(On behalf of site owner, Alfred Homes)	
Object to the omission of this site of 0.6ha from the policy as it would represent a logical rounding off of the settlement boundary.	This site does not form part of Policy SA3 as it is contained within the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) area, and is therefore being considered as part of the SPD. It is not appropriate to allocate smaller individual sites that form part of the larger SPD area.
The site is deliverable within the next 5 years.	
The site is available, suitable and achievable.	
The independent development of this site would not prejudice the wider Warfield development.	
Also made comments in relation to Policy SA9.	An SPD for Warfield is being progressed, and was subject to consultation November 2010-January 2011. See Policy SA9.
SHLAA site 302: Land at Dukes Ride	
(On behalf of owners of site, Wellington College/Eagle House School)	
Object to the omission of this site of 1.16 ha, which is immediately adjoining the settlement of Crowthorne and in a sustainable location.	The site is sustainability located, being in close proximity to Crowthorne Train Station and local shops. Additional landscape work (Kirkham, August 2011) has also been undertaken in

Suggested edge of settlement sites (omission sites)	
	relation to the site (as the site did not form part of earlier landscape capacity work produced to support the Preferred Option). Further consideration of the site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.
SHLAA site 310: Western Cottage, Nine Mile Ride (new site)	
(On behalf of owners of site, Mr & Mrs Edwards)	
Site is available/promoted for low density residential, C2, C1 or D1 uses (please see full pdf of representation for more details)	This site has been promoted through the Preferred Option consultation. However, as this site is within 400m of the SPA it would be excluded from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and would not be allocated for residential development through the SADPD process. The site also contains a Listed Building, and so redevelopment involving the loss of the building would be inappropriate.
SHLAA site 311: The Barn, Foxley Lane (new site)	
(On behalf of owners of site, Mr & Mrs Bury)	
0.32ha site promoted for housing.	Noted - consideration of this site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.

2.4 New urban extensions

A significant number of objections were made which related to development proposed in an area generally, e.g. Crowthorne (sites at Broadmoor and TRL), or Binfield (sites at Amen Corner north, Amen Corner south and at Blue Mountain).

Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne

Policy SA4 related to the proposed allocation of land at the former Broadmoor Hospital. A significant number of objections to this site concerned the likely impact of the development when considered together with that proposed at the TRL site (proposed under Policy SA5) and other development sites in Wokingham Borough. Traffic and highways considerations were also raised.

A number of comments made in relation to the sites contained in this Policy referred to the maps contained in the Preferred Option (Map 2 - Illustrative Concept Plan for Broadmoor and Map 29 - Extract of Proposals Map to show allocation of land at Broadmoor Urban Extension). For the purpose of summarising the main issues raised, these are summarised against the Policy.

Table 2.11 - Policy SA4 (Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne) - Residents Responses

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Scale / Principle of development	
Wish government would encourage people to move north where there is ample scope for development, so that these developments wouldn't take place in Crowthorne	This is a matter of national policy and is beyond the scope of this document.
Object to housing development in Crowthorne and propose other sites for those in housing need	It is accepted that some development has occurred in Crowthorne over the last few years. However, the population of the Borough and number of households is projected to grow further and there is a need to provide additional housing.
There is no need for this type of development in Crowthorne	
Crowthorne has changed enough and has had its share of development; we don't want more houses / too many flats have been built in Crowthorne in recent years	All sites proposed have been submitted as available for development through the SHLAA, including some small sites within and on the edge of the existing settlement. A number of the sites (including TRL and Broadmoor) involve previously developed land where some form of change is required due to the presence of buildings/uses that no longer
Oppose the scale / density of development proposed in Crowthorne - developments proposed are too large and out of character with the existing settlement.	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Crowthorne cannot support this level of development especially given the plans for development in Wokingham District - the size of Crowthorne will increase by 25% / double (varied according to response)</p>	<p>meet current needs. National policy (PPS1 and PPS3) suggests that priority should be given to these sites.</p>
<p>Whilst agree that Crowthorne should take its fair share of housing, what is proposed is far more than its fair share / two thirds of the 2,400 houses that BFC is planning to build are in Crowthorne - this is too high</p>	<p>In allocating sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals equate to an increase of approximately 30% in the number of properties in Crowthorne as a whole, the Council's proposals also include a number of sites in other parts of the Borough including large sites at Blue Mountain and Amen Corner North, Binfield. There capacity of available sites in other parts of the Borough is not sufficient to accommodate all future development needs.</p>
<p>The number of new houses in Crowthorne should be reduced to 400 in total / don't object to this site per se but should be a lower number of dwellings within the limits of existing infrastructure</p>	<p>The sites that the Council is proposing to allocate are considered to be those that are most compatible with national and local policy. Further details of the rationale for site selection is given in the Background Paper to the Draft Submission Document.</p>
<p>It would be fairer to spread development around the Borough rather than concentrate so much of it in Crowthorne</p>	<p>The type and size of housing to be provided will need to have regard to evidence contained within the Bracknell Housing Market Assessment. The densities proposed take account of local circumstances and national policy set out in PPS3 (para 44) that states that using land efficiently is a key consideration in planning for housing.</p> <p>The draft NPPF refers to the need to 'optimise' the potential of a site to accommodate development.</p>
<p>Combined impacts of this proposal with TRL (SA5) have not been properly assessed/considered.</p>	<p>Account is being taken of committed development and proposals on existing infrastructure and services and the need for the extension of/new facilities. An IDP is being refined which will set out requirements.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to plans for development in Crowthorne. No evidence that houses will be affordable to first time buyers, despite assurances</p>	<p>The Council will seek affordable housing from the site in accordance with policy. However, regard has to be paid to economic viability and the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including any public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured.</p> <p>The Government is proposing a significant amount of change in the delivery of affordable housing, including the introduction of an affordable rent product. The Government has published a new Framework for the 2011-2015 Spending Review period.</p>
<p>Lack of co-ordination with Wokingham Borough on house building around Crowthorne.</p> <p>Need to consider combined impact of Broadmoor and TRL together with Wokingham Borough Council's proposals</p>	<p>The proposals have been developed in the knowledge of the proposed development in Wokingham Borough Council (WBC). The Council has exchanged data with WBC to feed into the Council's respective transport models. Joint working has also taken place on various items of infrastructure, including education facilities. A dialogue with officers will be maintained as preparation on the SADPD continues.</p>
<p>Confusion exists about the number of dwellings proposed for this site, as it seems to vary over time.</p>	<p>The number of dwellings relating to this site has varied over time due to progression of the Site Allocations document through its various stages. At the Issues and Options stage the site formed part of a larger area (Broad Area 2) suggested for 480 dwellings as part of a mixed use scheme. At the Preferred Option stage, it was put forward for 278 new dwellings (plus 100 at Cricket Field Grove and 20 at School Hill). A Draft Indicative Option Working Paper published as part of a report that was considered by the Council's Executive in July 2010, suggested 450 dwellings on the site.</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Covenant should be signed by the land owners establishing an upper limit on the housing numbers on the site determined by sustainability and a guarantee of S106 improvements.</p>	<p>The Council has no powers to make the landowner sign such a covenant. However, if the site is allocated for development, it will be allocated for a specific scale of development. The form of development and mitigation required will be determined by the need for a sustainable scheme that is supported by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>A S106 Agreement is likely to include a variety of improvements to infrastructure in the area, however, the nature and scale of these must be compliant with the tests in Circular 05/05. The scope of any S106 Agreement will depend on the timing of the proposal in relation to CIL.</p>
<p>The proposals will result in the loss of green space and amenities currently enjoyed by all</p>	<p>The site is privately owned, and given the nature of the existing use of the site, the entirety of the site is not publicly accessible. The proposal will result in greater opportunities for public access due to the need to provide Open Space of Public Value and SANG with the development, and would seek to reprovide public open space and pitches that would be lost through redevelopment of Cricket Field Grove. Currently there is a public rights of way running through the grounds of Broadmoor (outside of the secure perimeter), which also forms part of the Three Castles Path.</p>
<p>The documents seek to avoid the risk of labour shortages in Bracknell; however due to the lack of public transport links between Crowthorne and Bracknell the proposed new housing will simply result in more congestion on the roads, increasing travel time to Bracknell such that employment opportunities in Fleet, Camberley, Windsor become more attractive</p>	<p>Whilst the Council cannot control where people work, it is important that there are opportunities for people to live and work locally. This helps reduce the amount of commuting.</p> <p>The proposals include provisions to improve links between the site and Bracknell, particularly by modes of transport other than the private car.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposals at Crowthorne, with their inevitable increase in traffic volume and congestion, do not meet the stated objective to improve environmental quality, and protect and enhance the Green Belt boundary and areas of natural and historic interest.</p>	<p>The Green Belt does not extend as far south as Crowthorne. Land outside defined settlements in this area is currently protected by countryside policies.</p>
<p>This site is to heavily constrained and only has limited options for development as confirmed by Council Officers, therefore this site is not suitable for development.</p>	<p>Within the over riding need to provide for growth, the Council will try to improve environmental quality and protect areas of natural and historic interest. The Broadmoor Estate is a registered historic park and garden, and contains Listed Buildings. The masterplan for the site has been formulated to take account of the natural and historic interest of the site. The Council is undertaking additional work in relation to the impact of the proposals upon the historic park and garden which will form part of the evidence base to support the Draft Submission stage of SADPD.</p>
<p>Crowthorne is a village (not a town, like Bracknell) - it should be allowed to stay that way / it will become a town if these plans go ahead.</p>	<p>There is a need to allocate sites that are available and conform with national policy and the locational principles set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>A sustainable form of development is sought that is well integrated with the existing settlement pattern and community.</p> <p>The draft NPPF states that the ambitions of neighbourhoods should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area.</p>
<p>Support identification of the preferred sites as they are more logical given that areas within Winkfield and Cranbourne are not appropriate for major development (due to their rural, narrow roads and overstretched community infrastructure)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Not clear why Broadmoor site is preferred - if you apply the appropriate weightings then other sites should be ranked higher</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal is one of a number of factors that influence the sites proposed for allocation. A number of other evidence studies were produced which formed part of the evidence base - as set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper.</p> <p>This site is partly brownfield, and would help to facilitate a new hospital facility that is fit for purpose.</p>
<p>Other sites were ranked higher than this one, in terms of suitability and sustainability, so not clear why this one is preferred / why have the Crowthorne sites, ranked 5 and 6 out of 8, been preferred to the number 1 ranked site?</p>	
<p>Proposed development is too high density - more suitable to an urban location such as Bracknell. 4 dph is more suitable</p>	<p>Proposals must be economically viable. The viability of as development is affected by market factors such as adjacent uses, existing, proposed and alternative uses for the site in terms of land values. It is also affected by cost factors such as site preparation costs relating to any physical constraints and delivery factors such as build out rates.</p> <p>PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a supply of deliverable sites. This includes ensuring that the development is achievable - in other words that there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time i.e. that it is viable.</p> <p>The number of units is considered to be appropriate. Rationale for this site is included in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>The social and environmental impact on the local communities of Crowthorne Parish and Wokingham Without Parish have been underestimated, simplified and ignored.</p>	<p>The effect upon the surrounding community is being considered in terms of the infrastructure required, and the need to integrate the new development with the existing community.</p> <p>The SADPD is accompanied by an IDP setting out the infrastructure requirements for the development.</p>
<p>What affect will an increase in population of 25% have on existing residents, infrastructure and services enjoyed by the existing residents of the village.</p>	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Sites have only been promoted because they are available not properly considering the impact upon existing communities.</p>	<p>PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a supply of deliverable sites (which is also included in the Draft NPPF). This includes ensuring that the development is achievable - in other words that there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time i.e. that it is viable.</p> <p>Sites within the SADPD must be available for development, and have been identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The earlier consultation in 2010 on the Issues and Options identified 8 possible Broad Areas for development, which were then reduced to 4 on ground of availability etc (the reasons for inclusion/exclusion of sites being set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper. The SADPD is supported by an evidence base which includes consideration of issues relating to landscape, ecology, flooding etc, together with an associated Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>In 2003, the Commission for Health Improvement found that the majority of wards at the hospital was unfit for purpose, and recommended the redevelopment of Broadmoor Hospital to provide modern healthcare facilities fit for the 21st Century.</p>
<p>The Broadmoor development is proposed because the Health Authority wants to redevelopable the hospital this is not a sound reason for development.</p>	
<p>No objection to this site - it is brownfield and seems to be least contentious to many people therefore is one of the most suitable sites proposed in the Borough</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Separation of settlements</p>	
<p>Object to development in Crowthorne as there will be no gap left between Crowthorne, Bracknell, Sandhurst and Wokingham</p>	<p>In many ways, this site has been distinct and separate from existing communities. However to create a new sustainable urban extension, any development of the site would need to integrate with Crowthorne. New residential</p>
<p>Oppose the development as it will result in Crowthorne becoming a suburb of Bracknell</p>	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>development will be contained to the walled kitchen garden, Cricket Field Grove and School Hill. The new hospital redevelopment would be related to existing buildings on the northern part of the site.</p> <p>The Broadmoor site does not form part of one of the gaps identified on the Key Diagram contained within the Core Strategy. Broadmoor is not essential in maintaining the separate identity of Crowthorne and its neighbours. Development will be contained within well defined boundaries and could be designed to reflect the local townscape and landscape character in order to maintain the distinctive character of Crowthorne, and therefore will retain a visual separation between settlements.</p>
Character / Community	
The character of the village will change to that of a town	It is hoped that the design and layout of the development will retain a visual separation of the settle of Crowthorne from Sandhurst and Bracknell, and could be designed to reflect local townscape and landscape character in order to maintain the distinctive character of Crowthorne.
The proposed developments will result in the loss of the character of the village and its sense of community	<p>Any development of the site would need to integrate with Crowthorne, by providing improved linkages to Crowthorne High Street. New residential development will be contained to the walled kitchen garden, Cricket Field Grove and School Hill. The new hospital redevelopment would be related to existing buildings on the northern part of the site.</p>
Infrastructure	
General	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The impact of the development / what infrastructure it will require has not been adequately addressed in the outline documents - these are a vague wish list of actions and enhancements and there is no evidence of budget allocations</p>	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the IDP's production, so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be. Where improvements to infrastructure are necessary, the service provider has to the best of their knowledge stated what mitigation measures would be required. In some instances there has been insufficient information to allocate budgets; however funding streams have been identified, with an indication as to whether developer contributions would be required.</p>
<p>The Council has no control over the infrastructure improvements needed. Furthermore, they are unlikely to happen in the current economic climate. Cannot satisfy the requirement for the development to be sustainable.</p>	<p>The infrastructure required to support the developments proposed would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p>
<p>Should not build any new houses in Crowthorne as the authority can not cater for what they already have. The roads and health care and already overstretched.</p>	<p>Developers will be required to mitigate against the impact of their development on services, e.g. through on-site provision of a community facility and off-site highway junction improvements. Some new services will also benefit existing residents e.g. an improved bus service. The Primary Care Trust (PCT) who oversee primary health care have been consulted. Any additional infrastructure required has been stated in the IDP.</p>
<p>Object to the unproven viability of the preferred option sites in Crowthorne, as evidenced by the gaps in the IDP</p>	<p>A viability study is being undertaken to test the viability of all sites in SADPD. In addition further work is being undertaken to fill gaps in the IDP, which will be provided as evidence to support the SADPD Draft Submission.</p>
<p>Too much onus is placed on the developers, beyond the reasonable responsibility for their sites</p>	<p>Mitigation, whether in-kind or by a financial contribution towards local provision, will only be sought where there is evidence of need and conformity with legal tests.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Do not want a repeat of Jennett's Park, new housing but no new facilities (school) built.</p>	<p>Jennett's Park facilities have been secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement, the Primary School is currently under construction and due to be open September 2011, there are several play areas, the permanent Community Centre is currently under construction, and the A329 link is open. Some items of infrastructure have been slow in coming forward because of the slow down in the housing market.</p>
<p>Transport</p>	
<p>Does not meet the criteria in Core Strategy Policy CS2 as it does not have good public transport links to the rest of the urban area or firm proposals to provide such links.</p>	<p>Whilst the site does not currently benefit from good transport links to the rest of the urban area, the proposals will include measures to improve these - further information is set out in the IDP.</p> <p>As with the Jennetts Park and The Parks developments, where there were inadequate public transport links, developers will be expected to integrate measures to improve public transport in their developments, i.e. Bus priority measures and all homes within a 400m walking distance of a bus stop. As is the case with Broadmoor, enhancements to the 194 service to serve the development.</p>
<p>The cumulative impact of developments from within and outside Bracknell Forest have been ignored.</p>	<p>The transport modelling work takes account of the cumulative effect of planned development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Borough, and of general background traffic growth. The models look at a number of highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all of the developments that are envisaged up to the year 2026.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>It is already virtually impossible to commute between Crowthorne and Bracknell / Wokingham / Sandhurst at peak times, and this situation will considerably worsen</p>	<p>The Council has modelled the cumulative effect of development impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration in the baseline situation even allowing for the additional traffic that the new development will generate (and traffic from proposed development in Wokingham).</p> <p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate how proposed transport improvements will mitigate the impact of their development and this will involve contributing in-kind and/or financially towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles.</p> <p>The movements related to the new link road have been factored in to the transport modelling work.</p> <p>The impacts of all the proposed strategic developments on key routes within the Borough have been included in the transport modelling work.</p>
<p>This site would put enormous pressure on on the existing infrastructure with regard to traffic congestion, which is already at breaking point.</p> <p>Development will add to congestion on Crowthorne High Street will be exacerbated by existing lack of service roads/service vehicles parking on the High Street - developers should be made to pay for service roads</p>	
<p>With the new link road from Jennett's Park to the A329, more traffic will use roads in Crowthorne to avoid congestion in Bracknell and Wokingham</p>	
<p>The proposed developments at Crowthorne will impact on traffic through Sandhurst (e.g. commuters wishing to get to the M3) - will this be taken into consideration when planning for infrastructure?</p>	
<p>Oppose the development as Crowthorne cannot cope with any more traffic / the developments will make the existing overcrowding on the roads worse</p>	
<p>Will be increased dependence upon car travel out of the area.</p>	
<p>Not enough infrastructure is proposed to cope with the traffic:</p> <p>Capacity improvements at junctions won't help - roads are already saturated</p>	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Provision of bus links: this would need to be guaranteed and provided for a long time to be effective (i.e. More trains into Reading from Crowthorne station/hopper bus around Crowthorne).</p>	
<p>Modelling work still required for highways; there is every possibility the Highway Authority won't be able to mitigate the impact of the development given the huge costs involved and the state of the economy.</p>	<p>The highways infrastructure required has been modelled and the costs have been estimated. It is anticipated that the funding for the improvements required to mitigate the impacts of the new development will be provided by the developers through legal agreements, planning conditions and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy. Viability assessments have been carried out on the proposals, which will form part of the evidence base supporting the Draft Submission.</p>
<p>Capacity improvements are already required to the junctions referenced within the policy, therefore additional lanes and/or roads will be required to take the traffic from the additional homes proposed.</p> <p>There are no recognisable arguments for dealing with the traffic problems that will result from the developments in Crowthorne. In many cases the proposals are wrong or advocate "do more studies".</p> <p>Crowthorne village will become a car park at rush hour.</p> <p>Congestion on existing roads will be worsened/capacity improvements are already required (particularly when combined with proposals at TRL): A3095 Sandhurst to Bracknell, Crowthorne High Street, Old Wokingham Road, Bracknell Road, Crowthorne Road, Nine Mile Ride, Coral Reef roundabout, Foresters Way, A322 plus associated junctions and further afield (M3 and M4).</p>	<p>Capacity improvements are only likely to be funded from new development. Transport modelling has shown that the increased capacity created by the proposed improvements will fully mitigate the traffic impacts of the proposed development at Broadmoor and TRL.</p> <p>It has been necessary to progress the transport work in line with the evolution of the proposals (from Broad Areas to the smaller sites proposed for allocation). Therefore, various studies have been undertaken to reflect the stage reached in the SADPD. Since the Preferred Option stage, the Council has carried out more detailed modelling work and incorporated more detailed data from Wokingham Borough.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The Council needs to look further afield regarding transport improvements, to include the A329(M), Crowthorne High Street, the A322 to the M3, the A30 past Camberley, and the M3 to the M25</p>	<p>The Council has modelled the cumulative effect of development impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The Council and Wokingham Borough Council are working closely with the Highways Agency regarding the impact on the Strategic Road Network.</p>
<p>Object as there is no extra car parking in Crowthorne High Street proposed / will put increased pressure on parking for local shops / the existing problems with parking in the High Street will be worsened/will add to congestion on the high street/increase pressure on parking for local shops.</p>	<p>The proposed development at Broadmoor will help to support the viability and vitality of Crowthorne High Street. If there is significant additional pressure on parking the Council has powers to control on-street parking and can review the requirement for additional parking provision.</p>
<p>This part of the policy refers to "improvements to Crowthorne High Street" but these are not specified.</p>	<p>There are significant land ownership and technical problems associated with the provision of rear service access to a significant number of properties on Crowthorne High Street which make this impractical. However there may be scope to increase controls on delivery times and provide improved service access in some cases.</p> <p>As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car.</p>
<p>Additional junctions will be required, not just improvements, which will increase the risk of rat-running from Bracknell Road to Sandhurst</p>	<p>The only additional junction proposed as part of the Broadmoor development is the new link road junction with Foresters Way. Modelling has shown that the traffic impacts of the</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Cambridge Road is unsuitable as a through road (as is proposed)</p>	<p>proposed developments at Broadmoor and TRL can be effectively mitigated by the planned improvements to the other existing junctions. This will reduce the current hospital-related traffic accessing the site from the Crowthorne side, including via Cambridge Road.</p>
<p>Many accidents previously occurred on School Hill and the surrounding roads, before Foresters Way was built. Adding so much traffic as a result of the development (when there are so many more cars on the road now in any event) will increase the risk of accidents for children at/ walking to Wildmoor Heath Primary School.</p> <p>Development coupled with sites listed in Policy SA2 (Cricket Field Grove and School Hill) will overburden existing access roads - these cannot cope</p>	<p>The proposed developments at Broadmoor would divert traffic for the hospital, the medi-park and the re-used listed building onto a new link road. This will ensure that traffic on local roads between Broadmoor and Crowthorne centre is not unacceptably increased. It will also provide better access for construction traffic.</p>
<p>The provision for hospital traffic to use access to the Sandhurst bypass will only provide limited relief.</p> <p>There is no suitable road network unless a new road was built to join the Crowthorne bypass.</p> <p>Limited/poor road access to the site (via Lower Broadmoor Road/Chaplins Hill or Brookers Corner/Upper Broadmoor Road).</p>	<p>The proposed new access road off Forester's Way will be for the hospital, re-used listed building and medi-park. This will reduce the current hospital-related traffic accessing the site from the Crowthorne side. However it is considered important that the planned new homes are properly linked to Crowthorne to form a sustainable urban extension rather than an isolated pocket of residential development.</p>
<p>Object because, whilst the new hospital will have access to the Sandhurst bypass, the proposed new houses will only have access down Upper and Lower Broadmoor Road into Crowthorne High Street. These roads will not be able to cope with the proposed additional traffic.</p>	<p>To make the development acceptable in planning terms, when the scheme comes forward, the developers must demonstrate how they have overcome any access issues to the site in order to overcome any highway concerns.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Access to the development should be directly onto Forester's Way and not any existing village roads</p>	
<p>The proposed access is mentioned as being temporary, which seems to be an insidious way of providing a new route in/out of Crowthorne</p>	<p>The recent planning application (11/00446/OUT) for the new hospital includes the proposal for a permanent new link road to serve the new hospital, the planned medi-park and the re-used listed hospital building.</p>
<p>An entrance to the hospital from Owlsmoor will only help in a small way as most hospital staff come from the Crowthorne side</p>	<p>Noted. It is anticipated that by improving public transport, cycle and pedestrian access to the site, alongside providing an alternative access road, this will lead to fewer hospital worker's cars entering the site from the Crowthorne side than current levels. The new entrance will also provide access to the re-used listed building and the proposed medi-park.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given to an affordable mini-bus service to key work centres in Bracknell - this would benefit the whole village</p>	<p>Developers will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by car.</p>
<p>Do not believe that, even with increased frequency, the bus service will provide sufficient alternatives to the car</p>	<p>Agreed, but it contributes to a solution.</p>
<p>Even if properties are located within 400m of a bus stop, bus services are run by a private company and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	<p>The Council has powers to procure bus services that would not be supplied by the free market alone, and to use developer contributions for this purpose to allow bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than an 'add on' at a late stage.</p> <p>In the long term, designing bus priority measures into a scheme(allowing the most efficient use of buses) and locating homes so that occupiers have good accessibility from</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>homes to bus stops, from day one, are the best means of enabling the provision of a commercially viable bus services.</p>
<p>Existing public transport is poor. Main bus service (194) is infrequent, whilst improvements are proposed, these will not be sufficient. No improvements proposed to bus route 122 to Wokingham.</p>	<p>The larger population in the area will increase the number of passengers using local bus services, which in turn will increase the viability of bus services, making increased frequency / hours of operation a more realistic prospect. This may be aided in the short term by developer funding to enable improved bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than an 'add on' at a late stage.</p>
<p>The nearest public transport to this site is 1 mile away.</p>	<p>The proposals will include provision of improved bus services in much closer proximity to the site.</p>
<p>Air Track was proposed between Heathrow and Bracknell so would have no benefit or mitigation for Crowthorne.</p>	<p>BAA has scrapped plans to build the multi-million pound Airtrack rail link connecting Heathrow to the south-west due to lack of funds and other priorities for Heathrow.</p>
<p>Parking at Crowthorne station is an issue and the new housing would put an additional burden on this resource.</p>	<p>The provision of additional car parking at local stations is an operational matter for Network Rail and, subject to other planning considerations, may be supported by the Council. As part of the development proposals the Council is proposing a range of other sustainable transport improvements to encourage alternative modes of access to the station other than the car.</p>
<p>The A329(M) is already congested and slow so the proposals will result in more cars, more congestion and more pollution (nitrogen dioxide and carbon monoxide).</p> <p>Increased pollution (nitrogen dioxide and carbon monoxide). Levels already high due to inappropriate high buildings and speed humps which will be exacerbated with new development.</p>	<p>Developers will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. Both of which will help minimise congestion and air pollution.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>To maintain air quality in Crowthorne cancel the plans to overdevelop it</p>	
<p>Increased cars and lack of public transport will lead to pollution; the existing pollution should be dealt with before more is added by virtue of the additional cars caused by the proposed developments</p>	
<p>There are many empty offices in Bracknell and so the new residents will have to commute to jobs outside the area, in Reading and London</p>	<p>The Council has no control over where people live in relation to their workplace. Developers will only build houses when there is demand - generally correlating to economic growth; so it is anticipated that new jobs will be created in Bracknell Forest as new homes are built. Developers will also provide transport improvements to facilitate access to job markets outside the borough.</p>
<p>The nearest facilities are in Owlsmoor this will add increased traffic to the local roads.</p> <p>Will be increased use of Owlsmoor Road as a rat run. Will traffic from the bypass still be able to accessed Owlsmoor Road from the north. The access at the northern end should be closed, only allowing access to be gained to Owlsmoor from the south.</p>	<p>The proposed new residential development will not have direct vehicular access to Foresters Way. It is being planned and designed as an urban extension to Crowthorne. Any applications for development of the site will be subject to a full transport assessment to ensure that no unacceptable impacts on the local road network result.</p>
<p>Poor junction with Old Wokingham Road and Easthampstead road will worsen (improvements were supposed to have been funded by Jennett's Park development, but this did not happen).</p>	<p>It has been agreed with Wokingham Borough Council to progress a joint funded safety improvement scheme in this financial year - focusing on the accident patterns.</p>
<p>Need effective traffic management to ensure safe access to the site and main traffic routes.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>Education</p>	

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The new secondary school in Binfield is too far away for children from Crowthorne to attend, and an extension to Edgbarrow won't be ready in time for the first children moving into the houses. The development will compromise the education of too many children</p>	<p>The residential development at this site is of insufficient scale (numbers of new homes) to justify a new primary or secondary school on site. Therefore a contribution would be sought to provide off-site school places.</p>
<p>Social infrastructure is insufficient: no new schools are proposed and there is a limit to the growth possible in the existing primary and secondary schools over the plan period (Primary School is Victorian in construction and limited outdoor space for expansion).</p>	<p>The sites falls within the designated catchment area of Edgbarrow secondary school (rather than the new school which is planned for at Blue Mountain), which may require further extension to accommodate additional pupils arising from the development.</p>
<p>Consideration must be given to building a new secondary school given the number of homes proposed in Crowthorne / Edgbarrow secondary school will not be able to accommodate the extra pupil</p>	<p>A new secondary school can only be provided if justified by the scale of development and if there is available funding. Given the extent of development proposed in the area over the plan period, this option is neither necessary or feasible for Crowthorne. As stated in the IDP, Edgbarrow is expected to have sufficient capacity to serve the needs of the site.</p>
<p>The demand for places at Edgbarrow School will increase, as it is a good school</p>	<p>The LEA has a statutory duty to provide school places for children, therefore phasing of additional school places will be considered at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Health</p>	
<p>Object as there is currently insufficient doctors and and the new residents will impact on the doctors, dentists and other services. Financial contributions should be sought from developers or new facilities provided with the development.</p>	<p>The PCT has been strongly promoting centralised services. The PCT had initially advised that the proposed new Health Space in Bracknell could serve future occupiers of this development. The PCT has however subsequently confirmed that it will be consulting practices in the area to consider solutions for meeting future demand. This might involve the extension of existing buildings or relocation to larger sites. Further discussions are taking place with the PCT.</p>
<p>No solution for GP facilities in the proposals.</p>	<p>The PCT has been strongly promoting centralised services. The PCT had initially advised that the proposed new Health Space in Bracknell could serve future occupiers of this development. The PCT has however subsequently confirmed that it will be consulting practices in the area to consider solutions for meeting future demand. This might involve the extension of existing buildings or relocation to larger sites. Further discussions are taking place with the PCT.</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Financial contributions from developers might be justified if the PCT can demonstrate a need based on robust evidence.</p>
<p>Drainage/flooding</p>	
<p>Doubt that there is sewerage capacity for these houses without relaying of pipes / the sewerage system is ancient and inadequate</p>	<p>Thames Water, the waste water service provider for this site, has indicated that the service is likely to need upgrading. This will be determined following modelling work funded by developers.</p> <p>If development requires waste water upgrades, but are not planned for at the planning application stage, Thames Water wouldn't object – only recommend a Grampian condition stating that there is to be no occupation until drainage provision in place. The developer would be required to assess capacity, draw up a drainage strategy and act on recommendations.</p> <p>The Council will work closely with water and waste water companies to overcome any sewerage capacity issues.</p>
<p>Pressure on existing sewage and drainage infrastructure.</p>	<p>Thames Water, who is the waste water service providers for this site, has indicated that the service is likely to need upgrading. This will be determined following investigations.</p> <p>The IDP requires developers to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to reduce risk of surface water runoff to green field rates.</p> <p>ACTION: add SUDS requirement to policy.</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>ACTION: add requirement to profile of site in relation to Developers investigating there is adequate waster water capacity</p>
<p>There is not enough water from Southern Water to service these developments</p>	<p>South East Water has been consulted. Although they have not objected to the proposed development of Broadmoor, they have stated that upgrades to the local water supply will be required.</p> <p>Houses will be expected to meet water efficiency standards of 105 litres/head/day.</p>
<p>Concern over housing being built on land which takes away all the open spaces and natural drainage</p>	<p>Whilst there is a recognised housing need, they will be delivered alongside significant amounts of open space and SANG, secured through planning obligation. SUDS will also be incorporated into development, minimising surface runoff risk, by mimicking natural drainage processes.</p>
<p>The site is liable to flood as it is in Flood Zone 1.</p>	<p>The site is not within Flood Zones 2 and 3 where flooding is most likely to occur and where new residential development is restricted. Flood Zone 1 areas have a low flood risk, with a 1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which forms part of the background evidence and will, in accordance with PPS25, inform the “layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage techniques... to reduce the overall level of flood risk”.</p>
<p>Surface water draining from the site turns the gardens of the properties along Lower Broadmoor Road boggy; building hundreds of houses on this land will lead to flooding of these properties</p>	<p>The Environment Agency is generally happy with the proposed layout of Broadmoor. They highlight that a culvert runs through north east corner of the site, and should the capacity be</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Increased housing will create a higher risk of flooding on the Loddon and the Thames through increased run-off.</p>	<p>exceeded, flooding may occur along the culvert. Deculverting the watercourse will reduce the probability of flooding.</p> <p>In line with comments made by the Environment Agency, the IDP (and SA4 policy) requires developers to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) into the development of the site to reduce risk of surface water runoff to green field rates.</p> <p>ACTION: add SUDS requirement to policy.</p>
<p>Ecology</p>	
<p>The development will threaten wildlife & designated sites (SSSI/SPA) Wildlife will die due to the destruction of habitats</p>	<p>Natural England have not objected to the proposals in relation to the proximity of the development to a SSSI/SPA.</p>
<p>Building these houses and the associated utilities close to an SSSI will inevitably damage the environment</p>	<p>The Council recognises that this site is close to the SPA. According to the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, it is required to take account of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development in consultation with Natural England. This is outlined in one of the documents issued to support the DPD - the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment.</p>
<p>All the new development, and the consequential loss of natural green space, will make it impossible for the SSSI's to protect their incumbent rare species</p>	
<p>The site is close to an SPA and will destroy the wildlife and be against English Nature recommendations other development have been refused for this reason.</p>	
<p>Object as within 100 yards is a mature wood with oak, beech, pine and chestnut trees, and 500 yards away is Whitemoor nature reserve</p>	<p>Any redevelopment will be accompanied by a package of measures to mitigate against any adverse impact on such sites. This will include substantial open space and natural greenspace detailed in Policy SA4 and measures to protect biodiversity as outlined in the 'Biodiversity' section of the IDP.</p>
<p>Removal of trees will affect views to the site/skyline.</p>	<p>Given the Hospital's setting and status as a Historic Park and Garden, trees make a defining contribution to the landscape. As</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Trees should be protected.</p>	<p>stated under point 10 of Policy SA4, any redevelopment will need to be sympathetic to the site's heritage assets; as such the Council will aim to preserve as many notable trees as is feasible in addition to new planting.</p> <p>ACTION: include the requirement for a Conservation Management Plan as part of the policy.</p>
<p>Query what will happen to the residents and animals at Broadmoor Farm if converted to an information centre for the SANG / car parking and changing facilities for the new sports pitches, as is suggested. Broadmoor Farm important in its own right as acts as wildlife corridor to Wildmoor Heath Nature Reserve Crowthorne Wood & Swinley Forest.</p>	<p>Noted. The Site Allocations DPD deals with the Land at Broadmoor at a strategic level. Detailed discussions about the farm are on-going.</p>
<p>Ponds at Butter Bottom are important for dragonflies, including the 'Brilliant Emerald', which is a nationally important species and Bracknell Forest BAP species.</p>	<p>This point is agreed; they have been surveyed for invertebrates, are recognised for their invertebrate importance and will be given appropriate protection. New ponds will also be created.</p>
<p>Other infrastructure</p>	
<p>The opportunity should be taken to make provision for allotments in Crowthorne - an assessment should be made of potential demand given that there is already a waiting list</p>	<p>It is recognised that there is a high demand for allotments across the Borough, far outstripping supply (refer to the Open Space section in the IDP Draft Submission document). There are currently no allotment sites in Crowthorne, with the Parish Council office having received numerous enquiries in recent years.</p> <p>Although developers can not be expected to fix this current deficit, when new development comes along, due to popularity and various other benefits, e.g. health and environment, the Council will seek to ensure a proportion of the Open Space provision will be set aside for allotments, as detailed in the IDP.</p>

<p>Policy SA4</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Pressure on existing recreational facilities</p> <p>Object as existing parks in the area are small and will be overcrowded by the new residents</p>	<p>BFC has a high quantity standard for Open Space of Public Value, which is over and above that recommended nationally by organisations such as Fields in Trust. This reflects the value placed on open space by residents and the importance of this in meeting objectives for environmental quality and healthy living.</p> <p>Developments will be required to meet the required local standard by providing new, on-site recreational open space. In addition, further recreational land will have to be provided as part of the development to mitigate and avoid potential impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, which will be publicly accessible.</p>
<p>Provision of additional open space is welcomed</p>	<p>Noted. The developer will be obliged to meet the Council's standard for providing 4.3ha of Open Space of Public Value per 1000 residents generated.</p>
<p>Point 13: natural surroundings of the Three Castles Path should also be protected (wide range of habitats and landscape in a small area in contrast to the large areas of heath (Wildmoor) and forestry plantation (Devil's Highway)).</p>	<p>As stated in the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP3), "Public Rights of Way (PRoW) should be duly considered in the site layout of new development for interlinking services and settlements to mitigate its impact on the highway network. This includes protecting the character of the path network and avoiding paths being absorbed within estate roads. This is particularly important in light of increased traffic volume and speed and the need to provide more attractive alternatives to the private motor vehicle for short journeys".</p> <p>Policy TP9 states that the Council will endeavour to protect and maintain the PRoW network in accordance with legislative duties and powers, and seek opportunities to enhance the network by creating, reclassifying and / or improving paths to provide new linkages and circular routes.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Pressure on police and fire service.	Emergency services have been consulted during the production of the IDP and therefore contains any known capacity issues to emerge. Subject to justification, developers might be expected to contribute towards mitigation measures.
There are already high voltage power lines close to residential properties and the provision of additional power would increase health concerns	In consultation, the National Grid have not flagged this up as being a particular issue, however if developers build near to powerlines, they are obliged to follow relevant design and safety guidelines.
Other	
Houses along Lower Broadmoor Road will be isolated (caught between a housing estate and a park) and will form a barrier which will lead to cutting through these properties as a short cut	It is not clear how a position between residential development and a park can be considered any more isolated than the current situation.
The proposed park at the end of a no-through road will lead to anti-social behaviour as the police will not visit it	The areas of open space are provided for formal and informal recreation and to divert recreational users from the Special Protection Area. It is not considered appropriate to restrict the provision of open space on the basis that it could allow anti-social behaviour.
Concern expressed whether BFC can cope with the maintenance associated with the new housing as there is no maintenance of the South Meadow Estate currently, other than refuse collections	Maintenance of the new housing will not be the responsibility of BFC.
Concern about the likelihood of the site being delivered within the plan period. The allocation should either be removed or the number should be reduced to reflect the unlikelihood of 278 dwellings coming forward within the plan period.	It is not clear why it is considered unlikely that the site will be delivered within the plan period. The site's owners have submitted phasing evidence to show that it can be delivered within this period.
The proposals should be checked for viability before moving on to the Sustainability Appraisal stage	All the strategic development proposals are being subject to viability testing as part of the preparation of the Draft Submission version of the SADPD.

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Seek establishment of a Neighbourhood Planning Group, whose proposals can then be subject to a referendum in line with the Localism Bill</p>	<p>When the Localism Bill comes into effect, it will be open to the local community, potentially through the Parish Council or local businesses to initiate the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The draft Bill makes it clear that this must accord with the strategic elements of the Local Development Framework and is not a replacement for it.</p>
<p>Do not need another nursing/care home as there are already 9 in Crowthorne.</p>	<p>It envisaged that the care home (use class C2) will provide care for people who require constant nursing care and who have significant deficiencies with coping with daily living.</p> <p>In planning terms, this is considered to be an acceptable use within this development, particularly in view of the ageing population. As far as having regard to the the number of other facilities in the area, it is unlikely that it will be provided unless commercially viable.</p>
<p>Destruction of Broadmoor Farm</p>	<p>This is not proposed as part of the SADPD.</p>
<p>Concern that construction traffic may result in damage to buildings along construction routes.</p>	<p>Construction traffic would be routed along the proposed link road to minimise disruption.</p>
<p>Increased crime.</p>	<p>It is not clear why the proposed development would result in any increase in criminal activity.</p>
<p>Statutory Consultee Comments</p>	
<p>See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Crowthorne Parish Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Wokingham Without Parish Council, Wokingham Without Councillors, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England, Berkshire East Primary Care Trust, Thames Water, RSPB, SE Berkshire Ramblers, British Horse Society, Crowthorne Village Action Group.</p>	<p>See specific responses to consultee comments.</p>

Policy SA4 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Also see comments on Background Evidence in relation to Landscape, Infrastructure, Transport and Habitat Regulations.	See specific responses to background papers.

Table 2.12 Policy SA4 (Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne) - Developer Responses

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Broadmoor (on behalf of owners of site, West London Mental Health Trust)	
The text in paragraphs 2.4.3 and 2.4.5 refers to a nursing home but Policy SA4 itself fails to also refer to one.	Noted - wording of Policy and supporting text will be amended accordingly, to ensure consistency. ACTION: include reference to nursing home in policy.
Item 3: should read "a small research park, and a nursing home"	Noted - wording of Policy and supporting text will be amended accordingly, to ensure consistency. ACTION: include reference to nursing home in policy.
Item 11: "significantly exceed 8ha per 1,000 people" is not necessary given the following phrase refers to the need for avoidance and mitigate. Suggest following wording: "On-site bespoke SANG to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heaths Special Protection Area"	The minimum requirement for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) is 8 hectares per 1000 new population. The developer will need to provide a SANG that is of a size and quality which will enable a conclusion of no adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA. Given the close proximity to the SPA of the Broadmoor development, this is likely of be of a size that is in excess of the minimum requirements.
Item 12: redundant and should be deleted on the basis that on-site bespoke SANG will avoid impact (as required by item 11)	The Council's SPA avoidance and mitigation measures are based on a combination of access management and the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG). This is clearly set out in the South East Plan (2009) policy NRM6, the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009) and the BFC Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy
List of infrastructure requirements may need revising depending on the finality of the Master Plan, and circumstances at the time specific planning applications are submitted.	Noted. In accordance with PPS12, "the infrastructure planning process should identify, as far as possible:...infrastructure needs and costs". The IDP will remain a 'live' document, so amendments will be made when more information or other issues emerge.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Map 2: identifies land to be allocated for mixed use development. In order to relate to existing and proposed development, this area should be extended (a map to show the extended area was provided as part of their submission).	This will be considered as part of the Draft Submission Document.
Representations were also made in relation to background documents (IDP, Landscape Capacity Study, Habitat Regulations Assessment & Transport)	See Responses to '7 'Responses to 'Landscape Capacity Study"', '15 'Responses to 'Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment"', 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan" and 13 'Responses to 'Transport Accessibility Assessment" .
Luff Developments Ltd (Policy SA7 - Blue Mountain)	
The scale of development proposed seems to be in keeping with its location and character. However, the site will not deliver until the end of the plan period and will not therefore contribute to the immediate 5 year land supply.	The new hospital needs to be rebuilt first in order that existing patients can be decanted into the new facilities before new housing can be built within the kitchen garden, due to security reasons. This accounts for the housing being delivered in the latter part of the plan period.
The illustrative concept plan needs to be clarified to show what is expected in the 'white' areas.	Masterplans will be updated and form part of the Draft Submission Document.
Croudace Strategic Ltd (on behalf of SHLAA ref 24 - not land owner of this site)	
Whilst this policy is not objected to in principle, noted that the timing of the delivery of the housing element of the development is uncertain, and dependant upon the hospital, and the 278 dwellings will not be provided until the end of the plan period. Noted that the site is expected to bear heavy infrastructure burden which may impact upon the viability of the housing proposals, which emphasises the importance of small and medium sized edge of settlement sites which can provide more certain and predictable housing completions, which should be released early in the plan period.	The new hospital needs to be rebuilt first in order that existing patients can be decanted into the new facilities before new housing can be built within the kitchen garden, due to security reasons. This accounts for the housing being delivered in the latter part of the plan period. All development needs to mitigate against the impact it would have in terms of infrastructure, which is set out within the IDP.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Meryl Developments Ltd (on behalf of part of SHLAA ref 292 (former site 221) - not land owner of this site)	
<p>Site is not suitable for residential development as within an close to the 400m exclusion zone around the SPA. Siting houses 401m from the SPA will not eliminate their impact, no amount of SANG will prevent this. There are more suitable sites for urban extensions further away from the SPA which should be allocated for residential development, such as land at Chavey Down.</p>	<p>The Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (policy CS14) contains a presumption against residential development within 400m of the SPA. For residential development between 400m and 5km of the SPA avoidance and mitigation measures will need to be put in place and agreed with Natural England. This is consistent with regional policy (South East Plan (2009) and guidance (Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009)). The test of suitability of other urban extensions is well documented within the Site Allocations DPD Participation and Preferred options documents. Many factors are taken into account when assessing suitability.</p>
Charles Church (on behalf of SHLAA ref 251 - not land owner of the site)	
<p>Redevelopment appears to be dependent upon support from the Government in relation to provision of a redeveloped hospital. Without any firm assurance from the Government, there is doubt over the likelihood and timescale of any development coming forward. Phasing of the site indicates that the site would not be completed until the end of the plan period. This highlights that any slippage could result in new housing coming forward after the plan period. Due to the uncertainty of the housing not coming forward during the plan period, the allocation is considered unsound.</p> <p>Proposed change: either remove the allocation or reduce the associated housing numbers.</p>	<p>There is an intention to provide a redeveloped hospital, which can be seen from the recent planning application (11/00446/FUL, pending consideration) which seeks the erection of a replacement secure mental health hospital, with new access road onto the A3095, also including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a staff/visitor car park • energy centre (to replace existing) • upgrading of existing administration buildings • demolition of part of curtilage listed building 'Berkshire House' • demolition of cartilage listed buildings 'Yorkshire House', Lancashire House' and 'Richard Dadd Centre' • new perimeter road, secure perimeter and wall
Persimmon/Redrow (on behalf of Jennetts Park - SHLAA ref 66, not landowner of this site)	
<p>Redevelopment appears to be dependent upon support from the Government in relation to provision of a redeveloped hospital.</p>	<p>There is an intention to provide a redeveloped hospital, which can be seen from the recent planning application (11/00446/FUL, pending</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Without reductions in planned Government spending, gives rise to uncertainty over the deliverability of the site. Even if funding can be obtained, there is certainty for this to be delayed. Broadmoor already assumed to be at the end of the plan period, there is a risk that delay would push completions beyond the plan period.</p>	<p>consideration) which seeks the erection of a replacement secure mental health hospital, with new access road onto the A3095, also including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a staff/visitor car park • energy centre (to replace existing) • upgrading of existing administration buildings • demolition of part of curtilage listed building 'Berkshire House' • demolition of cartilage listed buildings 'Yorkshire House', Lancashire House' and 'Richard Dadd Centre' • new perimeter road, secure perimeter and wall

Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne

Similarly to Policy SA4, a significant number of objections to Policy SA5 concerned the likely impact of the development together with other developments proposed in the area (by Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Borough Council). Traffic and highways considerations were also raised.

Table 2.13 - Policy SA5 (Land at TRL, Crowthorne) - Residents Responses

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Scale / Principle of development</p>	
<p>Wish that the Government would encourage people to move north where there is ample scope for development so that these developments do not threaten Crowthorne.</p>	<p>This is a matter of national policy and is beyond the scope of this document.</p>
<p>The need for development on this site is based on outdated evidence (economic and social changes). Fails to take account of Localism Bill.</p>	<p>PPS3 makes it clear that the level of housing provision should take account of evidence including the Government's latest published household projections. The CLG 2008 based household estimates show a continuing increase in the number of households in Bracknell Forest over the plan period - particularly small households. Whilst the area has been affected by adverse economic conditions, historic trends suggest that the plan period will also cover periods of growth.</p> <p>The Government has made it clear that the planning system should do everything it can to support economic growth and sustainable development. In a Written Ministerial Statement (23rd March 2011 - Planning for Growth, Greg Clark made it clear the Local Planning Authorities should continue to prepare up to date development plans and make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of the area and respond to wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p>This is re-iterated in the draft NPPF which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need for planning to encourage growth rather than act as an impediment.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>In terms of Localism, the draft NPPF makes it clear that the ambitions of a neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area and that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Object to housing development in Crowthorne. Other sites should be allocated for those in housing need.</p>	<p>It is accepted that some development has occurred in Crowthorne over the last few years. However, the population of the Borough and number of households is projected to grow further and there is a need to provide additional housing.</p>
<p>There is no need for this type of development in Crowthorne.</p>	
<p>The Council has identified this site because of its location on the extremities of the Borough. It is assumed that it will therefore meet little opposition.</p>	<p>All sites proposed have been submitted as available for development through the SHLAA, including some small sites within and on the edge of the existing settlement. A number of the sites (including TRL and Broadmoor) involve previously developed land where some form of change is required due to the presence of buildings/uses that no longer meet current needs. National policy (PPS1 and PPS3) suggests that priority should be given to these sites.</p>
<p>Crowthorne has changed enough and has had its share of development. Do not want anymore houses. Too many flats have been built in Crowthorne in recent years.</p>	<p>In allocating sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals equate to an increase of approximately 30% in the number of properties in Crowthorne as a whole, the Council's proposals also include a number of sites in other parts of the Borough including large sites at Blue Mountain and Amen Corner North, Binfield. The capacity of available sites in other parts of the Borough is not sufficient to accommodate all future development needs.</p>
<p>Oppose the scale / density of development proposed in Crowthorne / developments proposed are too large and inappropriate.</p>	
<p>Crowthorne cannot support this level of development especially given the plans for development in Wokingham Borough - the size of Crowthorne will increase by 25% / double (estimates vary according to response). Crowthorne should not be expected to take more than its fair share of the number of houses proposed for allocation - what is proposed is far more than its fair share / 60% / 40% (varied by response).</p>	<p>The sites that the Council is proposing to allocate are considered to be those that are most compatible with national and local policy. Further details of the rationale for site selection is given in the Background Paper to the Draft Submission Document.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>It would be fairer to spread development around the Borough rather than concentrate so much of it in Crowthorne.</p> <p>The number of new houses in Crowthorne should be reduced to 350-400 in total / don't object to this site per se but should be a lower number of dwellings within the limits of existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>The type and size of housing to be provided will need to have regard to evidence contained within the Bracknell Housing Market Assessment. The densities proposed take account of local circumstances and national policy set out in PPS3 (para 44) that states that using land efficiently is a key consideration in planning for housing. The draft NPPF refers to the need to 'optimise' the potential of a site to accommodate development.</p>
<p>Consider there to be scope to increase the scale/density of development at TRL. Such action would protect land at West End Lane from development as part of Policy SA9.</p>	<p>It is important that the scale and density of development is appropriate for the site. The site is constrained by various factors, including the SPA.</p>
<p>Acknowledge that the site is brownfield, but Crowthorne cannot support this development given developments at Jennett's Park, Broadmoor and in Wokingham District.</p>	<p>Account is being taken of committed development and proposals on existing infrastructure and services and the need for the extension of/new facilities. An IDP is being refined which will set out requirements.</p>
<p>Combined impacts of this proposal with Broadmoor (SA4) have not been properly assessed/considered.</p>	
<p>Object to plans for development in Crowthorne, as there is no evidence that the houses will be affordable to first time buyers, despite assurances.</p>	<p>The Council will seek affordable housing from the site in accordance with policy. However, regard has to be paid to economic viability and the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including any public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured.</p> <p>The Government is proposing a significant amount of change in the delivery of affordable housing, including the introduction of an affordable rent product. The Government has published a new Framework for the 2011-2015 Spending Review period.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Lack of co-ordination with Wokingham Borough on house building around Crowthorne.</p>	<p>The proposals have been developed in the knowledge of the proposed development in Wokingham Borough Council (WBC). The Council has exchanged data with WBC to feed into the Council's respective transport models. Joint working has also taken place on various items of infrastructure, including education facilities. A dialogue with officers will be maintained as preparation on the SADPD continues.</p>
<p>Confusion exists about the number of dwellings proposed for this site, as it seems to vary over time. Confusion exists over the amount of floorspace on the existing site and its capacity for re-use.</p>	<p>The number of dwellings relating to this site has varied over time due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progression of the Site Allocations document through its various stages. At the Issues and Options stage the site formed part of a larger area (Broad Area 3) suggested for 1,200 -1,300 dwellings. At the Preferred Option stage, it was put forward for 1,000 dwellings. A Draft Indicative Option Working Paper published as part of a report that was considered by the Council's Executive in July 2010, suggested 1,150 dwellings on the site. - A proposal (ref: 07/01196/OUT) promoted by Legal and General through a planning application that was refused and the subject of an appeal that was dismissed in June 2009. This involved a mixed use development including up to 975 dwellings. <p>As far as the existing position on the site is concerned, the appeal decision refers to the older buildings having a total floorspace of over 47,000 sq.m. (evidence from the owners of the site suggests that this may be a slight under estimate) and states that the buildings vary in size, quality and nature. The Inspector comments that the buildings include the former main office building which is 7 storeys high and that most of the buildings are currently unused - the potential for re-use is limited. The agreed position of commercial experts at the Inquiry was that the buildings have little or no potential for re use and that the area needed to be redeveloped if commercial activity was to resume to any significant extent.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>In addition to the above, there is also the relatively new TRL HQ building that was permitted in 2002 (01/00722/FUL). This involves 13,585 sq.m. of offices and a storage building (1,307 sq.m.). This would be retained in any future scheme.</p>
<p>Covenant should be signed by the land owners establishing an upper limit on the housing numbers on the site determined by sustainability and a guarantee of S106 improvements.</p>	<p>The Council has no powers to make the landowner sign such a covenant. However, if the site is allocated for development, it will be allocated for a specific scale of development. The form of development and mitigation required will be determined by the need for a sustainable scheme that is supported by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>A S106 Agreement is likely to include a variety of improvements to infrastructure in the area, however, the nature and scale of these must be compliant with the tests in Circular 05/05. The scope of any S106 Agreement will depend on the timing of the proposal in relation to CIL.</p>
<p>The proposals will result in the loss of green space and amenities currently enjoyed by all.</p>	<p>The site is privately owned. The proposal will result in greater opportunities for public access due to the need to provide Open Space of Public Value and SANG with the development. Currently there is only one public right of way across the north eastern corner of the site.</p>
<p>Do not understand why BFC is now supporting development on this site, having strongly opposed it previously at appeal and spent a considerable amount of the Council's money on the appeal. The reasons for refusal by the Planning Inspector still exist.</p>	<p>The application was refused in 2008 and was subsequently the subject of an appeal. It was assessed against the policy framework that existed at the time.</p>
<p>The Planning Inspector stated that the appeal proposal would result in significant operational issues to the detriment of road safety.</p>	<p>Since that time, the Council has started work on the SADPD with a view to allocating sites to meet the need for growth. The document will eventually form part of the planning policy framework. The consideration of this site through the LDF process ensures that the site is not considered in isolation. The advantages and disadvantages of developing the site are being considered alongside other</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>No explanation is given as to why BFC has changed its view about the development of this site. BFC previously objected to development proposals at the TRL site (for being in the countryside and harming the strategic gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell). The current proposal will have the same negative impacts.</p>	<p>alternative locations. Due to the scale of housing that remains to be accommodated and the range of sites available, it is clear that there is a need to allocate land on the edge of existing settlements that is currently defined as countryside for planning policy purposes.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. The scheme currently being promoted is of a very different scale and nature and will be required to mitigate its impact.</p>
<p>The previous proposal involved less units than now proposed / the proposal is a carbon copy of that proposed by Legal and General (varied by response)</p>	<p>The application that was the subject of the appeal involved a different form of development to that now proposed. The appeal proposal involved the redevelopment of the site for a mixed use development comprising up to 975 dwellings with associated local neighbourhood centre including shops (use class A1), financial and professional services (use class A2), restaurants/cafes (use class A3), primary school/nursery, community hall, health and fitness centre, healthcare centre and small scale office and business units (use class B1) plus a business park comprising 92,903 square metres of office floorspace (use class B1) with ancillary parking and food and drink uses, an 80 room hotel and a combined heat and power plant. Greenspace including SANG was also to be provided on the eastern side of the site.</p> <p>The business park was proposed to the east of the new TRL headquarters building. It was to contain up to 92,903 sq.m of headquarters style office development area, including some decked parking.</p>
<p>The development proposed at TRL appears to be out of step with the findings of the Inspector at the recent appeal.</p>	<p>The appeal decision makes it clear that the site is suitable for development but not in the form that was considered at the Inquiry. Further information on the Inspector's conclusions is set out in the Background Paper to the Draft Submission Document.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>There are few jobs in Bracknell as can be seen by the number of empty offices. New residents will have to commute to jobs outside the area, such as Reading and London.</p>	<p>Total employment in Bracknell Forest stands at around 55,400 jobs according to the Business Records Employment Survey 2009. This data replaces the Annual Business Inquiry and so the data to 2008 cannot be directly compared with 2009.</p> <p>The number of jobs in Bracknell Forest exceeds the number of households (around 47,000 households in 2008) so the ratio of jobs to households is just under 1.2 – a measure which is commonly used to quickly assess whether an area has a balance between jobs and homes.</p> <p>In March 2011, 2.1% of the working population in Bracknell Forest were unemployed. Although this is higher than a few years ago, it is lower than during 2010 and lower than the regional average.</p>
<p>The documents seek to avoid the risk of labour shortages in Bracknell. However due to lack of public transport links between Crowthorne and Bracknell the proposed new housing will simply result in more congestion on the roads and an increase in travel time to Bracknell. Employment opportunities in Fleet, Camberley and Windsor will become more attractive.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council cannot control where people work, it is important that there are opportunities for people to live and work locally. This helps reduce the amount of commuting.</p> <p>The proposals include provisions to improve links between the site and Bracknell, particularly by modes of transport other than the private car.</p>
<p>The TRL site is ideal for local employment.</p> <p>Opposed to the loss of jobs for local people which will result from the redevelopment of the TRL site.</p>	<p>The proposal would not result in the loss of all employment floorspace from the site. The existing TRL HQ building would be retained and other small scale employment generating uses are proposed such as an Enterprise Centre and a Local Centre. It is also proposed to re-locate the Council's Depot to this site.</p> <p>There are also other sources of employment in Crowthorne.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Suggest BFC reverts to plans for the site to be used as a business park, as an employment use will not damage the character of the area.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the agreed position of commercial experts at the Inquiry into the earlier planning application that was the subject of an appeal was that the existing older buildings on the site have little or no potential for re use. It was concluded that the area needed to be redeveloped if commercial activity was to resume to any significant extent.</p> <p>The ELR suggests that there is no quantitative or qualitative need for additional office floorspace in the Borough, in fact there is already more than sufficient to meet needs over the plan period. The loss of office floorspace on this site in favour of housing would help achieve a broad balance between jobs and homes. The ELR suggests that if the opportunity arises, the Council should permit most of the site to be released for housing or other uses (para 7.36).</p> <p>Whilst the proposed development will extend beyond the footprint of the existing buildings, it must be acknowledged that the site is predominantly classified as previously developed land and that the impact of the current proposal is unlikely to be significantly different to a redeveloped business park.</p> <p>An estimate of peak hour (8-9 am and 5-6 pm) trips based on typical TRICS type rates has been carried out for the existing development and proposed development. The comparison indicates that a similar level of trips would occur.</p>
<p>The proposals relating to Crowthorne, with their inevitable increase in traffic volume and congestion, do not meet the stated objective of trying to improve environmental quality, and protect and enhance the Green Belt boundary and areas of natural and historic interest.</p>	<p>The Green Belt does not extend as far south as Crowthorne. Land outside defined settlements in this area is currently protected by countryside policies.</p> <p>Within the over riding need to provide for growth, the Council will try to improve environmental quality and protect areas of natural and historic interest.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The TRL site should be redeveloped but only within the existing footprint and thus with substantially less than 1,000 dwellings.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed (1,000) is too high - less than half that would be appropriate.</p>	<p>Although the Inspector who considered the appeal proposal considered that there might be some minor exceptions, he felt that the appeal site as a whole could be regarded as previously developed land (para 860 of decision letter). He quoted the encouragement in PPS1 to bring vacant and underused PDL and buildings back into beneficial use and the similar encouragement in PPS3. PPS3 (para 44) also states that using land efficiently is a key consideration in planning for housing.</p> <p>The Government also requires development to be achievable which means determining that a development is economically viable. This means taking into account market factors such as economic viability of existing, proposed and alternative uses in terms of land values, attractiveness of the locality, level of potential market demand and projected rate of sales together with site preparation costs. The Council is commissioning further work on the viability of proposals being promoted through SADPD.</p> <p>The draft NPPF refers to the need to 'optimise' the potential of a site.</p>
<p>Respect the need for development in the District, including Crowthorne, but it must be appropriate and sustainable. The developments at TRL and Broadmoor are too large and inappropriate.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal for TRL includes 1,000 dwellings, it also includes other uses such as a primary school and Local Centre to help achieve a sustainable form of development. The scale of development proposed takes account of constraints affecting the site and provides an appropriate balance between the need to make the best use of available land and provide a mix of development including house sizes and type.</p>
<p>Support development at this site as it is a brownfield site and should be chosen above countryside areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The site seems generally acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Glad that the TRL site is at last being utilised</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Crowthorne is a village (not a town, like Bracknell) and should be allowed to stay that way. Concerned that the planned development will result in it becoming a town.</p>	<p>There is a need to allocate sites that are available and conform with national policy and the locational principles set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>A sustainable form of development is sought that is well integrated with the existing settlement pattern and community.</p> <p>The draft NPPF states that the ambitions of neighbourhoods should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area.</p>
<p>The proposals will result in more people living in the area but there will be fewer jobs.</p>	<p>Whilst the redevelopment of the Crowthorne Business Estate would involve the loss of just over 47,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, the Employment Land Review plus results of subsequent monitoring show that the Borough has an excess of office floorspace for the plan period. Other job opportunities exist in Crowthorne and the surrounding settlements, including those beyond the Borough boundaries.</p>
<p>Need to take into account a site proposed for 100+ houses opposite TRL at the junction of Old Wokingham Rd and Hatch Ride.</p>	<p>The Council is aware that a site at the junction of Old Wokingham Rd and Hatch Ride, in Wokingham Borough, is allocated for residential development (saved policy WH5 of the Local Plan allocates the site for 70 dwellings). Wokingham Borough Council is in the process of producing a Managing Development Delivery Development Plan Document which will update the position on this site.</p>
<p>Support identification of the preferred sites as they are more logical given that areas within Winkfield and Cranbourne are not appropriate for major development (due to their rural, narrow roads and overstretched community infrastructure).</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Other sites were ranked higher than this one, in terms of suitability and sustainability, so not clear why this one is preferred / why have the</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal is one of a number of factors that influences the sites proposed for allocation. A number of other evidence studies were produced, which formed part of the evidence base - as set out in the Preferred Option Background Paper.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Crowthorne sites, ranked 5 and 6 out of 8, been preferred to the number 1 ranked site?</p>	
<p>The sustainability discussion has been simplified and largely ignores the effect on the surrounding community of re-development.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact that an increase in population of 25% will have on the existing infrastructure and services enjoyed by existing residents of the village.</p>	<p>The effect on the surrounding community is being considered in terms of the infrastructure required and the need to integrate new development with the existing community.</p> <p>The SADPD is accompanied by an IDP setting out the infrastructure requirements for the development.</p>
<p>Proposed development is too high a density - more suited to an urban location such as Bracknell. 4 dwellings per hectare is more suitable here.</p>	<p>Proposals must be economically viable. The viability of a development is affected by market factors such as adjacent uses, existing, proposed and alternative uses for the site in terms of land values. It is also affected by cost factors such as site preparation costs relating to any physical constraints and delivery factors such as build out rates.</p> <p>PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a supply of deliverable sites (which is also included in the Draft NPPF). This includes ensuring that the development is achievable - in other words that there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time i.e. that it is viable.</p> <p>The number of units for the site is considered appropriate. The rationale of this site is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>Sites have only been promoted because they are available not properly considering the impact upon existing communities.</p>	<p>A range of available sites have been considered. In addition to availability, consideration has been given to locational factors, transport, infrastructure and landscape capacity amongst others.</p>
Character/Community	

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>A large area of housing with a new school is a pathetic attempt at creating a new community. The existing community spirit in Crowthorne will be lost as a result of the developments.</p> <p>The development will involve small enclave with few facilities.</p>	<p>The proposal will also involve a neighbourhood centre, community facilities, a care home, an enterprise centre and a depot together with a considerable amount of accessible greenspace. Furthermore, the design will aim to integrate the development with the existing built up area of Crowthorne, through the relationship of buildings and transport links.</p>
<p>The proposed developments will result in the loss of the character of the village (it will become more like a town) and its sense of community will be lost.</p> <p>The social and environmental impact on the communities of Wokingham Without and Crowthorne have been underestimated or ignored</p>	<p>It is accepted that the proposal will result in the expansion of the settlement of Crowthorne. However, additional facilities will be provided within the development to assist in the creation and integration of communities.</p>
<p>The loss of substantial trees and vegetation will have a detrimental effect on the current character of Crowthorne.</p> <p>Wish to see a belt of trees retained along Old Wokingham Road, as is proposed along Nine Mile Ride.</p>	<p>Part of the site is already developed. Whilst the development of certain areas will result in the loss of trees and vegetation, additional planting will take place on other areas, for example, sections of the former test track.</p> <p>The illustrative concept plan will be developed further to indicate a 50m wide green route along Nine Mile Ride and a tree lined frontage to Old Wokingham Road. The aim is to catch glimpses of the development along Old Wokingham Road, rather than completely screen the development. There would therefore be intervisibility between each side of Old Wokingham Road. It is hoped that this will assist integration with the existing urban fabric to the west of Old Wokingham Road.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend illustrative concept plan to include further detail on extent of green route along Nine Mile Ride and Old Wokingham Road.</p>
<p>Separation between settlements</p>	

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Object to development as there will be no gap left between Crowthorne, Bracknell and Wokingham. The strip of woodland that would be left on Nine Mile Ride would not achieve separation.</p> <p>The development will result in Crowthorne becoming a suburb of Bracknell.</p> <p>Existing towns and villages will be transformed into urban sprawl with a resultant loss of identity.</p>	<p>It is not proposed to allocate land north of Nine Mile Ride for development, thus helping to maintain a gap between Crowthorne and Wokingham, as this land provides an important wooded gateway to Crowthorne, forest setting to Nine Mile Ride, and the importance of the landscape in achieving gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne and Crowthorne and Wokingham.</p> <p>The north western corner of the site would remain undeveloped as open space. Furthermore, a 50m green route will be indicated along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Nine Mile Ride. Further consideration has been given to the location of uses within the north east corner of the site in order to retain a buffer between the settlements of Crowthorne and Bracknell. The aim is to retain an area of wooded landscape character devoid of development between the two settlements.</p> <p>The south eastern edge of the site is within the 400m buffer of the SPA. By providing this land as open space to mitigate the impact upon the SPA, it is considered that potential issues of coalescence between Crowthorne and Bracknell can be reduced.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend illustrative concept plan to include further detail on extent of green route along Nine Mile Ride and adjust disposition of uses in north east corner of site.</p>
<p>The suggestion that pupils will have to go to Easthampstead School emphasises the point that the development would need to link to Bracknell, which is against the objective of maintaining a strategic gap.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the fact that Easthampstead School is destined to meet the secondary educational needs of the site, prejudices any physical or visual buffer between the settlements of Crowthorne and Bracknell. There will need to be good transport links between the two, but this does not imply a lack of separation.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed development would adjoin Wokingham Without Parish. This would result in the two communities being joined.</p>	<p>The development will adjoin that part of Crowthorne that falls within Wokingham Without. Each area may have facilities that the other will benefit from.</p>
<p>The site is well hidden behind the trees along Nine Mile Ride and Old Wokingham Road</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>General</p>	
<p>The impact of the development/ what infrastructure will be required has not been adequately addressed in the outline documents - these include a vague wish list of actions and enhancements. There is no evidence of budget allocations.</p>	<p>Some infrastructure providers (providers of water, sewage, electricity and gas) have a statutory duty to provide services regardless of the economic climate. The Council will ensure other infrastructure is provided by securing contributions or in-kind provision through Section 106 Legal Agreements or CIL (depending on the timing of the application).</p>
<p>The Council cannot ensure provision of key infrastructure - roads, water, sewage, electricity, gas, medical facilities - and it is highly unlikely they will be delivered by others in the current economic climate.</p>	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the IDP's production, so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be. Where improvements to infrastructure are necessary, the service provider has to the best of their knowledge stated what mitigation measures would be required. In some instances there has been insufficient information to allocate budgets; however funding streams have been identified, with an indication as to whether developer contributions would be required.</p>
<p>The Council has no control over the improvements required to infrastructure for such a large development and therefore cannot assure people that the development will be sustainable.</p>	<p>Infrastructure improvements required as a result of the development will be secured either through Section 106 Legal Agreement or CIL (depending on the timing of the application).</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Too much onus is placed on the developers to provide infrastructure. Proposals go beyond the reasonable responsibility of developers to mitigate their development.</p>	<p>Mitigation, whether in-kind or by a financial contribution will be sought where there is evidence of need and conformity to legal tests.</p>
<p>The Council cannot ensure provision of key infrastructure - roads, water, sewage, electricity, gas, medical facilities - and it is highly unlikely they will be delivered by others in the current economic climate.</p>	<p>Some infrastructure providers (providers of water, sewage, electricity and gas) have a statutory duty to provide services regardless of the economic climate. The Council will ensure other infrastructure is provided by securing contributions or in-kind provision through Section 106 Legal Agreements or CIL (depending on the timing of the application).</p>
<p>Transport</p>	
<p>The proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS2 in that the site does not have good transport links to the rest of the urban area or firm proposals to provide such links.</p> <p>Poor links exist between the site and Crowthorne.</p>	<p>Whilst the site does not currently benefit from good transport links to the rest of the urban area, the proposals will include measures to improve these - further information is set out in the IDP.</p> <p>As with the Jennetts Park and The Parks developments, where there were inadequate public transport links, developers will be expected to integrate measures to improve public transport in their developments, i.e. Bus priority measures and all homes within a 400m walking distance of a bus stop. As is the case with TRL, enhancements to the 194 service to serve the development and improve linkages to Bracknell will be required.</p>
<p>The cumulative impact of developments from within and outside Bracknell Forest have been ignored.</p>	<p>The transport modelling work takes account of the cumulative effect of planned development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Borough, and of general background traffic growth. The models look at a number of highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all of the developments that are envisaged up to the year 2026.</p>
<p>The IDP over simplifies the traffic issues.</p>	<p>The IDP provides an outline of proposals and costings. However, it is not appropriate to include the fine details of every scheme in the document. Further</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>details can be found in Bracknell Forest's Transport Modelling report, which will form part of the SADPD's evidence base.</p>
<p>Concerned that the development proposed is not self-contained (no pub, community centre, health centre, nursery) so could lead to additional local traffic.</p>	<p>There will be a degree of self-containment. A new neighbourhood centre is proposed for the site together with a multi-use community centre, primary school and open space. The development will also include employment floorspace and a nursing home. The Council will seek enhancements to public transport, pedestrian routes and cycleways to make travel by more sustainable modes more attractive, thus offering an alternative to using private vehicles.</p>
<p>It is already virtually impossible to commute between Crowthorne and Bracknell / Wokingham / Sandhurst at peak times. The proposals will make the existing situation considerably worse.</p> <p>The new link road from Jennett's Park to the A329, will result in more traffic using roads in Crowthorne to avoid congestion in Bracknell and Wokingham. This needs to be taken into account in considering these proposals.</p> <p>A dual carriageway should be provided to the A329(M) as Peacock Lane is not suitable for the amount of traffic that will be generated</p> <p>The proposed developments in Crowthorne will impact on traffic through Sandhurst (e.g. commuters wishing to get to the M3). This needs to be taken into consideration when planning for infrastructure.</p> <p>Oppose the development as Crowthorne cannot cope with any more traffic - the points of entry to the</p>	<p>The Council has modelled the cumulative effect of development impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration in the baseline situation even allowing for the additional traffic that the new development will generate (and traffic from proposed development in Wokingham).</p> <p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate how proposed transport improvements will mitigate the impact of their development and this will involve contributing in-kind and/or financially towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles.</p> <p>The movements related to the new link road have been factored in to the transport modelling work.</p> <p>The impacts of all the proposed strategic developments on key routes within the Borough have been included in the transport modelling work.</p> <p>The emergency services have been consulted about the proposals and they will be involved further in the detailed plans.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>settlement are already difficult. The developments will make the existing congestion on the roads worse.</p> <p>Object to the proposals as local roads are already very busy especially at school run times. It is extremely unlikely that the minor junction improvements proposed will have a positive impact on traffic flow or capacity. This makes access for emergency services difficult.</p> <p>The local roads (in particular, Old Wokingham Road) cannot cope with the additional traffic and the proposed roundabout on Old Wokingham Road would only lead to long queues of traffic and increased traffic noise.</p> <p>Whilst improvements to road junctions are welcomed, they will not result in a reduction in the volume of cars on the roads.</p> <p>Capacity improvements are already required to the junctions referenced within the policy, therefore additional lanes and/or roads will be required to take the traffic from the additional homes proposed.</p>	
<p>Note that modelling work is still being carried out in respect of impact on the highway network. Concerned that the Highway Authority won't be able to mitigate the impact of the development given the huge costs involved and the state of the economy.</p>	<p>The highways infrastructure required has been modelled and the costs have been estimated. It is anticipated that the funding for the improvements required to mitigate the impacts of the new development will be provided by the developers through legal agreements, planning conditions and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy. Viability assessments have been carried out on the proposals, which will form part of the evidence base supporting the Draft Submission.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>There are no reasonable plans for dealing with the traffic problems that will result from the developments in Crowthorne. In many cases, the proposals seem to simply state that the Council will "do more studies".</p>	<p>It has been necessary to progress the transport work in line with the evolution of the proposals (from Broad Areas to the smaller sites proposed for allocation). Therefore, various studies have been undertaken to reflect the stage reached in the SADPD. Since the Preferred Option stage, the Council has carried out more detailed modelling work and incorporated more detailed data from Wokingham Borough.</p>
<p>The Council needs to look further afield regarding transport improvements, to include the A329(M), Crowthorne High Street, the A322 to the M3, the A30 past Camberley, and the M3 to the M25</p>	<p>The Council has modelled the cumulative effect of development impacts on the local highway network both with and without the proposed developments and the accompanying highway improvements. The Council and Wokingham Borough Council are working closely with the Highways Agency regarding the impact on the Strategic Road Network.</p>
<p>Object as will put increased pressure on parking for local shops / the existing problems with parking in the High Street will be worsened / no extra parking on the High Street is proposed.</p>	<p>If there is significant additional pressure on parking the Council has powers to control on-street parking and can review the requirement for additional parking provision.</p> <p>There are significant land ownership and technical problems associated with the provision of rear service access to a significant number of properties on Crowthorne High Street which make this impractical. However there may be scope to increase controls on delivery times and provide improved service access in some cases.</p> <p>As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Many of the minor roads in the area are already used as rat runs and the proposals will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Traffic calming measures will be required along Hatch Ride, Maple Drive, Rowan Drive, Ellils Road and Pinewood Avenue as these are already used as short cuts during peak times.</p>	<p>Detailed modelling of junction improvements will be carried out which will give a greater understanding of route switching. This can then be taken into account in the overall package of improvements.</p>
<p>Roads from the development should feed onto Bracknell Road / Foresters Way so that the development relates to Bracknell. There should be no entrance/exit via Old Wokingham Road.</p>	<p>The eastern section of the site adjacent to Bracknell Road will form the SANG and some of the OSPV for the site. It is not therefore appropriate to access the site from this direction. There are already existing access points off Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride. It is considered important that the planned new homes are properly linked to Crowthorne to form a sustainable urban extension rather than an isolated pocket of residential development.</p>
<p>The junction with Old Wokingham Road and Easthampstead Road is poor. This proposal will make the situation worse. Improvements that were suppose to have been funded by the Jennett's Park development have not happened.</p>	<p>It has been agreed with Wokingham Borough Council to progress a joint funded safety improvement scheme during this financial year focusing on the accident patterns.</p>
<p>The proposed Local Centre is too close to the Old Wokingham Road which is a major access road to the A329M and M3 motorway. It will encourage car use within the site.</p>	<p>The developer will need to take account of the proximity of the neighbourhood centre to Old Wokingham Road and ensure that it incorporates adequate parking and servicing arrangements.</p> <p>It is considered important to locate any centre in a visible position in order to assist its viability. Convenient cycle and pedestrian routes will be incorporated in the design to try and encourage future residents to use sustainable modes of travel to facilities within the site.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed residential development would result in an increase in the number of work day vehicle movements from 750 to 2,250 (based on 2.5 vehicles per household).</p>	<p>This assumption is incorrect. Full analysis of traffic impact in peak hours has been studied, using the transport model.</p>
<p>The Council has trouble gritting the roads now so how will it cope with additional roads.</p>	<p>During the winter months the Council's Maintenance Dept puts plans in place to treat the Borough's primary transport network. Account is taken of new roads.</p>
<p>Green cycle and pedestrian routes should be included in the proposals.</p>	<p>Part of the package of transport measures required to mitigate the impact of the development will include the provision of cycleways and pedestrian routes within and adjacent to the site. The SANG and OSPV will provide opportunities to create a number of new green routes.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given to the provision of an affordable mini-bus service to key employment centres in Bracknell. This would be of benefit to the whole village.</p>	<p>Developers will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by car.</p>
<p>Even if properties are located within 400m of a bus stop, bus services are run by private companies and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	<p>The Council has powers to procure bus services that would not be supplied by the market alone, and to use developer contributions for this purpose so that bus services can be put in place at an early stage in the development rather than as an 'add on' at a later stage.</p> <p>In the long term, designing bus priority measures into a scheme(allowing the most efficient use of buses) and locating homes so that occupiers have good accessibility from homes to bus stops, from day one, are the best means of enabling the provision of a commercially viable bus services.</p>
<p>Existing public transport is poor. The main bus service (194) is infrequent. Whilst improvements are proposed, these will not be sufficient. No improvements are proposed to bus route 122 to Wokingham.</p>	<p>The larger population in the area will increase the number of passengers using local bus services, which in turn will increase the viability of bus services, making increased frequency / hours of operation a more realistic prospect. This may be aided in the short term by developer funding to enable improved</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Public transport will not improve the situation as the bus service is very infrequent/train service will not accommodate the increase in transport need. Public transport is infrequent and services stop early in the evening. Lack of links from and to Crowthorne station.</p>	<p>bus services to be put in place during the early stages of a development rather than as an 'add on' at a late stage.</p>
<p>Bus and train timetables should be better co-ordinated.</p> <p>Object to the lack of consideration given to the need to develop the railway stations at Crowthorne and/or Bracknell.</p>	<p>The Borough Council works closely with transport operating companies and Network Rail in providing better accessibility to transport hubs. Improving reliability of journey times is a key part of the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and linking rail and bus plays an important part in providing an alternative choice to the motor car</p>
<p>Airtrack relates to travel between Heathrow and Bracknell. It will not benefit Crowthorne.</p>	<p>BAA has scrapped plans to build the multi-million pound Airtrack rail link connecting Heathrow to the south-west due to lack of funds and other priorities for Heathrow.</p>
<p>The rail infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional development.</p> <p>Parking at Crowthorne station is an issue and additional housing will place a further burden on this resource. It is unlikely the new residents will walk to the station.</p>	<p>The Borough Council works closely with transport operating companies and Network Rail in providing better accessibility to transport hubs. Improving reliability of journey times is a key part of the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and linking rail and bus routes.</p> <p>The provision of additional car parking at local stations is an operational matter for Network Rail and, subject to other planning considerations, may be supported by the Council. As part of the development proposals the Council is proposing a range of other sustainable transport improvements to encourage alternative modes of access to the station other than the car.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>The increase in the number of vehicles and lack of public transport will lead to pollution. The existing pollution problem should be dealt with before the situation is exacerbated by the additional traffic associated with the proposed developments.</p> <p>Concerned about the effect of breathing in more exhaust fumes (as a result of additional traffic) / object to increase in pollution levels which are already high (nitrogen dioxide and carbon monoxide).</p>	<p>Developers will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. Both measures will help minimise congestion and air pollution.</p>
Health	
<p>Concerned about lack of capacity at doctors and dental surgeries. The proposals do not include a solution to the problem. Financial contributions should be sought from developers or new facilities provided with the development.</p>	<p>The PCT has been strongly promoting centralised services. The PCT had initially advised that the proposed new HealthSpace in Bracknell could serve future occupiers of this development. The PCT has subsequently confirmed that it will be consulting practices in the area to consider solutions for meeting future demand. This might involve the extension of existing buildings or relocation to larger sites. Further discussions are taking place with the PCT.</p> <p>Financial contributions from developers might be justified if the PCT can demonstrate a need based on robust evidence.</p>
<p>There's a lack of hospitals. Concerned that further development will mean longer waiting times and poor care.</p>	<p>The area is currently served by Frimley Park in Frimley, Wexham Park in Slough and the Royal Berkshire Hospital in Reading. Significant investment is taking place in healthcare in Bracknell. This is evidenced by the Berkshire new HealthSpace which has recently been given planning permission and is anticipated to be operational in early 2013. It will help address concerns about healthcare by providing services that are currently provided in hospital closer to people's homes.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>The PCT has been involved in the development of the IDP.</p>
Education	
<p>The social infrastructure is insufficient. No new schools are proposed and there is a limit to the growth possible in the existing primary and secondary schools over the plan period.</p> <p>The primary school is full and the secondary school would require substantial expansion.</p>	<p>The providers of social infrastructure have been consulted in the development of the IDP. As a result the document contains infrastructure requirements needed to cope with the increased demand arising from the development.</p> <p>Subsequent consultation with providers indicates that a multi-functional community facility should be provided as part of the site proposal, to include a community centre, youth facility, children's centre and police drop-in.</p> <p>In respect of education, the site generates the need for a new primary school on site. Easthampstead Park School is expected to have sufficient capacity to absorb secondary school demand from the site; however, financial contributions will be sought to enhance facilities.</p> <p>The LEA has a statutory duty to provide school places for children, therefore, phasing of additional school places will be considered at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Query why a new primary school is proposed. The children from the development could go to Hatch Ride School. Has this option been dismissed purely because the school is within Wokingham Borough?</p>	<p>Discussions about the provision of educational facilities have taken place with Wokingham Borough. The development generates sufficient demand to justify a new primary school on the site.</p>
<p>Easthampstead School will be needed for children from Jennett's Park. The proposed new secondary school in Binfield is too far away for children from Crowthorne and an extension to Edgbarrow won't be ready in time for the first children moving into the</p>	<p>The site is currently within the designated area of Easthampstead Park School so provision will be made for children (of secondary school age) from the development to go to this school. Account has been taken of the additional demand arising from Jennett's Park.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>houses. The development will result in many new children in the area who will need to be educated.</p>	<p>Edgbarrow School cannot be extended to the extent that would be required to accommodate children from this development and other proposed developments in Crowthorne.</p>
<p>Consideration must be given to building a new secondary school given the number of homes proposed in Crowthorne. Edgbarrow School will not be able to accommodate the extra pupils.</p>	<p>A new secondary school can only be provided if justified by the scale of development and if there is available funding. Given the extent of development proposed in the area over the plan period, this option is neither necessary nor feasible for Crowthorne.</p> <p>As stated in the IDP, Easthampstead Park School is expected to have sufficient capacity to serve the needs of this site.</p>
<p>Recreation/Open Space</p>	
<p>The development will put pressure on existing recreational facilities such as small parks.</p>	<p>A significant amount of open space will be delivered with the development, equivalent to 4.3ha of Open Space of Public Value per 1000 residents. This should include woodland and more formal recreation provision such as play areas and sports pitches. This will reduce the pressure that would otherwise be felt on existing recreational facilities.</p>
<p>The current recreational facilities at TRL (including 3 tennis courts, 2 squash courts, a snooker room, small gym and a licensed function room) should be preserved or replaced through Policy SA5.</p>	<p>The existing facilities are privately owned. However, the development will need to be accompanied by substantial recreational facilities as part of the requirement for Open Space of Public Value (4.3ha per 1000 residents). The developer has stated that it may be possible to re-provide some of the existing facilities (tennis and squash courts) with the community facility.</p>
<p>The opportunity should be taken to make provision for allotments in Crowthorne. An assessment of potential demand should be undertaken bearing in mind that there is already a waiting list.</p>	<p>It is recognised that there is a high demand for allotments across the Borough, far outstripping supply (refer to the Open Space section in the IDP Draft Submission document). There are currently no allotment sites in Crowthorne, with the Parish Council office having received numerous enquiries in recent years.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>Although developers can not be expected to fix this current deficit, when new development comes along, due to popularity and various other benefits, e.g. health and environment, the Council will seek to ensure a proportion of the Open Space provision will be set aside for allotments, as detailed in the IDP.</p>
<p>The provision of open space is supported.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The provision of tracks for riding should be investigated, including linking with the Devils Highway and Jennett's Park Country Park.</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way will be sought to link into the existing network around the site. Paths that link the site to the SPA will be subject to an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>As stated in Policy TP9 of the Council's adopted Local Transport Plan (LTP3), the PRoW network is managed to encourage sustainable modes of transport, including horse riding.</p>
<p>Ecology</p>	
<p>A cycle and pedestrian link should be provided through the SANG.</p>	<p>The SANG will contain additional routes for people to use.</p>
<p>Having the houses 401 metres away from the SPA does not eliminate impact on the SPA. People will still walk their dogs on the SPA.</p>	<p>The proposal includes alternative recreational land to divert dog walkers and others from the SPA and mitigate the impact of the development on it. Given the proximity of the site to the SPA, significantly more mitigation land is required than the normal standard.</p>
<p>The proximity of the proposed development will lead to increased pressures on the SPA with respect to off road cycling, arson, dog and cat ownership</p>	<p>Natural England have not objected to the development at Broadmoor. The Council recognise that this site is close to the SPA. According to the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010, it is required to take account of any adverse impacts on the SPA that might arise as a result of the potential development in consultation with Natural England. This is outlined in one of the documents issued to support the DPD - the Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment. Avoidance and mitigation measures will need to be put in place in agreement with Natural England.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed SANG is set at the minimum threshold and does not take account of development at Broadmoor. It is therefore inadequate and would have a devastating impact on the SPA (do not consider the SANG will mitigate effect upon the SPA).</p>	<p>The minimum requirement for SANG is 8 hectares per 1000 new population. The SADPD Policy SA4 states that the SANG will need to significantly exceed this requirement. The developer will need to provide a SANG that is of a size and quality that will result in no adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA. Also, according to the Habitats Regulations 2010, the Council is required to consider in-combination effects on the SPA. This includes other plans and projects. This is outlined in the supporting document Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment Site Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>The quality of the SANG proposed is poor as it comprises of a narrow strip of land between a high density development and a main road.</p>	<p>The quality of the SANG will need to comply with the Natural England SANGs Quality Guidance and be acceptable to the Council and Natural England. The size and location is taken into account in the assessment.</p>
<p>The proposal does not contain provisions to limit light pollution and the threat of surface water flooding on the SPA.</p>	<p>At the planning application stage, the developer will need to provide enough information for the Council to be able to carry out a detailed Appropriate Assessment according to the Habitat Regulations 2010. This could include an assessment of light pollution and flooding. In order to grant planning permission for the development, the Council must be able to conclude no adverse impact on the SPA. This will be agreed with Natural England.</p>
<p>The site should accommodate up to 3,000 new dwellings as Crowthorne and Sandhurst already have protected open space in the form of the SPA. This would help protect the green spaces of Binfield and Warfield.</p>	<p>It is questionable whether this scale of development could be accommodated in the area without any adverse impact on the SPA. Also much of the TRL and Broadmoor sites are within 400m of the SPA where there is a general presumption against new self contained residential units.</p>
<p>The proposed development and consequential loss of natural green space, will make it impossible for incumbent rare species to be protected within the SSSIs.</p>	<p>Because of the location of the site adjacent to the SPA (and SSSI), a significant amount of SANG will need to be provided in addition to ensuring that no new homes are built within the 400m buffer zone. This will serve to mitigate the impact on the SPA, minimising pressure on rare species, provide an</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>opportunity to conserve existing habitats of value and create more habitats of benefit to biodiversity. A large proportion of the site is previously developed land.</p>
<p>The development would threaten the presence of (protected) adders in the woods around the former track.</p>	<p>Adders have been identified within surveys of the site and such considerations will be taken into account in the design and construction of the development.</p>
<p>Concerned that the Council has not surveyed the ecology of the site and has not produced plans to protect wildlife habitats.</p> <p>The development will threaten wildlife & designated sites(SSSI/SPA).</p> <p>Wildlife will be killed as the development will result in the destruction of habitats.</p>	<p>Some ecological surveys have already been carried out and the results of these and further work will be a significant consideration in the layout of the development in order to minimise impact.</p> <p>There are two main ways in which the developer will need to offset the developments impact on biodiversity. Firstly, a significant amount of open space (4.3ha per 1000 residents) will be provided that will include passive greenspace. SANG will also be needed (significantly in excess of 8ha per 1000 residents) in accordance with standards set by Natural England to steer pressure away from the neighbouring SPA. Such areas will provide a mixture of habitats for wildlife.</p>
<p>Concerned that at least half the TRL site is woodland and heathland that acts as a vibrant wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Concern about loss of woodland generally.</p>	<p>A Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out on this site prior to this consultation and concluded that there were several areas of woodland, heathland and grassland found to be of ecological value. Such information is being used to inform the site layout.</p> <p>Areas of high conservation value will be integrated into the site's network of greenspace - provided through the developers obligation to provide Open Space of Public Value and SANG.</p>
<p>Hundreds of trees will need to be removed before the site can be developed.</p>	<p>Trees influence the character of the site and will be a consideration in the determination of any planning applications. The developer will be expected to demonstrate how trees have been incorporated into the site layout, in order to minimise the removal of trees.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Concerned about the 'triangle' of land between Old Wokingham Road, Brookers Row and Bracknell Road. The proposal will result in more tarmac and the destruction of woodland.</p>	<p>This 'triangle' of land does not form part of the are proposed for allocation.</p>
<p>Suggest the site is returned to natural forest or converted to allotments for local residents.</p>	<p>The site is characterised by plantation tree species, i.e. Scots pine. Inevitably some will be lost in the sites redevelopment. Where feasible, the Council will seek opportunities to replace any lost woodland with indigenous, biodiversity-rich species that characterise the UK's natural woodland, e.g. Oak, Ash and Beech.</p> <p>The developer will also be expected to provide allotments as part of the open space provision.</p>
<p>Flooding/Drainage</p>	
<p>The issue of flooding has been totally disregarded - the TRL site is in the floodplain which renders it unsuitable for development.</p>	<p>The site is not within Flood Zones 2 and 3 where flooding is most likely to occur, and where new residential development is restricted. However the indicative surface runoff risk map shows a fair amount of the site within a surface runoff flood risk area. If development of the area is pursued a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.</p>
<p>Water runs off the TRL site and into land in Wokingham Borough. Properties in Hinton Close have been flooded because of inadequate drainage.</p>	<p>Watercourses run through the site which increases the sites susceptibility to flooding, and these in turn drain into the Emm Brook which encounters flooding problems. In order to minimise on and off site flood risk, the drainage strategy for the development will be expected to incorporate a comprehensive SUDS network. As a result the surface run off rates should be lower than current levels.</p>
<p>Concerned about housing being built on land that is currently open and part of the natural drainage system. Development of this land will increase surface run off.</p>	<p>ACTION: add SUDS requirement to policy.</p>
<p>The proposed development is unacceptable without a waste water treatment plant on the site.</p>	<p>Thames Water (the waste water service provider for the site) has indicated that the service is likely to need upgrading. This will be determined following investigations. Thames Water has not indicated that an on site waste water treatment plant is necessary.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The development will result in additional pressure on the sewage infrastructure.</p>	<p>ACTION: add requirement to profile of site in relation to Developers investigating there is adequate waster water capacity.</p>
<p>Southern Water cannot provide sufficient water to service these developments.</p>	<p>Houses will be expected to meet water efficiency standards of 105 litres/head/day. South East Water has been consulted, stating that upgrades to the local water supply will be required.</p>
<p>Other Infrastructure</p>	
<p>There are no community, leisure or retail facilities proposed, so residents of the new dwellings will travel to the existing facilities in Crowthorne, putting them under increased pressure.</p>	<p>The proposal includes a Neighbourhood Centre which will include 1 or 2 shops, new Primary School, Care Home and an Enterprise Centre. There will be additional infrastructure improvements as outlined in the IDP.</p>
<p>Object to the proposed location of the community centre. It will result in noise problems and young people rat running through the housing, causing nuisance on the way. Any community centre should be located out of sight where it will not interfere with the privacy of residents.</p>	<p>It is proposed to locate the community facility on the eastern edge of the development adjacent to the SANG/OSPV. This will help minimise disturbance to residents. However, it is also important that it is conveniently located for the new community that it will serve. Consideration will need to be given to providing convenient routes to the facility, particularly footpaths and cycleways.</p>
<p>Access to any Local Centre should be from Nine Mile Ride, not from Crowthorne.</p>	<p>Access to the neighbourhood centre is shown off Old Wokingham Road rather than Nine Mile Ride so that it is conveniently located for the new community and can also provide additional facilities for the existing community, if desired.</p> <p>The road around a possible square would operate as a one-way route from south to north to ensure that no conflicts are created and that the proposed parking operates efficiently.</p> <p>Any service roads provided alongside Old Wokingham Road will be designed to ensure that they are not dominated by vehicles and can act as cycle ways.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Object to proposed Local Centre at TRL. It is not necessary to build local shops as they will struggle to remain viable. Any increase in trade as a result of the development should be directed towards existing shops in the village centre.</p>	<p>The proposed 'Local Centre' is to be re-classified as a 'Neighbourhood Centre'. As such it will be a fairly small scale facility including one or two shops to meet local needs and thereby assist in creating a sustainable development e.g. a 'one-stop' style convenience store along with other units such as a café, hairdressers etc. This type of retail floorspace typically has a smaller catchment and is therefore unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on the retail centre of Crowthorne.</p> <p>ACTION: Change references to a Local Centre to a Neighbourhood Centre</p>
<p>Major services like Fire and Police should be maintained at least to their current levels and should be described as 'necessary' for the development in the IDP.</p> <p>Pressure on police and fire service.</p>	<p>The Risk classification should be considered as an infrastructure rank order. Infrastructure in the IDP should all be considered as 'necessary' for a development to go ahead, however with finite resources available this could be a way of prioritising contributions.</p> <p>The IDP's layout will be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>The Fire and Rescue and Police service have identified the need to enhance local services in order to maintain existing service levels. This is likely to require partnership work with developers to ensure their requirements are accounted for in site plans, and where developer contributions are sought, this will require justification by the service providers from a robust evidence base.</p>
<p>Delivery</p>	
<p>Do not consider that the site will be able to deliver housing until the third and fourth phases of the plan period as the developer is still involved in negotiations.</p>	<p>The owner's agent has supplied a delivery schedule giving details of forecast completions. This shows that the owner believes that site could start delivering completed dwellings in 2014/15. It also predicts that the last dwellings would be completed in 2019/20.</p>
<p>Object to the unproven viability of the preferred option sites in Crowthorne, as evidenced by gaps in the IDP.</p>	<p>The Council has commissioned a consultant to carry out viability work on the Preferred Option sites.</p>

<p>Policy SA5</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Two charities currently use the vacant TRL site to securely park minibuses. This secure car parking will disappear with the proposed development and nothing in the proposals appears to cater for these needs</p>	<p>This is a private matter between the landowner and charities.</p>
<p>Assurances should be given that the preference for the TRL site is not connected to Legal and General's role in the Town Centre redevelopment - more transparency is needed.</p>	<p>The proposed allocation of land at TRL is based on the application of planning policies and the results of technical studies.</p>
<p>The policy makes development on the north side of Nine Mile Ride more likely, which would impact further on infrastructure.</p>	<p>Nine Mile Ride is currently seen as a physical barrier to development of the land to the north. However, depending on the level of future housing need, it is accepted that this position may have to be reviewed.</p>
<p>It is inappropriate to locate a Depot within a residential area, which shares the same access as the housing. It should be located in one corner of the site with its own access to the local highways</p>	<p>After further consideration having been given to the nature of facility and access points, consideration is being given to adjusting the location of the Depot in order to provide a buffer around the site and make use of an existing access point.</p> <p>ACTION: Amend illustrative concept plan to show Depot in a revised position.</p>
<p>Object to the relocation of the Depot to this site due to associated traffic, especially large scale traffic movements.</p>	<p>The plan is to relocate the existing depot uses i.e. refuse collection, street cleansing, landscape and possibly the highway maintenance function including the salt barn. Refuse and recycling trucks would be parked overnight. They would leave at 7am and return by 4pm. No refuse would be kept on site overnight. There would be about 20 other vehicles stored on site for street cleansing and landscape - mostly smaller pick up type vehicles. There would also be a parking area for staff cars and an administrative office/workshop/storage areas. Specific details will depend on the requirements at the time.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
	<p>Having considered access arrangements further, it is likely that the access to the Depot would be separate to that serving the housing.</p>
<p>There should be restrictions to when development can take place (hours of work, etc) during construction</p>	<p>This is a matter of detail that is more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Do not need another nursing/care home in Crowthorne - there are already 9.</p>	<p>It envisaged that the care home (use class C2) will provide care for people who require constant nursing care and who have significant deficiencies with coping with daily living. It will accommodate about 80 people (approximately 3,600 m² of floorspace).</p> <p>In planning terms, this is considered to be an acceptable use within this development, particularly in view of the ageing population. As far as having regard to the the number of other facilities in the area, it is unlikely that it will be provided unless commercially viable.</p>
<p>Wish to see a Neighbourhood Planning Group established. Proposals would then be subject to a referendum in line with the Localism Bill.</p>	<p>When the Localism Bill comes into effect, it will be open for the local community, potentially through the Parish Council or local businesses to initiate the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The draft Bill makes it clear that this must accord with the strategic elements of the Local Development Framework, and is not a replacement for it.</p>
<p>Object to provision of social housing in the development</p>	<p>Any development must meet the requirements of existing policies which includes the need for affordable housing. Affordable housing</p>
<p>Statutory Consultee Comments</p>	
<p>See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Crowthorne Parish Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Wokingham Without Parish Council, Wokingham Without Councillors, Environment Agency, Natural England, Berkshire East</p>	<p>See specific responses to consultee comments.</p>

Policy SA5 Residents responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
Primary Care Trust, Thames Water, RSPB, SE Berkshire Ramblers, British Horse Society, Crowthorne Village Action Group.	

Table 2.14 - Policy SA5 (Land at TRL, Crowthorne) - Developer Responses

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Point of clarification:</p> <p>The existing site is approx 104ha and accommodates 72,585 sq.m. of floorspace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBE 47,414 sq.m. As listed in 1996 planning permission although subsequent re-measuring suggests 53,295 sq.m. - TRL HQ, test laboratory and warehouse 14,890 sq.m. - Other ancillary buildings 4,400 sq.m. <p>With the exception of the TRL HQ building, the age, condition, quality and layout of the buildings means that they have reached the end of their usable life.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Inspector established clear principles for the future development of the site in respect of the appeal decision in 2008. (ref: 07/01196/OUT).</p>	<p>It is agreed that he gave some direction on certain matters.</p>
<p>Support allocation of site (including associated changes required to Proposals Map) and extent of built development shown on concept plan.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Support recognition that TRL is previously developed land and suitable for redevelopment as an urban extension.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Re-iterate the availability of the whole site (except the TRL HQ building) from April 2011 for comprehensive redevelopment and regeneration. The site is deliverable as it is in single ownership.</p>	<p>This has been taken into account in proposing the allocation of this site.</p>
<p>Significant work has been carried out to make sure that the development is achievable within an appropriate timescale.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>Goodman (Development Manager) and the L&G Team consider 1,000 dwellings could be delivered by mid 2019. 170 could be delivered by 2014 and 700 by 2017. SANGS and Crowthorne Enterprise Centre could be delivered by third quarter of 2014.</p>	<p>As long as supporting infrastructure can be provided at appropriate times, to support this phasing, adjustments to the Trajectory are considered acceptable.</p> <p>ACTION: Adjust delivery indicated in the Trajectory</p>
<p>The TRL site will complement rather than compete with other sites with permission and allocations in North Bracknell in terms of timescale, range of housing and location. Advice has been sought to ensure that the housing proposed is in line with market demand in the local area. It will include 2 and 2.5 storey family orientated traditional housing. It will also include affordable housing.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the Council must plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends as well as current market trends. The market is often slow to react to a particular need and subsequently over provides. A percentage of affordable housing will be required in accordance with policy.</p>
<p>A masterplan is being prepared for the site in order to ensure that it is a sustainable mixed use urban extension. It would include housing, small scale employment floorspace, a neighbourhood centre, community centre, primary school, care home and other land uses. Sustainable design and construction methods would be used. For example an on site combined heat and power plant is proposed.</p>	<p>This is generally in line with the Council's proposals for the site.</p>
<p>The extent of the proposed built up area would safeguard the gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell.</p>	<p>The Council considers it important to secure some form of buffer between Crowthorne and Bracknell, particularly as the Inspector drew attention to this issue in the appeal decision on the earlier proposal. Many residents also feel strongly about this issue. This matter will be addressed through the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>The Old Wokingham Road frontage would be opened up to integrate with existing housing.</p>	<p>It is important to try and integrate the new development with the existing built up area whilst retaining trees along Old Wokingham Road.</p>

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
Road access would be off Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride. Improvements would be made to existing public transport and additional sustainable transport infrastructure would be included.	Noted.
New public open space and SANGs would be provided enhancing the character of Crowthorne and providing additional recreational opportunities for residents.	Noted.
<p>Suggest amended wording to Policy (see underlined and crossed out text):</p> <p>1st part of Policy:</p> <p><i>3. Provision of a <u>suitably sized</u> primary school</i></p> <p>2nd part of Policy:</p> <p><i>1. Highway capacity improvements to Foresters Way junction with Nine Mile Ride, <u>the</u> Bracknell Road junction with Old Wokingham Road and Dukes Ride <u>the Nine Mile Ride junction with Old Wokingham Road.</u></i></p> <p><i>2. Delete</i></p> <p><i>3. <u>Detailed consideration will be given to the need for improvements toat the Dukes Ride junction with Wokingham Road, Crowthorne High Street, Dukes Ride and A3095 including Hanworth roundabout <u>through the preparation of a detailed Transport Assessment Report in support of a planning application</u></u></i></p>	<p>A number of these points are agreed and it is intended to revise the wording of the policy in terms of infrastructure.</p> <p>Although this wording is factually correct, the wording has been amended to make it more explicit that a contribution will be sought toward the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) Project.</p> <p>ACTION: Policy will be reworded to provide consistency of approach with other policies in the SADPD.</p>

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p><i>4. Potential contribution towards strategic highway network improvements (M4 junction 10 and M3 junction 3) <u>in the event that development of the site would have a material impact on these motorway junctions</u></i></p> <p><i>6. Improvements to cycle and pedestrian facilities including improvements to Wokingham Road linking to Peacock Farm, improved links to Wokingham Borough across Old Wokingham Road junction, and further improvements to links north and south of the site to the existing network, <u>where such improvements are demonstrated to be feasible through the Transport Assessment Report</u></i></p> <p><i>8. Delete</i></p> <p><i>12. <u>A package of additional measures to manage any additional recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area In addition to the provision of an on-site bespoke SANG a financial contribution will be sought in accordance with the Council's SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy</u></i></p> <p><i>13. <u>Other requirements as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Any other requirements that are identified through the detailed assessment work that will be needed to support a planning application.</u></i></p>	
<p>Suggest the following trajectory (project could deliver 1,000 dwellings by 2019-2020):</p> <p>2014-15: 170 units</p>	<p>See comment above</p>

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
<p>2015-16: 166 units (336)</p> <p>2016-17: 166 units (668)</p> <p>2017-18: 166 units (834)</p> <p>2018-19: 166 units (1,000)</p>	
<p>To ensure delivery, the site should not be overburdened with unrealistic or excessive infrastructure demands.</p>	<p>A viability study is being undertaken to assess the viability of the sites contained within the SADPD.</p>
<p>Transport related infrastructure improvements can only be determined through the submission of a Transport Assessment Report in support of a planning application. The transport requirements set out in the policy are too detailed.</p>	<p>The Council has created peak hour versions of the BFMMTM. The models incorporate a number of highway and transport improvement works that will be necessary to accommodate the combined impacts of all developments envisaged up to 2026. Others will need to be determined once the nature of the proposed developments are determined.</p> <p>Developers will be required to contribute in kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by the Council and towards other local transport improvements for soft modes. The level of contributions will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall development.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be required with any application for the development. A degree of detail is considered appropriate in the interests of providing clarity and certainty.</p> <p>However, it is intended to revise the wording of the policy in terms of infrastructure.</p> <p>ACTION: Policy will be reworded to provide consistency of approach with other policies in the SADPD.</p>

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
SPA mitigation in respect of any additional recreational pressures should be met through financial contributions in accordance with the Council's Strategy.	Large developments such as that proposed at TRL are expected to provide bespoke SANG as well as a contribution towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMB) Project. This is in accordance with the Council's Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. There is not enough strategic SANG capacity in the Borough to enable the Council to take financial contributions from strategic sites.
The policy is too prescriptive on community infrastructure at this stage of the process as much will depend on the size, type and tenure of new dwellings e.g. need for 1 or 2 FE primary school. Unnecessary duplication of Limiting the Impact of Development SPD.	<p>The IDP is based on the best available information and will remain a live document that can be updated as more information emerges.</p> <p>Although the LID SPD can be used as a starting point, the more specific infrastructure contained in the IDP is considered to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The IDP considers capacity of existing social infrastructure and the specific requirements that have emerged from consultation with service providers who have looked at development across the Borough as a whole rather than applying a rigid LID approach.</p>
Need to clarify the meaning of a line on the concept plan that links TRL HQ with Bracknell Road.	<p>This was part of a 'ride' but is been reviewed as part of the process of updating the illustrative concept plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Review 'ride' that is shown on the Preferred Option concept plan.</p>
Consider that the site should have been given a higher score in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal - 62 rather than 35 (detailed comments dealt with in responses to Draft Sustainability Appraisal)	In order to be comparable with results for other sites, this site was assessed on the information available at the time. As work has progressed, further information has been provided on mitigating impact which has an effect on the score.
Luff Developments Ltd (Policy SA7 - Blue Mountain)	

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
Concerned about the number of dwellings allocated to this site in view of its unsustainable location - remote from Crowthorne High Street and local shops and services.	The site is an extension to the sustainable settlement of Crowthorne. It also comprises a mixed use development, thus enhancing its sustainability. Furthermore, it involves previously developed land.
The cumulative impact of this proposal on the road network needs to be looked at with those in Wokingham.	This has been done.
Concerned about the suitability of the land as SANGS and Open Space in view of the tree coverage.	Natural England has been consulted on the matter.
Most of the housing is not expected to come forwards until 2017 which would not help the Council's short term land supply issues.	The developer is suggesting that housing on this site can be delivered at an earlier stage. There are also other sites which are likely to contribute in the short term.
Charles Church (on behalf of SHLAA ref 251 - not land owner of the site)	
<p>Supporting text para 2.4.9 advises landowner is still negotiating with regards to future of site and SANGS, therefore whilst 1,000 dwellings may be achievable during the plan period, it is considered realistic to assume the housing will be delivered in the third and fourth phases, rather than the second and third.</p> <p>Proposed change: Amend phasing expecting phasing in para 2.4.9 and Appendix 2 (Land Supply Data).</p>	The landowner is aware of the Council's SADPD timetable and is suggesting that the delivery dates should be brought forward.
Meryl Developments Ltd (on behalf of part of SHLAA ref 292 (former site 221) - not land owner of this site)	
Site is not suitable for residential development as it falls within/ close to the 400m exclusion zone around the SPA. Siting houses 401m from the SPA will not eliminate their impact. No amount of SANG will prevent this. There are more suitable strategic sites further away from the SPA, such as land at Chavey Down.	The site is previously developed land and forms an urban extension to a sustainable settlement. Although part of the site is within 400m of the SPA, other parts lie within the 400m-5km bracket.
Part of SA5 allocation: Land at Western Cottages, Nine Mile Ride (SHLAA site 264)	

Developer / Landowner responses: Summary of issues raised	Response
Support the proposed allocation of the site for housing as part of the wider redevelopment of TRL. Owners of the site are receptive to any approach from Legal and General to discuss the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.	Noted.
Excluded from SA5 allocation: Windy Ridges, Crowthorne Road (new SHLAA site 310)	
Site is available/promoted for low density residential, C2, C1 or D1 uses.	Site promoted as a result of consultation. However, the site is within 400m of the SPA and is therefore treated as an excluded site in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The site also contains a Listed Building, so any redevelopment involving the loss of the building would not be appropriate.

Amen Corner North, Binfield

The majority of responses regarding this site were made in relation to both Policy SA6 and SA7. A key issue raised was the risk of coalescence with Bracknell and/or Wokingham leading to the loss of community identity for Binfield.

Table 2.15 - Policy SA6 (Land at Amen Corner North) - Residents Responses

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Principle of development/scale	
<p>Object to the high levels of development proposed at Binfield and Warfield, when considered in conjunction with proposals in Wokingham.</p>	<p>Wokingham Borough Council is in a similar position to Bracknell Forest Council in that it is involved in the process of allocating sites to meet its housing needs over the period to 2026. Its Core Strategy (January 2010) makes provision for the development of 13,230 dwellings. This has included allocating land for Strategic Development Locations including areas south and north of Wokingham.</p> <p>The site at Warfield was agreed some time ago through the Core Strategy DPD. The sites at Binfield that were included in the Preferred Option following an assessment of all available sites against the locational sequence established in Core Strategy Policy CS2, sustainability and infrastructure considerations.</p> <p>Both Wokingham and Bracknell Forest Borough Councils are aware of one another's proposals and are exchanging information.</p>
<p>The additional housing that the Borough needs could be accommodated in the town centre area which benefits from good access to rail and public transport network. There is no need for the scale of growth proposed in Binfield.</p>	<p>The identification of sites has followed the sequence established in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This directs development to Bracknell Town Centre in the first instance. The outline permission for the redevelopment of the Town Centre includes approx. 1,000 residential units. However, the capacity of the Town Centre is limited and it is therefore necessary to look at other locations (following the Locational Principles) in order to find sufficient sites to accommodate the scale of development required as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Sufficient residential development has already taken place in Binfield. Do not want to see the village urbanised or the scale of housing suggested particularly as the aim is to meet Bracknell's housing needs.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Binfield has grown due to the allocation of sites for residential development during previous plan periods, for example, the area around Benetfeld Road.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS3, the Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to identify land for housing across the Borough and assess the developability and deliverability of sites. An assessment against the the sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2 has then been carried out. As there is insufficient land available within the defined settlements to accommodate the level growth needed, it has been necessary to look at available land that would form extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements. This has included land in Binfield.</p>
<p>Consider Jennetts Park and Amen Corner (South) developments to be sufficient to meet needs for this part of the Borough.</p>	<p>Whilst the housing being built at Jennett's Park and Amen Corner (South) contribute to development needs for the plan period, there is insufficient capacity to accommodate all the Borough's needs. It has therefore been necessary to look at other available sites.</p>
<p>Support identification of the preferred sites as they are more logical for major development than parts of Winkfield and Cranbourne due to rural character, narrow roads and overstretched community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Other sites are available for housing, such as farmland in Sandhurst. Do not understand why areas in the southern part of the Borough have been dropped.</p> <p>Should be spreading new housing more fairly across the Borough. Such an approach would preserve the character of villages and minimise the loss of countryside.</p>	<p>Other possible sites were considered during the process and were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage. These included sites in the southern part of the Borough, such as Broad Area 1: South West Sandhurst. The findings in relation to all sites are set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The delivery of infrastructure is more difficult if development is spread across the Borough. Due to environmental constraints and availability of land, there are limited options for a more dispersed approach.</p>
<p>Object to the housing in Binfield as it is required due to immigration.</p>	<p>The latest population projections were published by ONS in May 2010. These predict that the population of the Borough will be 130,600 in 2026. This represents an increase of 18,800 from the estimated population of the Borough in 2006. This increase is as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural change which comprises the difference between the number of births and deaths each year. Although both figures (around 1500 births and 700 deaths) are expected to remain broadly similar over the plan period, the ongoing pattern of more births than deaths is expected to result in an increase in the population of the Borough by some 800 persons per year. • Net migration which is the overall increase or decrease in the population of the Borough as a result of internal (within England), cross border (between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) and international (UK and abroad) migration. This is expected to add to the population of the Borough by 100-200 persons per year.
<p>Object to the plans for more housing in this area as they are based on out of date evidence.</p>	<p>The Council is working to the requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to undertake a fundamental review of development requirements through the Review of the Core Strategy. However, recent evidence such as the 2008-based household projections that</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>were published on 26 November 2010 do not suggest that the level of growth being planned for is too high.</p> <p>In the meantime it is important to maintain progress on the Site Allocations DPD in order to secure a supply of land for housing.</p>
<p>There is no need for the amount of housing proposed in Binfield as the total requirement pre-dates the recession and the change in Government.</p>	<p>Whilst the country is currently suffering from adverse economic conditions, the plan period runs to 2026. Historic trends show that periods of growth and decline are likely to be experienced over such a time period.</p> <p>In a written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011) the Minister of State for Decentralisation (Mr. Greg Clark) makes it clear that local planning authorities should continue to prepare up-to-date development plans and make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p>
<p>The land proposed for development is outside the settlement boundary. The development of this land will set a precedent for building on adjacent land.</p>	<p>The SHLAA and SADPD process have shown that there is a need to allocate land for development beyond the existing settlement boundary. However, there will be a presumption against development on land that is not allocated/remains within the countryside. If further land is required in future, it would be necessary to follow a similar process to that being currently undertaken.</p>
<p>The open spaces represent an amenity which existing residents should be allowed to continue to enjoy.</p>	<p>Whilst it is recognised that the development will reduce the amount of open land in the area, each of the urban extensions will incorporate OSPV and SANGS. This will increase the level of public access to sites. The extent and location of allocated land will enable some open land to be retained around Binfield.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposals conflict with planning policy as they relate to land outside a defined settlement boundary i.e. countryside.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that the land is currently designated as being outside a defined settlement, it is necessary to review such designations every few years in order to accommodate growth needs.</p>
<p>Allocation of this land would conflict with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2, CS6, and CS8.</p>	<p>The form of development will be required to follow sustainable development principles. The site follows the locational principles as it is an extension to a defined settlement. The development will be required to mitigate its impact in accordance with Policy CS6 (Limiting the Impact of Development). The development will be required to provide new recreational facilities in accordance with Policy CS8. The Council's standard for OSPV is 4.3ha/1,000 residents.</p>
<p>Object to the loss of greenfield land/fields which can never be recovered. The countryside must be protected.</p>	<p>The Council has prioritised previously developed land, but, there are insufficient available and suitable sites to accommodate the development needs of the Borough. It has therefore been necessary to propose some greenfield sites for allocation.</p>
<p>Object as need to retain the Green Belt.</p>	<p>None of the sites that the Council is proposing for allocation affect the extent of the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Should be developing more brownfield sites such as TRL.</p>	<p>The Council has prioritised suitably located brownfield (or previously developed) sites in defined settlements that are genuinely available for development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2. However there are insufficient previously developed sites or other land within existing settlements to meet the growth requirements and the Council is therefore proposing extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements, where land is available.(including a previously developed site at TRL).</p> <p>TRL is already identified as a possible extension to Crowthorne for 1,000 new homes. A significant proportion of the TRL</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	site is constrained as it lies within 400m of the Special Protection Area within which no new residential development is permitted.
Should be using the unoccupied offices in the town centre which are brownfield sites	<p>Due to the known surplus of office accommodation within the Borough there are no significant new employment allocations proposed through the Site Allocations document. The use of some existing employment areas for housing is being proposed where opportunities exist, for example, Crowthorne BusinessPark and Farley Hall. The employment designation is also being removed from certain areas to try and encourage redevelopment for residential purposes.</p> <p>Unoccupied offices are not always available for alternative uses as the owners of such premises often retain them for the value they represent on balance sheets.</p>
Major employers have deserted Bracknell, leaving room in the town centre for residential apartments. Developments on the edge of Bracknell will further develop Reading's commuter belt.	A significant number of new homes are planned for Bracknell Town Centre. However to provide for the Borough's development needs a number of urban extensions are also required. It is hoped that the sites proposed for allocation will have strong links with Bracknell Town Centre and be conveniently located to areas offering employment opportunities in Bracknell Forest.
The Council should be building affordable homes conveniently located for the town centre, railway station and buses.	Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Locational Principles directs development in the first instance to Bracknell Town Centre. The Council expects all qualifying sites (threshold of 15 net dwellings) to provide a percentage of 'affordable' housing .
Should be building low cost affordable housing for families, not executive homes.	The Council expects all qualifying sites (threshold of 15 net dwellings) to provide a percentage of 'affordable' housing. This

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	includes affordable rent and intermediate. The size and type of housing provided is influenced by identified needs.
Oppose development at Amen Corner North and Blue Mountain as it will result in Binfield increasing by 50%.	The proposals relating to Amen Corner North and Blue Mountain include 800 new homes. These are shown as urban extensions to Bracknell.
Do not object to the use of the field opposite the Coppid Beech Hotel for development. There is good road access and the land is not in general public use.	Noted
Support high density housing (preferably on the Coppid Beech site, rather than at Blue Mountain) as it is more land efficient. If densities were increased, only one strategic site would be needed.	The density of development must be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. It is also influenced by site factors and the type and size of dwellings. It would not be acceptable to increase the density of development at Amen Corner North to such an extent as to remove the need for residential development at Blue Mountain.
Object to the proposed development as it will be ugly sprawl and hideous over development.	Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will result in the expansion of the built up area of Bracknell, this is necessary in order to accommodate the needs of a growing population. The development will include a considerable amount of green space and will be contained by areas of woodland to the north, Murrell Hill Lane to the east and London Road to the south. London Road is an important access route to Bracknell and has its own distinctive character. To the south of the proposed site are a mixture of residential (including flats) and commercial properties. The height and massing of the buildings in the locality varies. To the east of the site, is Popes Manor, a Listed Building. The design of the development will need to take these factors into account and respect the topography of the site and landscape beyond.
The plans are for the benefit of the Council and greedy developers. The views of local residents have not been considered.	The plans are required to accommodate the growth needs of the area as accepted through the Core Strategy. Local residents were

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>consulted on the overall strategy during consideration of the Core Strategy and have been consulted on the SADPD through an Issues and Options consultation at the beginning of 2010 and a further consultation on a Preferred Option towards the end of 2010/beginning of 2011.</p>
<p>Many new houses around the Borough have not been sold. What assurances can be given that this would not be the case in respect of the proposed homes in Binfield.</p>	<p>Two large sites are currently being developed in the Borough - The Parks and Jennett's Park. Recent contact with the developers of these sites indicates that there is not a significant surplus of completed homes. Experience suggests that developers do not progress sites unless they are confident that they can sell the properties. During recent adverse market conditions, there have been delays in the commencement of developments and a decline in building rates on larger sites.</p>
<p>This is an appropriate site for new homes due to good access from main roads. However, development should be limited to the outline map and include open space, north of the residential.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Character/community</p>	
<p>Concern that proposals will result in loss of village status for Binfield.</p> <p>The development will effect the enjoyment of residents living in the village.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the impact of the new developments on the character/identity/local heritage/listed buildings of Binfield.</p>	<p>Land to the west of Binfield originally formed part of a broad area that was suggested for development at the Issues and Options stage. Since then, the extent of the area proposed for development has been pulled back from Binfield in order to protect the character of the village. Amen Corner North would form an extension to the settlement of Bracknell rather than Binfield. The disposition of land uses within the site have been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to help maintain an undeveloped gap between Binfield and Bracknell. Pocket Copse (which falls within the site) and Blackmans Copse would help screen the development from Binfield. The</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>nearest listed building is Popes Manor which has access off Murrell Hill Lane. The buildings and site are screened from the development by a belt of trees and Popes Farm.</p> <p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another.</p>
<p>Lovely rural/semi-rural (varied by response) setting of Binfield will be destroyed and it will be turned into a 'concrete jungle'</p>	<p>The rural setting of Binfield village would be retained by maintaining the rural landscape to the west and Popes Manor/Popes Meadow and along Murrell Hill Lane.</p>
<p>Would be contrary to the Council's Character Areas Assessment (small scale infill should respect existing building lines and boundary treatment, open landscape on either side of Binfield together with open character of Popeswood North should be retained to maintain rural setting and distinctive character of Binfield, maintain strong links with rural setting, retain key views, retain transitional character of Foxley Lane).</p>	<p>Popeswood South is the closest Character Area (Area C). The character of the northern triangle of Area C will be protected by the retention of Popes Manor. Although the southern triangle of Area C is closer to the proposed development, the majority of the area does not adjoin Amen Corner North. The greatest influence on the setting of this area is Popes Manor. Only a small section of the southern triangle of Area C adjoins the development area, as shown in the Preferred Option. However, it is now proposed to remove a small area of land around Popes Farm from the development area. This will further reduce the impact of any new development on the southern triangle of Area C.</p> <p>The layout and design of the eastern block of the site will need to complement and respect the key characteristics of this part of Area C.</p>
<p>The development at Amen Corner South will create a Parish with three distinct communities. Any further increase will further diffuse identity.</p>	<p>The development will be an extension of the development at Amen Corner South. The development will need to be designed so that it links with that development and forms an</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The plans will have an adverse affect on the parish community.</p>	<p>integral part of that community. It is accepted that the Parish will contain more than one community. It will be important that each community has supporting infrastructure to help integration.</p>
<p>Separation between settlements</p>	
<p>Binfield would no longer be a separate village from Bracknell. Oppose so much development on the open green spaces which separate Binfield from Bracknell.</p>	<p>The development of this site does not affect the local gap shown on the Core Strategy Key Diagram.</p> <p>Amen Corner North would form an extension to the settlement of Bracknell rather than Binfield. Any buildings associated with this area would be some way south of the village of Binfield. Pocket Copse (which falls within the site) and Blackman's Copse would help screen the development from Binfield. Other open land to the north of the site together with Popes Manor and Popes Meadow add to the separation of settlements.</p>
<p>Given the location of the Wokingham SDL, greater significance should be attached to the green fields opposite Coppid Beech. These fields are important in separating Bracknell and Wokingham.</p> <p>Development on this site is unacceptable as it would severely reduce the strategic gap between Bracknell and Wokingham.</p> <p>There would be no visible gap between Binfield and Wokingham - this gap was recognised as being important (and found 'sound') in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Strategic gaps should be protected.</p>	<p>The developable area is a small part of the gap and located where the gap is most influenced by urban Bracknell.</p> <p>It is currently not possible to see one settlement from the other across the 'gap' due to landform and vegetation.</p> <p>Although the A329 (M) forms part of the gap, it is supplemented by adjacent open rural land. A gap would still be maintained between Wokingham and Bracknell.</p>
<p>Proposal conflicts with the Character Area Assessment SPD which recommends that the two gaps either side of Binfield be retained.</p>	<p>The area closest to SA6 is CA Area C: Popeswood South. As it is not proposed to develop Popes Manor nor the land to the north, the strongly defined edge of the Binfield-Wokingham gap is not compromised.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>The character of the northern triangle of Area C will be protected by the retention of Popes Manor. The southern triangle of Area C is more directly affected and the proposed housing at SA6 will affect its rural setting north of London Road. It is therefore important to retain the tree cover identified in the SPD and continue this along the London Road frontage of SA6. In order to retain the distinctive character of the southern triangle, the layout and design of the eastern block of SA6 should complement and respect the key characteristics of this part of Area C.</p>
<p>The proposal does not meet the Council's stated objectives of preserving the quality of the natural environment. (under the Core Strategy)</p>	<p>The maintenance and improvement of the natural environment is an objective (I) within the Core Strategy. However, this has to be balanced against other objectives that are related to the delivery of housing. The objectives are required to guide policy and ensure that potential adverse impacts are considered and mitigated as far as is possible.</p>
<p>The proposed sites at Binfield conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS9 which seeks to protect the countryside, strategic and local gaps.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy sets out the strategy for meeting the long term growth requirements of the Borough. This includes locational principles for the allocation of land. These principles include the possibility of extensions to settlements. It is therefore accepted that it may be necessary to allocate land that is currently outside defined settlements for development. Policy CS9 also seeks to protect gaps within or adjoining the Borough from development. Whilst the proposed development will decrease the extent of the gap between Wokingham and Bracknell in particular, there will still be visual and physical separation of the settlements.</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p>	
<p>General</p>	
<p>The development planned for Binfield will overwhelm the infrastructure in the area.</p>	<p>The developer must demonstrate what measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of the development on infrastructure, such as</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	community facilities and the local road network. Infrastructure improvements required will be secured either through Section 106 Legal Agreement or CIL (depending on the timing of the application).
<p>Fear that the infrastructure required for developments will not be adequately financed. As a result, it will not be provided.</p>	<p>Not every item of infrastructure in the IDP is absolutely essential to make a site 'viable', for instance higher priority for allocating funds will go towards items that could be considered as 'show stoppers' if they weren't delivered, e.g. utilities, school places and highway improvements.</p> <p>Whilst every effort will be made to secure necessary infrastructure, it is acknowledged there will likely be gaps as a result of finite resources being available on both sides – developers and service providers.</p> <p>A purpose of the IDP is to flag up any potential issues at this early stage so that funding gaps can be addressed to maximise the amount of deliverable infrastructure.</p>
<p>Do not believe that the population would benefit from the development. Bracknell has suffered from enough development (Jennett's Park, Staff College, Met Office) that has not been supported by infrastructure.</p>	<p>The sites quoted have been/are being supported by additional infrastructure where there is a lack of existing capacity. Infrastructure is provided at different stages throughout the delivery of the development - triggers are included in the Section 106 Legal Agreements. The triggers are often related to the completion of a particular number of new dwellings. It is not practical to provide all supporting infrastructure before a development commences as there is a need for a return on the investment.</p>
<p>Existing infrastructure should be updated before planning for new infrastructure for additional residents.</p>	<p>Circular 05/05 makes it clear that new development cannot be expected to make up existing deficiencies. A planning obligation must meet 5 tests including the following:</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That it is necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; and • That it is directly related to the proposed development. <p>However, the provision of new development will provide a source of funding to upgrade and provide new infrastructure. The effect of the infrastructure investment may be to confer some wider benefit on the community.</p> <p>The position may change slightly as the Community Infrastructure Levy proposals include provision for a proportion of the money raised to go to the local community to address local priorities.</p>
<p>The plans are sadly lacking on details of additional infrastructure e.g. nothing is mentioned about new doctor's surgeries, an improved road network and improved public transport.</p>	<p>Infrastructure improvements are detailed in the IDP which supports the SADPD. The IDP is a living document that will be updated as more information becomes available.</p>
<p>Transport</p>	
<p>Oppose development at Binfield as the volume of traffic in the area already results in congestion/roads being gridlocked.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the roads are currently gridlocked. Whilst there may be traffic delays at peak times, the objective is to keep waiting times at key junctions to an acceptable level and improve the choice of alternatives to the car.</p> <p>To make the development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. This will help minimise congestion.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Concern expressed regarding traffic flows on London Road and at the Coppid Beech roundabout, particularly if account is taken of planned developments at Amen Corner South and Jennett's Park.</p>	<p>Transport Modelling work has been conducted jointly with Wokingham Borough Council to establish highway improvements that are needed to mitigate the impact of traffic from development. The list to emerge will be included in the submission IDP.</p> <p>There are also proposals to ensure direct bus service to Bracknell Town Centre and to improve pedestrian and cycle access to reduce the need for private car use.</p>
<p>The road network (particularly the M3, A329(M) and M4) cannot cope with the additional traffic flow that will be generated.</p>	<p>The Council is engaging with the Highways Agency to ensure that proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on the Strategic Highway Network.</p> <p>Options are being explored for the funding of improvements to key motorway junctions from developments in Wokingham, Reading and Bracknell Forest.</p>
<p>Development at Binfield will lead to more car journeys as it does not have a railway station or an evening or Sunday bus service.</p> <p>There is a need for more frequent and cost effective bus services, particularly when compared to travel by car.</p>	<p>There are proposals to ensure direct bus service to Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>Increased population in the area will increase the number of passengers using local bus services, which in turn will increase the viability of bus services, making increased frequency / hours of operation a more realistic prospect. This may be aided in the short term by developer funding to enable improved bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than as an 'add on' at a late stage.</p>
<p>Whilst the policy identifies additional transport measures on the major roads, there seems to be little consideration of the impacts of the development on minor roads in the area.</p>	<p>The Council is preparing a package of highway improvements to support the proposed developments based on extensive modelling of existing and predicted flow. The proposed layout for Amen Corner north would focus access off London Road and therefore help reduce impact on minor roads.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The developments should be supported by 21st Century road planning: wider and straighter roads, more parking (especially in the town centre), a new ring road around the town centre and park and ride facilities.</p>	<p>The developments will be developed in accordance with the most up to date guidance on highways design including Manual for Streets 2.</p>
<p>Car to house ratios used for planning purposes are too low. 2+ cars per household should be used to work out traffic impact rather than 1.3 cars per household. This would be more realistic.</p>	<p>Trip rates are taken from the Bracknell Forest Multi Modal Transport Model. The forecasts include population, employment, households by car ownership, trip ends and simple traffic growth factors based on data from the National Transport Model (NTM). Parking requirements will be based on current Borough Standards</p>
<p>There are no jobs in Binfield and no viable public transport. All the new residents will get in their cars and drive to Bracknell for work (if there are even enough jobs for the new residents)</p>	<p>To make the development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements as well as those relating to highways. This will help facilitate more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>As far as buses are concerned, a rise in the population in the area will increase the number of passengers using local bus services, which in turn will increase the viability of bus services, making increased frequency / hours of operation a more realistic prospect. This may be aided in the short term by developer funding to enable improved bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than an 'add on' at a late stage.</p>
<p>Public transport facilities in the area are poor. As a result, levels of car ownership on the new developments will be high and this will result in an increase in pollution.</p>	<p>The intention is that no new home will be more than 400m from a bus stop. The policy proposals include provision of direct bus access to Bracknell Town Centre.</p>
<p>Object as there do not appear to be any plans to expand the capacity of the car parks at either Bracknell or Twyford stations.</p>	<p>The provision of additional car parking at local stations is an operational matter for Network Rail and, subject to other planning considerations, may be supported by the Council. As part of the development</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>proposals the Council is proposing a range of other sustainable transport improvements to encourage alternative modes of access to Bracknell train station other than the car.</p>
<p>Providing bus stops within 400m of each dwelling is not sufficient to guarantee a good, reliable bus service.</p>	<p>400 metres is a recommended maximum walking distance to bus stops, not a generally acceptable standard. The Council will work with developers to ensure the best access to bus stops (including design and location of footpaths, crossing points and lighting) from the maximum number of homes.</p>
<p>The scale of existing roads prohibits the provision of cycleways. Traffic lights are not sympathetic to cyclists.</p>	<p>Bracknell Forest Council takes cycling very seriously and has pursued a programme of improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities for some years which has resulted in a comprehensive footway/cycleway network. Most of these improvements have inevitably been concentrated in areas where cycling is a more common form of travel. In terms of safety at junctions, traffic lights provide us with the ability to build in phasing specifically for pedestrians and vulnerable cyclists allowing them to cross the road safely.</p>
<p>Concern expressed regarding impact of the proposed sites in terms of increased traffic on motorways and hence noise and pollution levels.</p> <p>Increased traffic will lead to worse air pollution and more health problems for residents.</p> <p>There are already concerns about the levels of nitrogen oxides and smog in Binfield - these proposals will make it worse.</p>	<p>The package of highway and transport measures should ensure that traffic congestion is kept to levels that do not cause a significant increase in pollution and air quality. Air quality is monitored around the Borough. If the statutory limits for any particular pollutants are exceeded, an AQMA is declared and an Action Plan has to be produced.</p>
<p>Health</p>	
<p>Hospital provision needs to be improved due to the increase in population in Binfield</p>	<p>The PCT has informed the Council that the Bracknell HealthSpace will help address this concern by providing some services that are currently provided by a hospital, closer to the community.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Local health services cannot support the existing population, let alone if all the new people are brought in	The PCT has commented that the proposed development and associated population increase will result in pressure on existing services. Developer contributions may be sought to improve and support the development of new facilities, subject to the PCT providing a robust evidence base that demonstrates a need. The Bracknell HealthSpace is being progressed and discussions are taking place about an extension to Binfield Surgery.
Ecology	
Cannot understand why the presence of an SPA in the south of the Borough is more important than protecting the wildlife, flora, fauna and green spaces in and surrounding Binfield.	The SPA is protected by EU Directive and has a much higher nature conservation status due to the ground-nesting bird species it supports. This level of protection does not apply to any areas around Binfield.
Object to development around Binfield, which is being proposed on every bit of land, as eventually wildlife will become extinct and (nationally) we will not be able to grow our own food.	The amount of land being considered for development has decreased since the Issues and Options Consultation. Furthermore, developments will be expected to minimise impact on biodiversity by providing firstly, a significant amount of OSPV (4.3ha per 1000 residents) that will include passive greenspace, and secondly, Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) (8ha per 1000 residents) in accordance with standards set by Natural England to steer pressure away from the SPA.
<p>Has any consideration been given to the deer that live in the area.</p> <p>The development will be harmful to wildlife</p>	<p>A Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out on an area that included this site prior to this consultation. It concluded that there were several areas of woodland, heathland and grassland of ecological value. Such information will be used to inform the site layout.</p> <p>Areas of high conservation value will need to be integrated into the sites network of greenspace - provided through the developers</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	obligation to provide Open Space of Public Value and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace. (SANG).
The area is currently open to the public and trees on the site should be preserved if development goes ahead.	Trees are a consideration in the determination of planning applications. A tree survey will need to be carried out and the developer will have to demonstrate how any trees that are worthy of retention have been incorporated in the site layout. Although there is a footpath across part of the site, the land is in private ownership.
The British Horse Society approves of the proposal to protect and extend the bridleway network at Amen Corner North.	Noted. Opportunities will be sought to extend and enhance the Public Rights of Way network. As stated in Policy TP9 of the Council's adopted Local Transport Plan (LTP3), the PRoW network is managed to encourage sustainable modes of transport, including horse riding.
Drainage/ Flooding	
Increased pressure on water and sewage infrastructure	The utility companies are statutorily obliged to serve new development. The Council is working with the water and sewage treatment companies to ensure that any necessary upgrades or improvements to water supply or the drainage/sewage system are implemented.
More flooding will result as the Council indiscriminately removes green areas and replaces them with houses, footpaths and roads. The village of Binfield is built on heavy clay soil.	Whilst there is a recognised housing need, they will be delivered alongside significant amounts of open space and SANG, secured through planning obligation. Although a clay subsoil is more susceptible to flooding, SUDS will be incorporated into development, minimising surface runoff to reduce the risk of flooding.

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Action: Include SUDS requirement in policy
Development of this area is likely to lead to flooding of the A329(M) which is built on lower lying land than the site.	The IDP requires developers to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to reduce risk of surface water runoff to green field rates. In effect, this could reduce the current level of runoff.
Flooding in and around Binfield is a frequent occurrence after heavy rainfall when the drainage system is stretched to its limits	Noted. Development at Amen Corner North will be required to incorporate SUDS into the site's design in order to reduce surface runoff contributing to the risk of flooding off site.
Other infrastructure	
There is a lack of shops in the area and the existing ones won't be able to cope	New locally significant retail units are likely to be included in the nearby development at Amen Corner South to meet day-to-day needs.
<p>Police cannot support the existing population. The problem will get worse if the population rises.</p> <p>Crime levels in Binfield are currently low but concerned that this may change if the planned housing goes ahead.</p>	<p>Thames Valley Police have been consulted on the proposals. The IDP will highlight additional facilities required for the policing of the area e.g. new police points at Amen Corner South and Blue Mountain.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the planned housing will result in an increase in levels of crime. The intention is to create balanced communities.</p>
Existing schools are already at capacity	Agreed. A new primary school will be required - anticipated at either Amen Corner South or Blue Mountain sites, as well as a new secondary school which is proposed at the Blue Mountain site.
Increased pressure on telephone/broadband	BT Openreach has indicated that "localised enhancements and improvements will be required". Development is therefore not expected to slow down the existing network.

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Further to this, BT Openreach plan to upgrade part of the Borough's existing network to the fibre optic broadband network later this year.</p>
<p>Do not want a repeat of Jennett's Park where the provision of infrastructure is behind schedule.</p>	<p>The infrastructure at Jennett's Park is being delivered in accordance with the trigger points in a legal agreement. Adverse economic conditions and the associated decline in building rates have resulted in the trigger points being met some time after the commencement of the development. The number of dwellings completed act as trigger points.</p>
<p>If developers only have to make contributions towards infrastructure who pays the rest?</p>	<p>Not all infrastructure improvements over the plan period will be funded by developers. Other funding streams are, for example BFC's Capital Programme or Government Grants. Details of funding streams are provided in the IDP under each service area.</p>
<p>Nearby resident would prefer to see field in north eastern sector of site omitted from the proposal due to concern about intensive public use of the area (possible play areas, sports pitches). If this is not possible, consideration should be given to the designation of the land as passive open space so that it retains a countryside appearance.</p>	<p>The disposition of land uses within the site is being reviewed and consideration will be given to relationship with other properties in the area.</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Object to development at Binfield as Bracknell doesn't have a decent town centre/shopping centre for existing and new residents.</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a Council priority.</p>
<p>The reduction in open space and trees will result in an increase in carbon usage which will cause further damage to our planet.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will lead to the loss of some open space and trees, it will be important to maximise the use of existing features and habitats wherever possible. The provision of green infrastructure will need to be considered as part of the master planning process.</p>

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Development proposals will also need to comply with Core Strategy policies CS10 (Sustainable Resources) and CS12 (Renewable Energy) which seek to deliver development that takes into account climate change. Residential properties must accord with the relevant Code for Sustainable Homes.
The quality of life for those living in the new homes will not be sustained.	There is no evidence to support this. The development would be supported by necessary infrastructure such as greenspace.
The proposed developments around Binfield will result in a reduction in property values.	The value of property is not a planning matter.
Concerned about the impact of the new residents on attempts to reduce landfill.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in liaison with the waste management team. With the increasing amounts of waste being recycled and the recycling capacity developed by the Council's external contractors there has not been found to be any problem with landfill capacity arising from the proposed development.
Query whether sustainability appraisals have been carried out for this and other sites in the SADPD	The various stages of SADPD have been subject to SA/SEA. The assessment of individual sites has become more detailed as proposals have been refined and more information has become available.
Concerned about the political motivations for allocating sites - Binfield is now outside the parliamentary constituency. Concerned about the motivations of members of the Executive Committee.	The proposals have been informed by the evidence base, the results of consultation and the SA process. The policies have followed the due process for decision making, including involvement of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission.
Concerned that objections raised at the Issues and Options stage have been ignored.	All representations have been taken into account. Representations received in respect of Broad Area 4 at West Binfield, have influenced the decision to pull development away from the village of Binfield.
A newspaper article questioned the availability of the site for development - the plans are therefore unrealistic.	All sites proposed for allocation must be deliverable (requirement of PPS3).

Policy SA6 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Some of the low density housing is on land that is privately owned and not for sale. Does this mean that the Council is going to use compulsory purchase powers?</p>	<p>The availability of the land has been checked. The majority of the site is under the control of Interlaken. A small area to the east (Popes Farm) is owned by another individual and the position has been clarified. The result is that a small slither of land currently shown as being part of the developable area needs to be removed from the site.</p> <p>Action: Amend boundary of area to be allocated and concept plan.</p>
<p>It is confusing to rename the site Amen Corner North rather than West Binfield</p>	<p>West Binfield was used at the Issues and Options stage to refer to a much larger area of land that, in part, adjoined Binfield. The current proposal involves an extension to the settlement of Bracknell and in particular, the development proposed at Amen Corner South. It was therefore considered appropriate to use the name Amen Corner North to reflect its relationship with the adjoining area to the south.</p>
<p>Statutory Consultee Comments</p>	
<p>See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Binfield Parish Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England, Berkshire East Primary Care Trust, Thames Water, RSPB, Binfield Village Protection Society and Northern Arc Action Group.</p>	<p>See specific responses to consultee comments.</p>

Table 2.16 - Policy SA6 (Land at Amen Corner North) - Developer Responses

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Interlaken	
General	
<p>The Council should be using the housing requirement set out in the South East Plan. PPS12 requires DPDs to conform with Regional Strategies.</p>	<p>Although Regional Strategies were re-instated as part of the statutory development plan following the CALA Homes judgement in November 2010, a proposed clause in the Localism Bill will eventually enact the Government's commitment to abolish Regional Strategies.</p> <p>This DPD cannot be used to change the housing requirement set in the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
<p>The Council should not be placing any reliance on windfalls. PPS3 para 59 states that windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply. There is no evidence to justify a departure from this.</p>	<p>Para 59 of PPS3 states that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified.</p> <p>The Council's SHLAA methodology does not requires the inclusion of sites that have a capacity for less than 10 net dwellings. This is because such sites generally involve small scale infill development/ redevelopment/ conversions within defined settlements. It is not feasible to identify such sites as they may arise suddenly as a result of businesses facing financial difficulties, structural changes, probate, changes in personal circumstances. Historical records show that this source of supply has been responsible for contributing a steady supply of dwellings in the past.</p> <p>However, in the interests of flexibility, a windfall allowance will no longer be included in the first 10 years of land supply. The allowance included for the 10-15 year period is restricted to sites that have a capacity for</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>less than 10 net dwellings and is based on previous trends of delivery from this source of supply.</p> <p>Action: Windfall allowance to be removed from first 10 years of land supply.</p>
Principle of development/scale	
<p>Support this site as a logical and sustainable extension to Bracknell which relates well to the Amen Corner South site which has already been identified in the adopted Core Strategy. Together these sites will create a 'gateway' to Bracknell.</p>	<p>The relationship of this site with Amen Corner South will need to be considered carefully, particularly in respect of the treatment of London Road as it currently acts as a barrier between the two sites. It is considered that there is also scope to improve the approach to Bracknell. The detailed design of the green infrastructure and built form will need to consider this objective.</p> <p>Action: Add requirement to policy SA6 re green infrastructure and built form to emphasise gateway status.</p>
<p>The majority of the site is in single ownership and is available now for development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Separation between settlements	
<p>By reason of landform and vegetation the development wouldn't be visible from Wokingham or vice versa. The issue of the strategic gap between Wokingham, Binfield and Bracknell can be addressed.</p>	<p>The proposed housing area will affect the perception of the open rural landscape gap along London Road. Once Wokingham's strategic site south of the A329M is developed, the land between the A329M and the Urban Extension will need to be maintained as the remaining open rural land between two major settlements. The proposed housing does not extend further west than Amen Corner. However the A329 (M) should not form the chief element of the gap and must be reinforced by retention of open rural land in the remaining part of the strategic gap and an enhanced woodland strip on the western boundary of the site. Care will need</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	to be taken over the design and siting of the development due to land levels and views into the site from the surrounding land.
Transport	
The site is accessible by public transport and has the potential for direct access from London Road.	Agreed, although there will be a need to consider public transport provision for this site alongside Amen Corner South and to ensure that all properties are sited so that they are within 400m of a bus stop.
It is accepted that it is reasonable to increase the junction capacity on the B3408 in the vicinity of the site.	Noted.
There is insufficient evidence to support the need for financial contributions towards Junction 10 of the M4. A detailed scheme has not been fully developed, costed or apportioned. Whilst an indicative cost of £8.2M is given, £4M is attributed to background growth. Any contributions must comply with Circular 05/05 and the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regs 122(2).	This Council and Wokingham Borough Council are working closely with the Highways Agency regarding the impact on the Strategic Road Network. The Highways Agency is developing its scheme for improvements and it is up to the Highways Agency to justify any contribution.
Do not consider there to be reasoned justification to support improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout, or to junctions on the A322 and A329. The N and S Wokingham SDLs have been identified to fund £4.2M of improvements to the roundabout and park and ride to the west. Object to this draft policy requirement	This Council and Wokingham Borough Council are carrying out extensive modelling of existing and predicted flow . This is being used as a base for producing a package of justified highway improvements. Negotiations are also taking place on how the cost of the improvements will be shared between developments in the area and how the improvements will be delivered.
The need for contributions is also highlighted to a number of other schemes (1.3, 1.13, 1.16, 1.18, 1.20, 1.22 and 1.23). There is insufficient detailed justification to support this position. Furthermore, there is reference to ongoing studies.	The Council is carrying out extensive modelling of existing and predicted flows. This is being used as a base for producing a package of justified highway improvements.
Consider that Amen Corner North is a less appropriate site for a Primary Health facility than Blue Mountain or Amen Corner South, if one is required for these developments	The PCT does not envisage the provision of an additional primary care facility on this site.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Object to requirement for a children's centre to be provided on site (although financial contributions towards a new or existing facility may be justified).	Following the Preferred Options consultation, it has been resolved that financial contributions will be sought towards a multi-functional community facility on Land at Blue Mountain, that will contain a Children's Centre able to serve the Amen Corner North development. This will be joint-funded between the two sites.
The affordable housing policy referred to in Policy SA6 should be clarified.	The Council's approach to affordable housing is derived from PPS3 and Policy H8 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan. Guidance is also given in the Council's Housing Strategy. The requirement is subject to viability testing.
Support clustering of SANG and open space around Blackman's Copse to help maintain separation between Bracknell and Binfield	Due to the contours of the site, it may be necessary to adjust the location of areas of SANG and OSPV. However, Pocket Copse and Blackmans Copse are seen as important to the separation of settlements and opportunities will be taken to strengthen them through further planting within the site.
Ecology	
Ancient woodland/LWS would be retained. There is adequate land to provide for SANG.	Noted.
The Illustrative Concept Plan should be amended to show open space/ SANG up to the southern edge of Pocket's Copse (to ensure consistency with Map 31). The land is within the same control as that further south.	The illustrative Concept Plan contained within the Preferred Option will be amended to take into account additional evidence received, prior to insertion in the draft Submission Document. These changes will include the disposition of land uses. Action: Amend illustrative Concept Plan.
The requirement for 'a package of measures to manage additional recreational pressures on the SPA' (point 16) should be deleted as the bespoke SANG as an avoidance measure will ensure no net effect on the SPA	The Council's SPA avoidance and mitigation measures are based on a combination of access management and the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG). This is clearly set out in the South East Plan (2009) policy NRM6, the Thames

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (2009) and the BFC Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.
Other	
Amen Corner North is one of the least infrastructure and physically constrained sites and so it is not clear why this has been phased to the end of the plan period.	Amen Corner North is a greenfield as opposed to a previously developed site and is dependent on the provision of substantial improvements to the infrastructure in the area, including those to the transport network, educational and recreational facilities. The Council aims to ensure a continuous supply of land for housing over the plan period.
Oppose suggestion that the development is dependent on delivery of a secondary school, any more than the other urban extensions to Bracknell	All urban extensions to the north of Bracknell are dependent on the provision of a new secondary school
Phasing and delivery of development is optimistic and it is therefore considered that Amen Corner North will not deliver housing until the third and fourth phases.	The delivery of housing is related to the timing of improvements to infrastructure to help mitigate the impact of the development. The Preferred Option Housing Trajectory showed the site delivering housing during the mid to latter half of the plan period.
Amen Corner South SPD indicates that development will commence in 2011. This is unlikely, as is the completion date of 2016. The phasing for Amen Corner North should be amended so that the development is shown as commencing in the later stage of phase 3 and continuing in phase 4.	<p>The Council's Housing Trajectory at 1st April 2011 shows Amen corner commencing in 2013/14. The timescale has been re-adjusted. There is considerable interest in progressing the development of the area and discussions are taking place with the owners of land within Amen Corner South and prospective developers.</p> <p>Whilst plans for Amen Corner North will need to take account of infrastructure and the disposition of uses within Amen Corner South, the delivery of housing on the northern site is not dependent on the completion of the southern site.</p>
Luff Developments Ltd (Policy SA7 - Blue Mountain)	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Concern expressed about the location as it is rather remote from the existing settlement and separated from other committed development by the London Road that acts as a physical barrier.</p> <p>It represents an incongruous extension to Bracknell which is based on administrative boundaries rather than principles of sustainable development.</p>	<p>The site adjoins the settlement of Bracknell and is close to a defined employment area. It is only about 2 miles from Bracknell Town Centre and close to the SRN. It adjoins the area already agreed for development at Amen Corner South.</p> <p>Whilst the London Road currently acts as a physical barrier, a requirement of the design is to address integration of the developments to the north and south and consider the treatment of London Road and its junctions.</p>
<p>There is no physical barrier to prevent development spreading further west and north.</p>	<p>Existing woodland and the topography of the land are seen as barriers to prevent the spread of development.</p>
<p>The site is not expected to deliver until the mid plan period and it would therefore not help the Council's short term land supply issue.</p>	<p>The Council aims to ensure a continuous supply of land for housing over the plan period. Other sites are available than could potentially contribute to the Council's short term land supply issue.</p>
<p>Popes Farm, Murrell Hill Lane (new SHLAA site 309)</p>	
<p>Availability of land (field to rear of farm buildings, adjacent to London Road) confirmed as available.</p>	<p>The proposal, including the site area proposed for allocation and the Concept Plan will be adjusted to reflect the confirmed position.</p>
<p>Charles Church (on behalf of SHLAA ref 251 – not land owner of site)</p>	
<p>Reference made at 2.4.12 to co-ordinating this allocation with Amen Corner South. A Trajectory is given in the Amen Corner SPD. Note from projections given in the SPD that assumptions are based on dwellings being built from 2011 onwards. Given that detailed applications are yet to be submitted, estimates would appear optimistic.</p> <p>Residential development at Amen Corner South will continue beyond 2016, as a result Amen Corner North will be unable to deliver housing until the third and fourth phases.</p>	<p>The Council's Housing Trajectory at 1st April 2011 shows Amen Corner commencing in 2013/14. The timescale has been re-adjusted. There is considerable interest in progressing the development of the area and discussions are taking place with the owners of land within Amen Corner South and prospective developers.</p> <p>Whilst plans for Amen Corner North will need to take account of the range and timing of infrastructure at Amen Corner South, the delivery of housing on the northern site is not dependent on the completion of the southern site.</p>

Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield

The majority of complaints regarding this site related to traffic impacts, loss of open space / the golf course facility, and coalescence with Bracknell and/or Wokingham leading to the loss of community identity for Binfield.

Table 2.17 - Policy SA7 (Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield) - Residents Responses

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Scale / Principle of development	
<p>Preferred Option is based on outdated situation (economic, social changes, Localism Bill, Regional Strategy housing figures are no longer valid).</p>	<p>The Council is no longer working to the old Regional Strategy figures and is using the lower numbers from the adopted Core Strategy. There will be an opportunity to undertake a fundamental review of development requirements through the Review of the Core Strategy but it is important to maintain progress on the Site Allocations DPD in order to secure a supply of land for housing as required by existing and emerging national policy.</p>
<p>Object to loss of Greenfield land</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used first (in accordance with Government guidelines), for example TRL</p> <p>Council should not be wasting tax payer money on changing its adopted policies and Proposals Map when other brownfield sites are available.</p>	<p>The Council has prioritised suitably located brownfield sites that are genuinely available for development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 and has identified a number of these to help meet development needs. However there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet requirements and the Council has therefore proposed extensions to the Borough's most sustainable urban areas.</p> <p>TRL is already identified as a development site for 1,000 new homes. Much of the TRL site is constrained by lying within 400m of the Special Protection Area within which no new residential development is permitted.</p>
<p>Object: am staggered at how many green sites are proposed for development, which are currently used by local people for leisure activities and by wildlife</p>	<p>The identification of sites has followed the sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2 with urban area sites being the first priority. Beyond that the Council has identified major development on Brownfield sites at TRL and Broadmoor and has focused the</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>remaining requirement in extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements, Bracknell and Crowthorne.</p>
<p>Development at Blue Mountain should be sequenced as the very last greenfield site to be lost to "urban extension"</p>	<p>It is not clear why this should be the case, and the inclusion within the site of the proposed new secondary school would suggest that it should not remain as the last site to be developed.</p>
<p>Do not want to see any new housing here</p> <p>There is no need for the housing proposed</p> <p>Development should not be concentrated here but should be spread around the Borough</p> <p>Why is so much development proposed in the north of the Borough while areas in the south have been removed?</p>	<p>Suitable and available sites across the Borough have been identified in accordance with the priority sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2, through the SHLAA process and through sustainability assessment.</p> <p>Other significant allocations are proposed within the urban area of Bracknell and on the edge of Crowthorne.</p> <p>It will not be possible to accommodate the necessary development to meet the Borough's needs without using some land on the the edge of the urban areas</p>
<p>Should be spreading new housing fairly throughout the Borough on small scale sensitive developments that would preserve the character of villages and minimise the loss of countryside.</p>	<p>Where suitable smaller scale sites have been identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process these have been included as part of the overall provision. However these sites (and others within the urban area) do not provide sufficient land to meet the Borough's development needs. This means that, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2, the Council is proposing a number of urban extensions.</p>
<p>It is unfair that Binfield and Warfield will have to accommodate the bulk of new development - why have areas to the south of the Borough been removed from the SADPD?</p>	<p>The rationale for the selection of sites is set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation. The proposals do include a number of sites in the south of the Borough including large sites at TRL and Broadmoor as extensions to Crowthorne.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Other sites are available for housing, such as farmland in Sandhurst.	Other available sites were considered during the process and were consulted on at the options stage. The findings in relation to all the sites are set out in the background paper to the preferred option consultation.
This site has not been considered in conjunction with those proposed in Wokingham Borough The Council needs to consider also the proposed development in Wokingham	The proposals have been developed taking account of the proposed development in Wokingham. The Council has exchanged data with WokinghamBC to feed into the Councils' respective transport models.
Binfield has had its "fair share" of development This amount of development will lead to Binfield effectively merging with Bracknell Could the number of houses be reduced to a single line of houses built along the southern boundary of the site? The Core Strategy identifies the gap between Binfield and Bracknell as important and it should not therefore be built on	The level of development planned is that required to meet the Borough's development needs in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that the existing gaps between Bracknell and Binfield would be eroded by the proposed new development. However, the proposed layouts have been devised to use the retained areas of open space to protect the integrity of Binfield village. Recommendation: Ensure the proposals for the Blue Mountain site maintain a buffer of open land between Binfield Village and the Bracknell urban area.
Object as the size of the village will double Surely the housing which is already agreed to be built at Amen Corner is enough?	The development proposed in Policy SA7 is for 400 new homes which itself will not increase the size of Binfield by 50%. The development proposed around Binfield at Blue Mountain, Amen Corner (south) and Amen Corner North has been proposed as urban extensions to the built up area of Bracknell with the retained open space used to help protect the integrity of Binfield village. There are sites proposed within BinfieldVillage (SHLAA sites 24 and 93) but these are much smaller in scale.
Oppose loss of Green Belt.	None of the Council's proposed housing sites affect the extent of the Green Belt.

<p>Policy SA7</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The proposal to build 400 homes and a new primary school looks sensible</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The land proposed for development is outside the settlement boundary and so will set a precedent for building on adjacent land</p>	<p>The need for development to be located beyond the existing settlement boundary has been established through the SHLAA and SADPD process to date. Any further development of land beyond settlements would similarly only take place through the preparation of a Development Plan Document with the accompanying consultation that entails.</p>
<p>The existing open spaces which you are proposing to build on are an amenity which existing residents should continue to enjoy</p>	<p>The proposals will result in the loss of a significant part of the open space currently occupied by the golf course. However the proposals do allow for the provision of an area of open space across the northern part of the site which will be publicly accessible for recreation.</p> <p>Action: Ensure that the proposals for the Blue Mountain site include significant areas of public open space available for recreation.</p>
<p>The amount of housing proposed in Binfield is not needed, as the housing targets were established prior to the economic collapse / as the government has removed the housing targets</p>	<p>The need for new development arises from a number of sources including changes in the average household size and people generally living longer in their own homes. The government has made it clear that planning authorities should continue to plan for housing to meet their area's needs.</p>
<p>What benefits would the development have to anyone? Bracknell has had enough development (Jennett's Park, Staff College, Met Office) without the infrastructure to support it</p>	<p>The development is required to meet the Borough's housing needs. The proposals for Blue Mountain would also include the provision of extensive areas of open space that would be accessible to the public. The site also provides an opportunity to locate a combined education facility which would serve a large area of the north of the Borough. It also provides a new home for Bracknell Town FC which would free up a sustainable location</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>in the town centre for a high density housing development and enable the club to provide enhanced community football facilities.</p> <p>Action: Ensure that the proposals for the Blue Mountain site provide adequate infrastructure provision to mitigate their impact on local services and the transport network.</p>
<p>Consider that there is scope for increased size/density of development at Blue Mountain which could protect land at West End Lane from development as part of Policy SA9</p>	<p>The numbers proposed for the Warfield development have been established through the adopted Core Strategy. It is important that the appropriate size and density of development is achieved on both sites. With regard to the Blue Mountain site, the Council is seeking to preserve a significant part of the site as open space in order to respect the integrity of Binfield village and to provide a public amenity for new and existing residents.</p>
<p>The proposed density of 35 dph looks tight</p>	<p>35 dwellings per hectare for the identified housing areas in the Concept Plan is considered an appropriate balance between the need to make the best use of available land (and reduce the need for additional land take) and the need to provide a mix of housing types including family housing.</p>
<p>Support high density housing (preferably on the Coppid Beech site, rather than Blue Mountain) which requires less land, so that only one of these sites is needed</p>	<p>While higher density development would reduce the amount of land take it is important that building densities and heights are appropriate to the context of the development site and that an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes are incorporated. The circa 35 dwellings per hectare for the identified housing areas in the Concept Plans for the Blue Mountain and Amen Corner North sites is considered an appropriate balance in this context.</p>
<p>Object to the proposed development as it will be ugly sprawl and hideous overdevelopment</p>	<p>It is not clear on what basis the proposed development can be considered ugly sprawl as no detailed plans or elevations for any</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Oppose the development as it would result in urban sprawl</p>	<p>buildings have yet been prepared. The Cambridge dictionary definition of sprawl in this context is "(especially of a city) to cover a large area of land with buildings which have been added at different times so that it looks untidy" This does not seem appropriate in this case where a comprehensive mixed use development is proposed. The term sprawl also suggests a wide spread of lower level development, whereas over-development would suggest something developed at an inappropriately high density. 35 dwellings per hectare for the identified housing areas in the Concept Plan is considered an appropriate balance between the need to make the best use of available land (and reduce the need for additional land take) and the need to provide a mix of housing types including family housing.</p>
<p>Plans are for the benefit of the Council and greedy developers, not local residents</p>	<p>The need for new development arises from a number of sources including changes in the average household size and people generally living longer in their own homes. The government has made it clear that planning authorities should continue to plan for housing to meet their area's needs. The rationale for the selection of individual sites to meet these needs is set out in the background paper to the Preferred Option.</p>
<p>Allocation of this land would conflict with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2, CS6, and CS8 and Local Plan Policy EN8</p>	<p>The selection of sites has been carried out with regard to the sustainable development principles set out in Policy CS1 and are the result of testing through the Sustainability Assessment process. The allocation is in accordance with Policy CS2 which allows for the allocation of extensions to defined settlements. The proposed development will be expected to include necessary infrastructure provision in accordance with Policy CS6 and as outlined within the policy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The proposal will include recreational and leisure facilities in the form of a new football ground and extensive areas of open space and</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>SANGS land in accordance with Policy CS8. With regard to Policy EN2, (saved local plan policy) the identification of sites has prioritised those within the urban area. These sites do not have the capacity to accommodate the Borough's development needs, particularly for housing. For this reason it has been necessary, in accordance with the sequence identified in Core Strategy Policy CS2 to look to urban extensions to sustainable settlements which includes the proposal at Blue Mountain as an extension to the urban area of Bracknell.</p>
<p>The only green spaces in Bracknell are Easthampstead Park, Downshire Golf Course and Blue Mountain. Land is finite.</p>	<p>The major development proposals in the Preferred Option will all be accompanied by extensive areas of open space. This will include normal public open space requirements plus large areas of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) to mitigate the impact of development on the Special Protection Area.</p> <p>Action: Ensure that the proposals for the Blue Mountain site include significant areas of public open space available for recreation.</p>
<p>Blue Mountain was not identified in the Core Strategy and was only identified latterly.</p>	<p>This applies to all four of the proposed new urban extensions in Preferred Option Policies SA4, SA5, SA6 and SA7.</p>
<p>The Council should be building affordable housing, which is conveniently located for the town centre and buses. This would meet the Councils aim of meeting the of the changing UK demographics (increasing household formation, increasing divorce rate)</p>	<p>In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 the Council has sought to locate new housing, including affordable housing within Bracknell Town Centre. However there remains a need for family housing, including affordable family housing which may not be best located in the town centre. The increasing divorce rate can, where there are children involved, result in increasing demand for family housing if both parents wish to be able to accommodate their children.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The Council should be building affordable housing in the town centre, which is better located for public transport and facilities</p>	<p>The Council is seeking opportunities to provide affordable housing within the town centre, including through the regeneration proposals. It is important that we do not create over-large concentrations of social housing as in the words of PPS 3 the government's policy objective is "to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas, both urban and rural."</p>
<p>Should build on Downshire Golf Course instead as this is losing money and is council owned, no deals would therefore need to be made with builders.</p> <p>Have the Council fully investigated the alternative golf course site in Bracknell to safeguard the Blue Mountain Golf Course.</p>	<p>The Downshire golf course was included in the Council's considerations among a large number of Council-owned sites but was rejected as the site is covered by a restrictive covenant and was not likely to be available for development during the plan period. The BlueMountain site is available for development and is being actively promoted for development by its owners.</p> <p>Where suitable, sustainably located, Council-owned land is available for development we do actively pursue this option. An example of this is the proposal to relocate the Council depot from a site within Bracknell to the Transport Research Laboratory site at Crowthorne which is included in our preferred option. This has enabled us to allocate the existing depot site for 77 new homes on an urban brownfield site that would otherwise have required the allocation of additional greenfield land.</p>
<p>Object to development at Binfield - Bracknell doesn't have a decent town centre/shopping centre to offer the intended rise in population</p>	<p>The Council is making progress on the regeneration of Bracknell town centre and planning applications have been recently approved/submitted for a new food store, a new health space and for enhancements to the Princess Square shopping mall.</p>
<p>Major employers have deserted Bracknell, leaving room in the town centre for residential apartments; new developments on the edge of Bracknell will only develop Reading's commuter belt</p>	<p>A significant number of new homes are planned for Bracknell Town Centre. However to provide for the Borough's development</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>needs and support the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre a number of urban extensions are also required.</p>
<p>Should be reusing empty buildings before building on green spaces/Crowthorne has enough land for housing.</p>	<p>Where brownfield sites or existing buildings are available and suitable for residential redevelopment the Council is pursuing this as a priority in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2. Two brownfield sites were identified in Crowthorne as part of this approach, along with a number of other previously developed sites within urban areas of the Borough.</p> <p>In addition, the SADPD proposes removal of the designation on certain employment areas in the Borough which may facilitate these areas coming forward for alternative uses, including housing.</p>
<p>There are no jobs in Binfield and no viable public transport so all the new residents will get in their cars and drive to Bracknell for work (if there are even enough jobs for all the new people)</p>	<p>The Blue Mountain site is being proposed as an extension to the built up area of Bracknell. There are employment opportunities within the major business parks on the north and west of the town, and it is also proposed to improve public transport to Bracknell Town Centre where there are further employment opportunities.</p>
<p>Separation of settlements</p>	
<p>Oppose development as open green space needs to be maintained to separate Binfield from Bracknell, so that Binfield keeps its separate identity</p> <p>Concern that the proposed developments at Binfield would breach current planning policies (EN8 of the BFLP and CS9 of the Core Strategy DPD which seek to protect the countryside and local gaps.</p> <p>Local and strategic gaps should be protected.</p>	<p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another. While the Council does have planning policies to protect defined gaps the Site Allocations DPD will provide new policies and form a new part of the planning policy framework. This means that the potential development of this site is not being considered in isolation against</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Don't want Binfield to become part of Bracknell so need to keep the green space separating them - this means the golf course since Temple Park housing estate was built</p> <p>A slither of green space between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell will not maintain the individuality of these settlements.</p> <p>There would be no visible gap between Binfield and Bracknell - a gap which was recognised as important (and found 'sound') in the Core Strategy</p> <p>Object to development on the golf course as it is a designated 'open space of public value' and forms the green gap between Bracknell and Binfield (it original purpose when the Temple Park development was passed)</p> <p>Loss of the golf course would conflict the aim in the Sustainable Community Strategy to reduce the impact of local developments on the environment</p> <p>Object to loss of a 'green lung'</p>	<p>existing policy, but in relation to the relative merits of developing it compared to alternative locations.</p> <p>In order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focused on the southern part of the site where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. The Northern part of the site will be allocated as public open space (to include mitigation land to avoid adverse impacts on the Special Protection Area to the south of the Borough). This will ensure that an undeveloped gap remains between Binfield and Bracknell. It will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p> <p>Policies EN8 and CS9 mostly relate to the control of development within land outside of settlements. The Site Allocations DPD proposals would, due to the need to allocate land for housing to meet the Borough's needs, result in the land proposed for development being taken out of the countryside and included within a settlement. The policy approach for this process is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2.</p> <p>Local gaps are not defined on the Proposals Map</p> <p>The response prepared by Kirkham Landscape Planning to comments on the Preferred Option concludes that the immediate open landscape to the east of Binfield and approximately half the existing open land will be maintained.</p>
<p>Development of this site would conflict with the findings of the August 2008 Entec report which found that the size of the gap between Binfield and Bracknell could not be reduced without harming its function</p>	<p>The Entec report stated that "it is considered unlikely that the size of the gap could be reduced without harming its function". It also indicated that the site had a moderate to low capacity to accept development. It is accepted that the proposed development will</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>reduce the size of the gap, and that this will to some extent harm its function. However, the extent of the gap is not defined on the Proposals Map and the more recent Landscape Capacity Study identified that the part of the site proposed for development has a moderate capacity.</p> <p>In order to preserve the separate identity of Binfield the development has been focused on the southern part of the site where it will link to the existing built up area of Bracknell. The Northern part of the site will be allocated as public open space (to include mitigation land to avoid adverse impacts on the Special Protection Area to the south of the Borough). This will ensure that an undeveloped gap remains between Binfield and Bracknell. It will also ensure that the undeveloped area is accessible to the public for informal recreation use.</p> <p>The response prepared by Kirkham Landscape Planning to comments on the Preferred Option concludes that open tracts of SANGs will remain between settlements, albeit that the settlement boundaries will move closer together. This will require a robust scheme for green infrastructure on the remaining open land. The arrangement of the proposed football ground and education facilities should also be designed to minimise coalescence.</p> <p>Action: Ensure the proposals for the Blue Mountain site maintain a buffer of open land between Binfield Village and the Bracknell urban area.</p>
<p>The development would be visible for many people who live in Binfield village and will spoil the attractive landscape</p>	<p>Significant development on the site will inevitably change certain views. However, a significant part of the site is proposed to be allocated to SANGS and other open space and part is proposed to remain as land outside of the settlement. Opportunities will also be</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>sought to retain good quality mature individual trees and tree groups to soften the visual impact of the new buildings.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the ENTEC study, Kirkham Landscape concludes that:- "Entec set out a number of tests for Gap 1 Binfield - Bracknell. The purpose of a local gap policy is to retain the separate identity of the settlements and prevent their coalescence. This does not solely rely on distance and openness of the land but also on the character of the open landscape. Entec however conclude that it would not be possible to reduce the size of the gap without harming its function. The Entec study also identified the landscape sensitivity as 'moderate' in 2006 and the landscape value as 'moderate to high'. However the parkland (which is excluded from SA7) played an important part in this assessment. The visual sensitivity was assessed as 'moderate to high' and this will be partly compromised by the development. The Landscape Capacity Study 2010 updates the Entec study and the area to be developed lies within an area (B1) of moderate landscape capacity which can accommodate some development."</p>
<p>Having been persuaded to sacrifice the farmland for a golf course when Temple Park was built, the SADPD now says that the natural landscape has been degraded so is more suitable for housing</p>	<p>The policy approach is based on an assessment of the sites available to meet housing needs and the allocation of those that provide for the most sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>The Landscape Capacity Study took a consistent approach and examined conditions of all the landscapes within the Broad Areas at the time. Where the rural landscape is more intact, or of historic significance, the landscape capacity will be lower.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>What has changed, since Temple Park was passed requiring the open green space between Binfield and Bracknell? The Council promised that this area would be protected from further development when the Temple Park was allowed.</p>	<p>There is now a need to plan for development to meet the needs of the Borough to 2026 and beyond.</p>
<p>The Green Belt which provides a barrier between Binfield and Bracknell will be obliterated, together with the resident wildlife</p>	<p>No areas of Green Belt in the Borough are proposed for development and no changes are proposed to the Green Belt Boundary</p>
<p>Proposal conflicts with the Character Area Assessment SPD which recommends that the two gaps either side of Binfield be retained.</p> <p>Would be contrary to BFC's own Character Areas Assessment (small scale infill should respect existing building lines and boundary treatment, open landscape on either side of Binfield together with open character of Popeswood north should be retained to maintain rural setting and distinctive character of Binfield, maintain strong links with rural setting, retain key views, retain transitional character of Foxley Lane).</p>	<p>The Character Area Assessment SPD makes it clear that there is a need to find additional sites for new development. It states that this will inevitably have an impact on some of the character areas detailed in the SPD. It also states that the SPD is therefore not to be seen as a tool to stifle or resist development proposals, but as a tool to</p> <p>inform change and guide future development.</p> <p>The Blue Mountain site lies outside of the Binfield study areas. The SPD identifies certain positive characteristics of the site which, with sensitive design can be retained such as having open space on the northern part of the site to retain a defined edge to the village and the potential to retain much of the perimeter hedgeline.</p> <p>Parts of the site lie close to three identified character areas. The area proposed for built development is separated from the character areas by retained open land, including SANGs. The character of Character Area 'A' (in the Character Areas SPD) will be largely unaffected apart from the impact on the character of Forest Rd, which will be mitigated by SANGs and green infrastructure. The main impact on Character Area 'B' will be to the key views. The proposal is to set housing back from these viewpoints. The northern triangle of Character Area 'C' abuts the housing separated by a clump of trees. Although</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>housing will be set back from Popeswood Road some views over parkland will be affected.</p> <p>Action: Ensure the proposals for the Blue Mountain site maintain a buffer of open land between Binfield Village and the Bracknell urban area.</p> <p>Action: Revise the Illustrative Concept Plan to show retention of elements of tree screening and additional landscaping along the southern edge of the site.</p>
Community / Character	
<p>Binfield will no longer have a village character as it will lose its rural setting through having no gaps on either side</p> <p>The current proposals will result in the convergence of Binfield, Bracknell, Warfield and Wokingham which will lead to a loss of community identities and loss of character and natural landscape</p> <p>Object to the planned housing as this would infringe on Binfield (which is already overdeveloped) and would spoil the unique character and community spirit of the village</p> <p>The current proposals will result in the convergence of Binfield, Bracknell, Warfield and Wokingham which will lead to a loss of community identities and loss of character and natural landscape</p> <p>Lovely rural/ semi-rural (varied by response) setting of Binfield will be destroyed and it will be turned into a 'concrete jungle'</p>	<p>In order to help preserve the identity of Binfield the Concept Plan has been devised so that the areas of open space required as part of any new development (including land required to mitigate impacts on the Special Protection Area) would be used to maintain an undeveloped gap between Binfield and Bracknell.</p> <p>The housing numbers require us to allocate greenfield sites and in accordance with our development location policy (Core Strategy Policy CS2) these will be extensions to existing settlements and inevitably in some cases these will form part of a gap between that settlement and another.</p> <p>The response prepared by Kirkham Landscape Planning to comments on the Preferred Option concludes that open tracts of SANGs will remain between settlements, albeit that the settlement boundaries will move closer together. This will require a robust scheme for green infrastructure on the remaining open land. The arrangement of the proposed football ground and education facilities should also be designed to minimise coalescence.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	Action: Ensure the proposals for the Blue Mountain site maintain a buffer of open land between Binfield Village and the Bracknell urban area.
Do not see how the proposal to locate a football club for Bracknell in Binfield will achieve the Sustainability Appraisal objective "to create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive communities"	The proposed development at Blue Mountain, while within the parish of Binfield, has been devised, as shown on the Concept Plan, as an extension to the urban area of Bracknell. As such the proposed new football ground will lie at the edge of the built up area of Bracknell. It is not for the planning authority to determine which club uses the ground, but rather whether the site is suitable for the proposed use which is being promoted by the site's owners.
The Amen Corner south development will create a Parish with three distinct communities - any further increase will completely diffuse that identity	The proposed development at Blue Mountain has been devised, as shown on the Concept Plan, as an extension to the urban area of Bracknell. This should minimise its impact on the identity and integrity of Binfield village.
No consideration has been given to the character / local heritage of Binfield and how the new developments would affect it	The character and local heritage of Binfield have been considered in the assessment of available sites. On East Binfield the changes from the Options consultation include reducing the area of land to be allocated including taking out the area of the historic park and garden at Newbold College.
The extra traffic will erode and harm Binfield's historic buildings, conflicting with the Binfield Design Statement Rev C	The layout for the Blue Mountain site shown in the Concept Plan provides for vehicular access directly onto the northern distributor road which links directly to the strategic highway network. This will minimise the impact of traffic from the site on the local road network, particularly on the roads through Binfield Village where the majority of the local historic buildings are located. Action: Ensure that vehicular access to and from the site is via Temple Way to minimise traffic impacts on Binfield Village.

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Concern that proposals will result in loss of village status for Binfield	The Blue Mountain proposal is designed as an extension to the urban area of Bracknell and as such is not considered to have any material impact on Binfield's status as a village.
Loss of golf course	
The removal of the Golf Course is against Government policies to get fit and healthy/contrary to PPG17 which stresses the importance of providing sporting facilities.	The development will result in the loss of the golf course as a recreational resource. This will be to some extent be balanced by the provision of significant areas of open space for informal recreation which will be publicly accessible to all, which the existing golf course is not. The proposals include a new location for Bracknell Town Football Club and opportunities will be sought to gain maximum community benefit from the facilities this will provide.
Object to loss of golf course due to loss of jobs there / loss of local business	It is likely that a number of new jobs will be created on the site through the inclusion of the combined education facility in the proposed mix development on the site. The relocated football ground will also provide some employment on the site but this will at least in part be relocated employment from the current Bracknell Town FC ground.
<p>Object to development on Blue Mountain - the area needs a golf course not a football club / why is it proposed to destroy one sport facility (golf) and replace it with another (football)?</p> <p>Oppose loss of Golf Course as a recreational and community facility/ pleasant walking area/ loss of amenity which will be required even more if the area has a larger population</p> <p>It seems bizarre to build on a golf course when health/ exercise has become such an important issue</p> <p>Consider that the Blue Mountain golf course should be kept in perpetuity for the benefit of existing residents</p>	<p>The proposal is being put forward by the site's owners. The Council supports the proposal as providing a sustainable location to meet the Borough's development needs and to enable the development of the existing Bracknell Town FC site for high density housing close to Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>The mix of development and open space on the site will include a new football ground with community football facilities, further sports opportunities through facilities sharing with the proposed schools and extensive areas of fully accessible public open space for informal recreation.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to loss of golf course as it provides a high quality facility which is enjoyed by many, and alternative provision elsewhere (at Downshire) is poor</p> <p>Proposals to build on the Golf Course do not accord with the Core Strategy which states that existing open space and recreation facilities should be maintained and enhanced, or with the push to promote healthy lifestyles</p>	<p>A Golf Course Assessment has been prepared on behalf of the site owners by Boyer Planning. This has identified 14 alternative golf courses within 8km (5 miles) of the site. Of these 5 are nine-hole courses and 9 are eighteen-hole. It has identified an additional 28 courses between 8 and 16km (5-10 miles) from Blue Mountain. Of these, 7 are nine-hole and 21 are eighteen hole. This makes a total of 42 courses within ten miles distance. They include nearby 'pay and play' facilities such as Downshire (4km from the site) and Bird Hills.</p>
<p>Replacing the golf club with a football stadium benefits a select few rather than accommodating an eclectic selection of people</p>	<p>The proposal is to replace the golf club with a mixed use development including housing and education uses as well as the football ground and significant areas of public open space. The large areas of open space will be fully publicly accessible. The football ground is proposed to include junior pitches to encourage community football.</p>
<p>The Employment Potential Study should be updated and would show that the golf course is a profitable business and is used by local businesses for conference facilities</p> <p>The site is used for more than just playing golf, e.g. conferencing facility, social amenity providing entertain and hosting special occasions such as weddings.</p>	<p>An employment potential study would not demonstrate the profitability or otherwise of individual businesses. The owners of the site are promoting it for housing development and as a new home for Bracknell Town FC.</p>
<p>There has been no thought concerning the loss of existing amenities such as the Golf Course.</p> <p>Binfield Residents have not been consulted by the developers on the proposals for Blue Mountain Golf course and therefore the plan does not meet PPG17 requirements.</p> <p>Loss of the golf course facility contravenes UK national planning guidance (PPG17)</p>	<p>Residents across the Borough have had the opportunity to comment on the proposed allocation of the Blue Mountain Site through the consultations on the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The requirement on developers relates to the submission of a planning application and the process has not yet reached that stage, however a Golf Course Assessment has been prepared on behalf of the site owners by</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The facilities of the Golf Course are heavily used by local residents.</p>	<p>Boyer Planning. This has identified a number of other golf courses and facilities in the vicinity of Blue Mountain (see above).</p>
<p>The fact that parts of the site have been allowed to deteriorate does not mean that development should be allowed.</p>	<p>The condition of parts of the site has not been put forward as a justification for its allocation.</p>
<p>Loss of leisure facilities such as cycle track around the golf course.</p>	<p>The provision of open space and SANGS as part of the site proposals will enable informal leisure use to continue on a significant part of the site.</p>
<p>Loss of the golf course (a requirement of the Temple Park development) undermines the Council's promises for infrastructure etc made today (for the current developments proposed) - sends the message that what is promised today can be taken tomorrow</p> <p>Object to loss of Golf Course as this was agreed to form the gap between Binfield and Bracknell when the Temple Park development was approved, and would be contrary to original planning permission for the area.</p>	<p>The Council needs to identify land to meet the Borough's future development requirements. The available sites to achieve this were identified in an open and transparent way during the Participation consultation. The Council has proposed a set of sites in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in light of the Sustainability Appraisal outcomes as set out in the Background Paper of the Preferred Option consultation.</p>
<p>Football stadium</p>	
<p>Object to relocation of Bracknell FC to Binfield, and feel that adequate sports facilities for the schools should be provided as part of the development (not rely on the football ground).</p>	<p>Any school provided will need to have access to adequate sports facilities. Whether they are provided solely within the school or make use of shared facilities is not an important issue provided the facilities are readily accessible and of a suitable standard. Any opportunities to share some facilities with a new football ground should be explored to minimise the cost of the new school and the amount of land that needs to be allocated for the development.</p>
<p>Would have an adverse impact on Binfield's existing clubs.</p>	<p>Not clear why this would be the case.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Object to relocation of Bracknell FC, as will cause traffic congestion and parking problems/not a sustainable location	It is considered that a shared access route and parking facilities could work well with the proposed location of the new football ground and education facility which would have different hours of peak movement and activity.
Object to relocation of Bracknell FC's ground, as Bracknell ground share with Wokingham FC and so two effectively two football clubs will have to relocate	The proposal is to establish the principle of the use as a football ground, and is being promoted by the owners as a new ground for Bracknell Town FC
Consider that the existing football ground should be redeveloped, rather than moved to Binfield (and query what will happen to the old football ground)	The existing ground is not large enough to support the club's promotion and community football aspirations. The existing ground was included in the preferred option consultation as a location for high density housing in a sustainable location close to the town centre.
Do not consider a football stadium to be an adequate replacement for a golf course	The proposal is for a new main ground as well as a main practise pitch (all-weather) and a number of smaller pitches to support community football activity.
<p>Object to the proposed new football stadium as it would result in increased traffic, noise, pollution and parking problems and, being in close proximity to Binfield Football Club, may encourage football hooliganism/ drunks.</p> <p>Object to relocation of football club for traffic reasons - traffic would be worse at specific times whereas currently, as a golf course, traffic movements are spread throughout the day</p>	The proposed new ground would be some 1.2km from the existing Binfield football club which lies to the north-east of the Blue Mountain site. The vehicular access route to the proposed new ground would be shared with the proposed new schools and would come off Temple Way to the south of the Blue Mountain site and along the western edge of the proposed new residential development. This is well away from the Binfield FC site and would avoid football related traffic needing to pass through Binfield village.
If a football stadium is to be built on the Blue Mountain Golf Course then it should be for Binfield FC rather than Bracknell FC	The proposal for the new ground is being put forward by Bracknell Town FC. There may be opportunities for Binfield FC to make use of the ground or some of its planned facilities such as junior pitches by agreement with Bracknell Town FC.
The football stadium would bring excessive light pollution with flood lights being used every night in the football season.	The area proposed for the football ground is already occupied by a floodlit driving range and is visually well contained. Conditions

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	would be applied to any planning permission to control levels of light spill and hours of operation.
The capacity of the proposed football stadium excessive, Bracknell FC weekly attendance figure around 250.	The capacity of the proposed ground reflects the Football Association's requirements for the league level that Bracknell Town aspire to.
<p>Object to the proposed relocation of the football club and suggest that it is moved elsewhere within central Bracknell (Jennett's Park, Crown Wood, Amen Corner North or Amen Corner South, Downshire Golf Course) so as not to be in direct competition with Binfield FC. Need to keep the cultural differences between Binfield and Bracknell.</p> <p>Negotiations have been in place for Bracknell Town Football club to move to this site for eighteen months, yet residents have only just been given the chance to comments and influence the plans for the site.</p> <p>No evidence/need to justify the football academy/stadium.</p> <p>Binfield should not accommodate other areas leisure facilities as it will bring traffic and other problems.</p>	<p>Bracknell Town FC have been seeking a site for a new ground for several years and have pursued a range of alternative sites. Their existing site does not have capacity to meet the FA requirements for the league level the club wants to develop or for the community football facilities the club would like to provide.</p> <p>The site is being promoted as a new home for the club by the site's owners with the backing of the club and was promoted in this manner in their response to the Site Allocations Participation Document February 2010.</p> <p>The Blue Mountain site has a number of advantages including the potential to share an access with route with the proposed schools; an existing, floodlit and visually contained location in the form of the driving range; and the potential for synergies in the provision of sports facilities within the planned schools. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes requirements for improved bus links, particularly to the town centre.</p>
What guarantees will be given that the football club will have adequate car parking provision.	Masterplanning of the site will be expected to provide parking to a standard appropriate for the level of usage. There may be potential for joint use of parking with the proposed school as the hours of peak operation will be different for the two uses.

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Bracknell Football club should stay in central Bracknell where it is more easily accessible to supporters and players/could share a site with Bracknell Rugby club (as Reading do with London Irish).</p>	<p>The existing Bracknell Town FC site does not have the space to accommodate facilities for the standard of league football that the club aspires to, or to provide club's desired level of community football facilities.</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p>	
<p>General</p>	
<p>Fear the expansion of Bracknell through sites SA7 and SA6 will not be adequately financed and therefore won't provide the infrastructure required</p> <p>The infrastructure cannot cope with this huge influx of houses and there will not be sufficient funding to ensure the infrastructure is provided.</p> <p>Object based on inability of infrastructure to cope with the development.</p>	<p>The Council is doing all within its powers to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided through the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and initial work on establishing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging regime.</p>
<p>The existing infrastructure should be updated for the existing residents before taking on additional residents</p>	<p>The provision of new development will provide a source of funding to upgrade and provide new infrastructure for the benefit of all. The Community Infrastructure Levy proposals include provision for a proportion of the money raised to go to the local community to address local priorities.</p>
<p>There is a lack of information in the plans: nothing is mentioned about new doctor's surgeries, an improved road network and improved public transport in the plans.</p>	<p>These aspects of infrastructure are covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>Do not want a repeat of Jennett's Park, infrastructure behind schedule.</p>	<p>The Jennett's Park infrastructure was delivered in accordance with the trigger points in the legal agreement. This was some time after the commencement of the development - the timing was delayed due to the slow down in the housing market which meant the trigger points in terms of the numbers of units completed were not hit as early as had originally been anticipated.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
Transport	
Local roads will become a rat run - including Forest Road, and the small lanes around Binfield which will create highway safety issues for those who use the lanes for cycling and walking (they will be more reluctant to do so).	Development will be accompanied by a comprehensive package of highway improvements that have emerged from Bracknell/Wokingham's joint transport modelling work to improve the flow of traffic and safety of users on main routes (to make their use more attractive) and improvements to encourage sustainable modes of transport.
Insufficient infrastructure - already congestion on roads from Blue Mountain to the M4, takes an hour to drive to Reading and the train to London is slow.	<p>See comment above.</p> <p>Developer contributions may be sought towards the improvement of M4 J10, if there is evidence to justify this, alongside the developer's Transport Assessment and Bracknell Forest's Transport Model.</p> <p>Railway journeys are not a planning issue and should be brought to the attention of the relevant railway operator.</p>
Oppose development at Binfield as the volume of traffic in this area is already too high - roads are gridlocked	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the roads are currently gridlocked. Whilst there may be traffic delays at peak times, the objective is to keep waiting times at key junctions to an acceptable level and improve the choice of alternatives to the car.</p> <p>To make the development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements, to facilitate traffic movement and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. This will help minimise congestion.</p>
Highways improvements to Temple Way should include making it a dual carriageway, widening the pavement to create a cycle path, and putting in a roundabout at its junction with Boltons Lane	<p>A number of junction improvements have been identified to increase capacity on the local highway network.</p> <p>The journey time modelling work carried out for the Council shows that the junction capacity improvements will result in shorter</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	journey times than the baseline situation without the improvements or the associated developments.
Concern expressed about the parking standards used and whether or not the car parking provision will be sufficient in any new development.	The appropriate level of car parking will be sought for the proposed land uses in accordance with Council policy.
<p>Concern expressed regarding impact of the proposed sites in terms of increased traffic on motorway and hence noise levels</p> <p>The Highways Agency raised concerns if East and West Binfield were developed. The same issue was raised by Wokingham Borough Council as they have plans to build more houses near the A329M.</p>	<p>The Council is engaging with the Highways Agency to ensure that the proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on the Strategic Highway Network.</p> <p>Options are being explored for the funding of improvements to key motorway junctions from developments in Wokingham, Reading and Bracknell Forest.</p>
The developments should be supported by 21st Century road planning: wider and straighter roads, more parking (especially in the town centre) and new ring road around the town centre and park and ride facilities	The developments will be developed in accordance with the most up to date guidance on highways design including Manual for Streets 2. This does not necessarily mean wider, straighter roads, which can encourage higher speeds and car dominance which in many situations is not in accordance with current best practice.
Object to developments at Blue Mountain and Amen Corner due to impacts on local traffic/congestion and public transport services (in particular, caused by the proposed two new schools at Blue Mountain)	There is a need for new schools, including a secondary school in the north of the Borough and the proposed location is considered a good location in terms of highways access.
If roads are built to ease the traffic resulting from the development, these would be unsightly and take up more of the countryside	Roads will be required within the site in order to provide local access to the development. Other than that, off-site highways works related to this site will comprise capacity improvements to identified junctions in the IDP.
The minor road and public transport improvements proposed by council planners will be totally ineffective	No evidence has been provided to support this view. The Council is preparing a package of highway improvements to support the

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>proposed developments based on extensive modelling of existing and predicted traffic flows.</p> <p>The journey time modelling work carried out for the Council shows that the junction capacity improvements will result in shorter journey times than the baseline situation without the improvements or the associated developments.</p>
<p>Whilst the Policy identifies additional transport measures on the major roads, there seems to be little consideration of the impacts of the development on minor roads in the area</p>	<p>The Council is proposing a package of highway improvements to support the proposed developments based on the modeling of existing and predicted traffic flows. This has demonstrated that the proposed improvements would fully mitigate increased traffic from the planned development. The proposed layout for the Blue Mountain would focus vehicular access directly from Temple Way which will minimise impacts on minor roads.</p>
<p>Road safety concerns: the existing roads prohibit provision of cycleways and traffic lights are not sympathetic to cyclists</p>	<p>Development will be accompanied by a comprehensive package of additional footpaths and cycleways and improvements to existing infrastructure to encourage the use sustainable modes of transport. Additionally, opportunities will be sought to protect and extend the Public Rights of Way network to facilitate access segregated from roads.</p>
<p>Object as there do not appear to be any plans to expand car park capacity at either Bracknell or Twyford stations</p>	<p>The provision of additional car parking at local stations is an operational matter for Network Rail and, subject to other planning considerations, may be supported by the Council. As part of the development proposals the Council is proposing a range of other sustainable transport improvements to encourage alternative modes of access to the station other than the car.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Public transport facilities are not good and so the development would encourage car ownership and therefore increase pollution and noise</p> <p>Development at Binfield will lead to more car journeys as it does not have a railway station or an evening or Sunday bus service</p>	<p>The concept plan has been devised to allow for penetration of the site by a bus route. The intention is that no new home should be more than 400m from a bus stop.</p> <p>The policy proposals include provision of direct bus access to Bracknell Town Centre.</p>
<p>Measures need to be taken to prevent increase air pollution caused by increase in traffic.</p> <p>There are already concerns about the levels of nitrogen oxides and smog in Binfield - these proposals will make it worse.</p> <p>Object to the development as it would not be compliant with current EU pollution codes.</p>	<p>The package of highway and other transport measures proposed should ensure that traffic congestion is kept to acceptable levels that do not cause significant worsening of air quality.</p> <p>Air quality around the Borough is regularly monitored. If and when the statutory limits of any pollutants are breached the Council will make an Air Quality Management Area and produce an action plan to address levels of these pollutants.</p>
Education	
<p>A new secondary school is not needed as Garth Hill should have allowed for the expansion in numbers, also new schools are only needed if the housing goes ahead.</p>	<p>Garth Hill was built to the maximum size that the education authority considers appropriate for a single school. The need for additional school places arises from the existing population as well as from the occupiers of the planned new development.</p>
<p>If there is to be a school on this site it should include leisure facilities (e.g. a swimming pool) which will benefit more people than a football club would</p>	<p>The Council is pursuing community use of facilities provided as part of the school and the proposed new ground for Bracknell Town FC.</p>
<p>Any school built in the centre of this site will be located some distance from housing in the area. This will result in increased traffic at peak hour due to school runs.</p>	<p>The proposed school site is adjacent to planned housing. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the various infrastructure improvements and new provision required to support the new development and mitigate its impacts.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Schools already oversubscribed; promises of improvements like new schools in the past haven't happened so not believed this time</p>	<p>New schools have been delivered in the past, and continue to be provided with the recent completion of the new school at Jennett's Park. The Council, as education authority, have a duty to provide the necessary school places, and the proposals for Blue Mountain are an important part of planning for proper education provision for the north of the Borough particularly with regard to secondary level schooling.</p>
<p>Fail to understand how the housing in Warfield can legitimately be linked to the building of schools on Blue Mountain / there is no need to build a school here as 2,200 homes at Warfield aren't built.</p> <p>Blue Mountain should not have to provide a school because one cannot fit on the Cabbage Hill Development Plan.</p> <p>If new schools are required for Bracknell then they should be built in Bracknell.</p> <p>School complex at Blue Mountain should be avoided, with the pupils instead going to the new expanded Garth School / to the schools proposed in the development in North Warfield (Core Strategy Policy CS5).</p>	<p>A new secondary school is needed in the north of the Borough to meet needs arising from a number of new developments (Amen Corner, Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain and Warfield and a number of smaller sites) and from the population already resident in the area.</p> <p>Primary pupils within the proposed Warfield development would attend schools planned as part of that proposal.</p>
<p>Proposed schools are unlikely to be built due to lack of Government funding and this will result in even more houses being developed / schools won't be built immediately meaning further pressure on existing schools</p>	<p>The delivery of education capacity will be phased to align with the delivery of new housing. The education department will plan for the transitional arrangements leading up to the full operation of the new secondary school.</p>
<p>Promises to deliver schools are made to overcome objections, but knowing that they won't be built (as was the case at Farley Wood)</p>	<p>The Council has a statutory duty to provide school places for the population. The Council will secure the provision of necessary new schools in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Blue Mountain should be built on last as it is greenfield; and for this reason it is not appropriate to site a school there. The education facilities should be built at Warfield, which will come forward earlier, even if it means more housing at Blue Mountain</p>	<p>Warfield is also greenfield development, and due to the multiplicity of land ownerships and its scale it may well take longer to fully develop than Blue Mountain which is almost entirely within a single ownership.</p>
<p>Locating a school on this site is inappropriate (in low density housing via a B road and single lane hump back bridge controlled by traffic lights)</p>	<p>The proposed access to the school would be via a direct link from Temple Way which would be constructed to the appropriate width and be shared with the education facilities. A location close to family housing is considered appropriate for a school site.</p>
<p>If this site fails, where will students go to school?</p>	<p>There are limited options for the location of a major piece of infrastructure such as a secondary school. There are no other options being pursued at the present time as Blue Mountain has been agreed with the Education Authority as the preferred location.</p>
<p>It is a strange exchange, to provide new infrastructure (e.g. schools) at the expense of existing sport and recreation facilities</p>	<p>The proposals include a mix of residential, educational and sport and recreation facilities (in the form of SANG and other public open space and the new football ground).</p>
<p>Health</p>	
<p>Local health services cannot support the existing population, let alone if the population rises.</p>	<p>The PCT envisage demand from this development being absorbed by Bracknell's new HealthSpace. If the need to provide additional facilities in the locality emerges, the IDP will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>There needs to be an increase in hospital provision in the area.</p>	<p>No specific hospital requirement has been flagged up as a result of consultation with service providers; however health care in the borough will see huge benefits from the new HealthSpace in Bracknell town centre and the new specialist cancer and renal care services at Brant's Bridge, east of the town centre.</p>
<p>The Council will need to consider how it will deliver the health infrastructure (planned GP surgery at Blue Mountain) when the PCT is disbanded</p>	<p>No surgery is planned for at Blue Mountain. The IDP contains information regarding health care requirements in the Borough. Regardless</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	of any changes to the delivery of healthcare, the Council will continue to be in contact with healthcare providers.
Other infrastructure	
Increased pressure on telephone/broadband.	There are no specific telecommunication infrastructure requirements identified by the providers as necessary to deliver the planned development. BT Openreach has a legal obligation to provide a telephone line and telephone service to all new development
Increased pressure on water and sewage infrastructure.	Agreed. The IDP has been developed in consultation with water and waste water providers, as such it contains various infrastructure capacity improvements and recommendations that are likely to be required.
Object to the community facilities proposed (football club and school) as these will not benefit all groups of people.	The proposed development will also secure contributions to other community facilities as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will include significant areas of public open space accessible to all.
The development should provide for local (numerous, and smaller) shops, which would also be supported by the current residents of Temple Park and would create a community feel Lack of shops in area, existing ones won't be able to cope with new developments.	The proposal for 400 new homes is considered too small to support a new local shopping centre. Local centres are proposed as part of the larger developments at Amen Corner and Warfield.
The green proposals will be out of date and too small within less than 5 years	It is assumed that this representation refers to the provision of open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space. In this regard the provision of these facilities is being provided in accordance with the relevant standards related to the amount of development proposed. It is not envisaged that these standards will change significantly within 5 years. If additional development is

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	proposed then that will be expected to make similar provision in accordance with operative standards.
Planning one green area in Binfield is not sufficient for the amount of people who will be using the area recreationally	The proposals for Blue Mountain, Amen Corner and Amen Corner North each include proposals for open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (to divert recreation use from the Special Protection Area). These spaces will result in significantly more open space being available for public recreation than is normally secured.
Development would result in the loss of rights of way which are regularly used by locals	The proposals would be designed to maintain rights of way, and to create new areas for public access within the open spaces which will cover a large area of the northern part of the site.
The police cannot support the existing population, let alone if all the new people are brought in	Following consultation with Thames Valley Police, it has resolved that a Police Point will be sought in the multi-functional community facility that is proposed for the Blue Mountain development.
The infrastructure burden for this site may be too high and affect the viability of the scheme.	Funding for some of the infrastructure on the site (particularly the proposed secondary school and special educational needs facility) will be pooled from a number of developments across the north of the Borough and may also require funding from other sources.
Ecology	
Why is the presence of the SPA in the south of the Borough any more important than the wildlife, flora and fauna in and surrounding Binfield?	The SPA is protected by EU Directive and has a much higher nature conservation status due to the ground-nesting bird species it supports. This level of protection does not apply to any areas around Binfield.
Object to development around Binfield, which is being proposed on every bit of land, as eventually wildlife will become extinct and (nationally) we will not be able to grow our own food	The existing golf course is largely covered by a mono-culture of maintained grass with interspersed tree and shrub belts and hedgerows to the perimeter of parts of the site. The proposed development will provide

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	significant areas of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) in accordance with the required standard.
Policies seek to protect designated areas from development, including the TBH SPA. This site is within the 5km buffer to the SPA	The proposed development site, being within 5km of the TBH SPA is required to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) in accordance with the required standard. This is included within the development proposals. Developers are also required to contribute towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring of the SPA itself in order to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation.
<p>Concerned about the impact on wildlife/the development will be harmful to wildlife, especially birds who will not visit the area if it is built on.</p> <p>There are protected blue bells within ancient woodland within the site</p> <p>The area is a land bridge for Roe Deer that use the pastures to rear their young at the south western end of this area.</p> <p>Loss of habitat for birds and mammals, including badgers.</p>	<p>The area proposed for development is predominantly a golf course rather than a natural or semi-natural landscape. As part of the proposals extensive areas of open space, including land to mitigate the impact of development on the Special Protection Area in the south of the Borough, will be provided. This will provide an opportunity to improve the nature conservation value and biodiversity of the retained open space. The provision of private gardens within the development will also provide feeding opportunities for birds.</p>
Loss of trees on the site is not acceptable	The proposal is supported by landscape analysis as set out in the Background Paper. As part of the planning application process for the site a full tree survey will be expected and development proposals will be expected to retain important trees and tree groups and to provide additional planting as appropriate as part of a landscape strategy for the site.
Drainage / Flooding	
The drainage system will be unable to cope as the area is already subject to flooding on the south side of Forest Road (with the water that drains from the golf course)	Development of the site will provide the opportunity to incorporate a sustainable drainage system (SUDS). This would be able to provide on site surface water storage and better control run-off within and from the site.

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>More flooding will result as the Council indiscriminately removes green areas and replaces them with houses, footpaths and roads</p> <p>More flooding will result; the Pitt's Bridge area to the north of Blue Mountain is already subject to frequent localised flooding</p> <p>Flooding in and around Binfield is a frequent occurrence after heavy rainfall - the drainage system is stretched to its limits</p> <p>In the past Forest Road has been impassable at Pitt Bridge after heavy rain - more hardstanding etc may lead to more frequent problems</p> <p>Concern that localised flooding (i.e. Tilehurst Lane) will be worsened with development (grassy drainage areas will be lost, tarmac, increased run off).</p>	<p>Developers will be required to ensure that the drainage system is provided to a level that ensures that run-off from the site is no greater than that which occurs at present.</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Various objections: internet connection is slow at weekends, length of waiting list for local Beavers, Tesco's is already one of the busiest in the Country</p>	<p>No specific telecommunications requirements have been identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan - this will be reviewed as the sites come forward. The development proposals around the Borough will be required to contribute towards the provision of new community facilities to enable local groups to carry out a range of community activities. The level of retail provision will be monitored and new provision is planned as part of the Town Centre Regeneration proposals.</p>
<p>Live in an old house and when lorries go past it shakes. The increased traffic resulting from the developments would make this worse</p>	<p>This is a structural / technical issue outside the scope of the SADPD.</p>
<p>Quality of life for those living in the new homes will not be sustained</p>	<p>No evidence is provided to support this view and the proposals are accompanied by a range of infrastructure requirements including recreation and education facilities to support a good quality of life.</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
The proposed developments in Binfield will result in lower property values	No evidence has been provided to support this view and the value of property is not a material planning consideration.
The substantial number of elderly people who live in Binfield would be disorientated by the building works	Older people will have seen more change over their lifetimes than younger ones and it is not therefore clear why further development would cause them to be disorientated. As part of the planning of the proposed new developments an objective will be to create layouts that are 'legible' and easy to find your way around.
Crime levels in Binfield are low but no doubt this will change if the housing plans go ahead	No evidence has been provided to support this view and the intention is to create a well balanced community.
<p>The government states there is a requirement for affordable housing, therefore it is inappropriate to build 400 'Executive Homes' on Blue Mountain.</p> <p>Object to proposals for "executive homes" - we should instead be planning for starter homes and affordable housing for young families</p> <p>Object to proposals for "executive homes" as these will have more cars and children than other types of housing creating more pressure on the roads, schools, doctors, etc.</p> <p>Should be building low cost affordable housing for families, not executive homes.</p>	There is no proposal for 'Executive Homes' on the Blue Mountain site and the Preferred Option proposals do not include reference to such a proposal. This reference was in one of leaflets put out by a local amenity group. The Council will seek an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to help create a mixed sustainable community.
Tesco's should be given extended opening hours to serve the new residents	Any application to extend the opening hours for any store would be considered in the light of all relevant planning considerations, including any impacts on local residents.
Concern at political motivations for allocating sites (Binfield is now outside the parliamentary constituency) and motivations of Councillors on the BFC Executive committee	The proposals for the Site Allocations DPD have followed, and will continue to follow, the due process for decision making.

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Loss of well used facilities, Wyevale Garden Centre</p>	<p>The Wyevale Garden Centre was included in the wider area consulted on at the options stage, but was not proposed for allocation within the Preferred Option and not proposed for allocation in the Draft Submission Site Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>These developments will cause the dual income families who live in Binfield to move away.</p>	<p>It is not clear why this should be the case. It is not considered likely that the proposed development will result in existing homes being abandoned.</p>
<p>The well meaning Sustainability Objectives seem to have been disregarded in the assessment of this site.</p>	<p>The site has been subject to Sustainability Assessment in accordance with the Council's sustainability objectives and with the relevant guidance. The summary of this work can be found in Table 23 (Page 63) of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report Incorporating SEA) Site Allocations DPD Preferred Option, November 2010.</p>
<p>Concern expressed regarding the impact of the new residents on attempts to reduce landfill.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in liaison with the waste management team. With the increasing amounts of waste being recycled and the recycling capacity developed by the Council's external contractors there has not been found to be any problem with landfill capacity arising from the proposed development.</p>
<p>Commercial companies are moving out of the area, which is too expensive to live in, so people will commute. There is little appeal in the town centre.</p>	<p>The council is working in partnership to secure the regeneration of the town centre and at the time of writing a number of planning applications have been approved or are in the process of being determined relating to sites within the town centre including a new foodstore and HealthSpace. There remain a significant number of major employers in the town and it is envisaged that the town centre regeneration will create a more positive image and create new employment opportunities.</p>
<p>Just because the land is in one ownership doesn't make it any more suitable for development</p>	<p>Agree. The majority of the site (all but the southern tip) is in single ownership but this does not, of itself, make it more suitable for development. The site's suitability for</p>

Policy SA7 Summary of main issues raised	Response
	development is set out in the Background Paper to the preferred option consultation. Having a single major owner who is fully supportive of its redevelopment does help to demonstrate that the site is genuinely deliverable as required by PPS3.
Building more homes will not encourage job mobility and will harm economic progress.	New homes are required to meet the Borough's needs. These needs arise from a number of sources including population growth, reduction in the average household and the balance of migration to and from the Borough. Housebuilding levels are at a historic low and increased housebuilding will help stimulate economic growth, not just in construction but also the other businesses involved in the fitting out and furnishing of new homes, landscaping, associated infrastructure provision etc.
Statutory Consultee Comments	
See 17 'Specific Consultee Comments' for consultee responses to this Policy including Binfield Parish Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England, Berkshire East Primary Care Trust, Thames Water, RSPB, Binfield Village Protection Society and Northern Arc Action Group	See specific responses to consultee comments.

Table 2.18 - Policy SA7 (Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield) - Developer Responses

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Luff Developments Ltd	
Principle of development/scale	
<p>The housing numbers should be based on the South East Plan, as it remains part of the Development Plan. This means that further housing needs to be accommodated on urban extensions. Furthermore, the Council does not have a 5 year land supply based on a requirement of 10,780 which is 2,000 below the figure that should be used.</p>	<p>The publication of the Localism Bill provides further clarity that the South East Plan is to be abolished, in all likelihood before the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD. At that point the default position will become the Core Strategy which provides the basis for the level of housing being planned for in the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is well aware of the housing land supply situation.</p>
<p>Support the allocation of the site for a mixed use development but the capacity of the site should be re-assessed. It can accommodate 900 homes, rather than 400. A significant number of these could be delivered within the next 5 years. The following points are based on a scheme including 900 homes.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for the site to provide 900 homes and it is considered that this level of development would not enable the provision of a sufficient open space buffer between Binfield and Bracknell - see comments below.</p>
<p>A development of 900 homes would still retain a gap between Binfield and Bracknell (refer to master plan previously submitted to the Council).</p>	<p>The Preferred Option approach would locate the combined education facility at the north end of the site adjacent to a large area of open space. Part of the rationale for this is that the open school playing fields would contribute to the gap between Binfield and Bracknell. This would not be possible with 900 home scheme where this area would be filled with housing. It would also result in development of the area to the east of the Preferred Option concept plan site which is proposed to remain as country side in the preferred option.</p>
<p>The site is well contained on 3 sides by existing settlements. Green open space on the north and west would act as a buffer between the settlements of Bracknell and Binfield. It would also protect the setting of Listed Buildings and the Historic Park and Garden at Newbold College. A landscape consultant has been involved in developing the developer's proposals.</p>	<p>The site is not considered to be well contained on three sides by development. There are open fields and parkland/gardens to the east and west of the site. The developer's proposed 900 home option would not provide any greater protection of the Listed Buildings or Historic Park and Garden at Newbold College than the Preferred Option proposal.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The provision of SANG will allow a significant ecological contribution to be made compared with the existing artificial landscape created around the provision of a golf course. This will allow the provision of publicly available open space.	This would apply to any residential development within the 5km buffer zone around the SPA.
Access to local services and the Town Centre is good. The Western Industrial Area is near by and has public transport links.	This does not apply any more to a 900 home scheme than the it does to the Council's preferred option proposal.
The site is a good location for new educational facilities to meet needs.	Noted and agreed.
The allocation of the site for mixed use development would allow the football club site at Larges Lane to be released for higher density development and contribute to the 5 year supply. The new football facility will complement other uses on the site and allow shared use.	Noted - this was part of the Council's preferred option proposal.
The site has a single owner.	Noted
The transport implications of the proposal have been assessed. A range of access solutions have been developed.	Noted
The Council's concept plan needs to be subject to discussions as the eastern side of the site is considerably short of the overall site boundary. There is inconsistency with Map 32 in the Preferred Option document.	Noted. Action: Amend Map 32 to exclude the land to the east of the site from the proposed settlement.
If a development of 400 dwellings was to be pursued, the developer would limit greenspace provision to 7.4ha of SANG and 4ha of OSPV. The balance of the land would be retained.	SANG will need to be provided at a ratio of at least 8 ha per 1,000 new population in addition to OSPV at 4.3ha per 1,000 people. Open land to avoid and mitigate adverse impacts on habitat protected by the SPA designation (SANG) is not the same as open space provision to meet recreational needs (OSPV). Each serves a different purpose and is defined as such. Therefore the capacity of the SANG is based on at least 8ha/1000

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	persons after discounting any relevant OSPV. Management of the SANGs is required to bring the sites up to a higher quality which will encourage more visitors and divert visits away from the SPA. If contributions towards the management of open space provision are reduced, the baseline quality of OSPV will be reduced. This baseline is a consideration in providing the necessary measures to bring SANGs up to the required standard.
Interlaken	
Consider that Amen Corner North is a less appropriate site for a Primary Health facility than Blue Mountain or Amen Corner South, if one is required for these developments	Following further consultation with the PCT, the need for additional healthcare facilities has not been identified. The PCT anticipate that Bracknell's HealthSpace will serve new development to the north of the borough.
Wood Lane (SHLAA ref 20)	
Confirmed that no longer wish site to be included as part of allocation.	Noted. Site to be removed from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and taken off area of Concept Plan for Policy SA7.
Croudace Strategic Ltd (on behalf of SHLAA ref 24 - not land owner of this site)	
Note that the infrastructure burden this site is expected to carry is of a particular high order and with a development of only 400 dwellings, considered unlikely that the site could achieve this without adversely affecting the viability of the site.	The Council will work with the developers of the site to ensure that appropriate levels of infrastructure contribution are made to mitigate its impacts. Where infrastructure on the site is needed to meet needs arising elsewhere this will be reflected in contributions required from other relevant developments or, where the need arises in part from existing populations, alternative funding sources will be sought.

2.5 Allocation of land covered by Core Strategy Policies CS4 and CS5

Land at Amen Corner, Binfield

Relatively few objections were made in respect of this site, which perhaps reflects its identification through Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (which establishes the principle of development at this site). Indeed, the majority of complaints regarding this site related to the impact of developments proposed around Binfield generally, in terms of traffic and coalescence with Bracknell and/or Wokingham leading to the loss of community identity for Binfield.

During the consultation, confusion arose regarding the status of the two major locations for growth identified within the Core Strategy, that are included for allocation in the SADPD. During consultation on the SADPD Preferred Option (November 2010 - January 2011), the Council issued a '[Planning Policy Status](#)' note to clarify the position, which is summarised (in part) below.

The Core Strategy is the principal DPD for Bracknell Forest, and was adopted in February 2008. As a DPD, the approach taken was subject to examination by an Inspector to check that it had been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and was sound. The approach includes giving direction about where development should go in broad terms and more specifically for two major locations of growth - land at Amen Corner (now known as Amend Corner South) and land North of Whitegrove and Quelm Park (now known as Warfield). Policies CS4 and CS5 were included in the Plan to deal specifically with these areas and give an indication of the expected requirements. The supporting text (para 24) states the level of housing that was assumed on the sites in the overall strategy.

The Core Strategy DPD was produced under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. In accordance with government guidance, the Core Strategy sets out broad allocations for land use; detailed site specific allocations are left to subsequent Development Plan Documents (such as the Proposed Site Allocations Policy). The Core Strategy does however establish the principle of development for those two areas in the Development Plan. The broad extent of the land to which these policies apply is indicated on the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map which also forms part of the Development Plan.

The Amen Corner SPD provides detailed guidance regarding the implementation of a policy in a parent DPD, namely Core Strategy Policy CS4, and was adopted in March 2010. Although not part of the Development Plan for the purposes of Section 38 it is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications affecting Amen Corner. In accordance with national legislation and guidance, any submitted application that is consistent with Policy CS4 and the detail included in the Amen Corner SPD may be granted permission unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. Further information on the Amen Corner SPD can be found on this link: www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/amencorner

Table 2.19 - Policy SA8 (Land at Amen Corner South) - Residents' Responses

<p>Policy SA8</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Scale / Principle of development</p>	
<p>Object to the high levels of development proposed at Binfield and Warfield by the Council (in conjunction with Wokingham BC proposals) as Binfield will no longer be a separate village from Bracknell and because roads and infrastructure are unable to cope</p>	<p>Wokingham Borough Council is in a similar position to Bracknell Forest Council in that it is involved in the process of allocating sites to meet its housing needs over the period to 2026. Its Core Strategy (January 2010) makes provision for the development of 13,230 dwellings. This has included allocating land for Strategic Development Locations including areas south and north of Wokingham.</p> <p>The principle of development at Amen Corner South and Warfield was agreed some time ago through the Core Strategy DPD. The sites at Binfield that were included in the Preferred Option followed an assessment of all available sites (as submitted through SHLAA) against the locational sequence established in Core Strategy Policy CS2, plus sustainability, infrastructure considerations and other matters.</p> <p>Both Wokingham and Bracknell Forest Borough Councils are aware of all proposals and are exchanging information. Since the Issues and Options consultation, development has been pulled back from Binfield in order to help maintain the identity of the settlement. The location of open space and SANG within the urban extensions will help maintain settlement separation. For example, green space and woodland within and adjacent to the Amen Corner North site, plus open land to the North will help maintain a gap between Binfield and Bracknell. The open space/SANG provision for Amen Corner South is detailed in the SPD.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the roads are currently gridlocked. Whilst there may be traffic delays at peak times, the objective is</p>

<p>Policy SA8</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>to keep waiting times at key junctions to an acceptable level and improve the choice of alternatives to the car.</p> <p>To make the development acceptable in transport terms, the developer will be expected to contribute towards highway, public transport and pedestrian/cycleway improvements as detailed in the SPD for this particular site.</p>
<p>Many new houses have already been built in Binfield: it has "done its bit"</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Binfield has grown due to the allocation of sites for residential development during previous plan periods, for example, the area around Benetfeld Road.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS3, the Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to identify land for housing across the Borough and assess the developability and deliverability of sites. An assessment against the the sequence established by Core Strategy Policy CS2 has then been carried out. As there is insufficient land available within the defined settlements to accommodate the level growth needed, it has been necessary to look at available land that would form extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements. This has included land in Binfield. The Background Paper provides further information on the spread of development across the Borough.</p>
<p>Do not see the need for the scale of growth proposed at Binfield</p>	<p>The level of development planned is that required to meet the Borough's development needs in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy. Further sites have been identified in Binfield through the Site Allocations process following due process taking account of up-to-date appraisal and evidence.</p>

Policy SA8 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>What benefits would the development have to anyone? Bracknell has had enough development (Jennett's Park, Staff College, Met Office) without the infrastructure to support it</p>	<p>The development will meet the need for housing and will bring a number of infrastructure and service benefits such as open space, a primary school, roads, public transport and community facilities. These are detailed in the Development Principles in the Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
<p>The designation of an area for employment is optimistic, given the amount of existing available office space both in Bracknell and the surrounding towns</p>	<p>The amount of floor space is the product of consultation during the production of the Core Strategy DPD through to the Amen Corner SPD. However, the Council will reflect on whether the amount of floorspace in the SPD is appropriate given market conditions and other material considerations during dialogue with prospective developers in the preparation of planning applications affecting the site.</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p>	
<p>General</p>	
<p>Should not be building any new houses in the area as the roads and infrastructure cannot cope.</p>	<p>Developers will be required to mitigate against the impact of their development on services, through for example on-site provision of community centres and/or off-site highway junction improvements. Some new services will also benefit existing residents e.g. an improved bus service. In respect to Amen Corner South all the necessary infrastructure, services, facilities and open space requirements are set out in the Amen Corner SPD.</p>
<p>Transport</p>	
<p>The concentration of development proposed around the Coppid Beech and Amen Corner area will result in gridlock of the roads.</p>	<p>Other developments will also provide assessment and measures to ensure that the road network is fully functioning. Specifically, the Council has undertaken transport modelling in support of the production of the Amen Corner SPD. This work took account of necessary capacity improvements to the Coppid Beech roundabout and surrounding</p>

<p>Policy SA8</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>area which will be required with the developments. All are detailed in the Development Principles in the SPD. Detailed applications will also be required to include data based on further modelling and transport assessment.</p>
<p>The roads in Binfield are already congested and the schools are already full - the infrastructure cannot cope with so much new development</p>	<p>The development at Amen Corner will provide measures to ensure that it does not adversely impact on traffic congestion. These include a new road, pedestrian and cycle routes, junction improvements and public transport provision. The development will provide a new primary school and contribute towards secondary school provision. The development will also provide open space and enhance community and recreation facilities. All improvements and measures are detailed in the Amen Corner SPD.</p>
<p>Concern expressed regarding traffic flows on London Road and at the Coppid Beech roundabout in conjunction with developments at Amen Corner North and Jennett's Park</p>	<p>The Council has assessed the impact of the development through transport modelling associated with the Amen Corner SPD. Measures to improve the highway network and junctions, public transport, pedestrian routes and cycleways are required and are set out in Development Principles 12 and 13 of the Amen Corner SPD. Further modelling work to assess impact and improvements is also underway for the whole network taking into account existing, new and proposed development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Borough.</p>
<p>Whilst the policy identifies additional transport measures on the major roads, there seems to be little consideration of the impacts of the development on minor roads in the area</p>	<p>The Council's transport modelling concentrates on the Borough's strategic road network as these carry the most traffic. Some minor road junctions have been included but most do not carry any through traffic and should not therefore be affected. Areas in need of capacity improvements have been identified through forecast modelling and mitigation measures included within the IDP.</p>

Policy SA8 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed railway station at this site is unlikely to happen.</p>	<p>The Council supports a railway station in principle but Network Rail and the train operators have a major influences on the achievement of such a station.</p>
Health	
<p>There is a lack of information in the plans: nothing is mentioned about a new doctors' surgery, an improved road network and improved public transport</p>	<p>Details of infrastructure, services, facilities, roads, junctions and public transport are detailed in the Amen Corner SPD.</p>
<p>Consider that Amen Corner North is a less appropriate site for a Primary Health facility than Blue Mountain or Amen Corner South, if one is required for these developments</p>	<p>Following further consultation with the PCT, the need for additional healthcare facilities has not been identified on this site. The PCT anticipate that Bracknell's HealthSpace will serve the development. Discussions are also taking place about a possible expansion of the surgery in Binfield.</p>
Separation between settlements	
<p>Lack of gaps/green space between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell. Will not maintain the individuality of these settlements</p>	<p>The Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document details in paragraph 8.4 that the separation between Binfield and Wokingham will be met through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the existing A329; • open space areas provided on the eastern side of the A329 within the Wokingham strategic development locations; • the provision of open space on the western side of the A329; and, • the provision of a reinforced public right of way. <p>Other proposed urban extensions to settlements are designed to include the greenspace that is needed as part of the development (OSPV and SANG) on areas of the sites that will contribute most effectively to helping to maintain a visual and physical break between settlements and maintaining</p>

Policy SA8 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>a “sense of place”. Furthermore, following the Issues and Options consultation, it was decided to pull development away from Binfield in order to help maintain a degree of separation.</p>
Character / Community	
<p>Loss of village character and community identification.</p>	<p>The Amen Corner South site is separate from Binfield village. It is more closely related to the existing employment and housing areas of the area of Binfield Parish which is physically attached to the wider urban area of Bracknell.</p>
Drainage / Flooding	
<p>More flooding will result as the Council indiscriminately removes green areas and replaces them with houses, footpaths and roads</p>	<p>Development of the site will provide the opportunity to incorporate a sustainable drainage system (SUDS). This will provide on site surface water storage and better control of run-off within and from the site.</p> <p>Developers will be required to ensure that the drainage system is provided to a level where the run-off from the site is no greater than it is at present.</p>
Other	
<p>Planning one green area in Binfield is not sufficient for the number of people who will require recreational facilities</p>	<p>The Council is not planning for one green area in Binfield. Each site will bring forward its own elements of green infrastructure. For example the Amen Corner South site is more advanced in terms of the planning policy process and has more detail on the green space it will provide which is detailed fully in Chapter 7 of the Amen Corner SPD. The other Binfield sites will provide their own open space and SANG in accordance with standards.</p>
<p>Crime levels in Binfield are low but will change if the housing plans go ahead</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that new housing increases crime levels.</p>

<p>Policy SA8</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Concern expressed regarding the impact of new residents on attempts to reduce landfill</p>	<p>Wherever people live there is a need to reduce landfill. In Bracknell Forest the Council provides a service which has in the past few years been very successfully in recycling a significant proportion of waste rather than burying it. The development will provide on-site community recycling facilities as detailed in Development Principle AC2 of the Amen Corner SPD.</p>
<p>The sustainability of this site and the sites in Wokingham should be considered. The Councils should work together to reduce costs.</p>	<p>The sustainability of the site is, for example, assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process which is an iterative process. The process of planning for developments in Wokingham is at a different stage to those for the sites in the SADPD. The processes cannot therefore be merged. The Council is liaising with Wokingham BC e.g considering each others transport implications.</p>
<p>This policy cannot replace CS4, it can only supplement it.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Action: amend text throughout SADPD to state that Policy SA8 supplements Core Strategy Policy CS4 and that Policy SA9 supplements Policy CS5.</p>

Table 2.20 - Policy SA8 (Land at Amen Corner South) - Developer Responses

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Scale / Principle of development	
Question whether Warfield and Amen Corner allocations will deliver 2,925 dwellings in 15 years given land equalisation issues	None of the developers involved with both sites have indicated that they will not be able to build out the sites in a timely manner nor that equalisation will delay development beyond the plan period.
Nike (land owners of part of site)	
<p>Concerned that current housing market will not support 50dph. Request option be introduced to allow part of the land currently indicated for employment (Golf Driving range adjacent to Hewlett Packard offices) to be allocated as either employment or housing. This would also be logical in view of current commercial property market in Bracknell, where it is estimated there is a 30 year supply of vacant offices.</p> <p>Point 9 of second section of SA8 should be amended to give an option of an alternative lower density than specified in the Amen Corner SPD.</p>	There is flexibility to allow for less employment space to accommodate the housing elements at a lower density if required, particularly given the current over supply of office space within the Borough. The SADPD referred to 'up to 35,000sqm of employment and leisure space', and is therefore not a maximum. The figure of about 725 dwellings contained within the Core Strategy relates to critical mass in order to achieve necessary infrastructure to support the development, in a sustainable location, which contributions to the housing numbers within the Core Strategy.
Request Map 6 (illustrative concept plan for Amen Corner) is amended to show this land as having an alternative employment or residential use.	It is not necessary to amend the Concept Plan if more flexibility is built into Policy SA8 and its supporting text.
Request Point 1 of Policy SA8 be amended to read "a target of 725 new houses"	The term "at least 725 dwellings" is consistent to the Amen Corner SPD which provides detailed guidance to the Core Strategy DPD and identifies "about 725 dwellings".
Request that point 2 of the third section of SA8 be deleted as the junction at the London Road end of John Nike Way has already been upgraded and the junction at Beehive Road end of John Nike Way is covered by point 5 in section 2 of SA8.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Action: delete point 2 of section 3 and renumber subsequent points.</p>

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Hewlett Packard (land owners of part of site)	
Supports allocation of its land for employment and railway station as shown on Map 6.	Noted.
<p>For clarity, suggest the following should be added to the policy:</p> <p>"Land held by Hewlett Packard Ltd is identified for future employment floorspace associated with a potential new railway station, Additional employment space on the Hewlett Packard Recreation Ground will be acceptable subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification for the employment uses, • The provision of a Railway Halt, • Provision of alternative recreational facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS8" 	<p>The delivery of a railway halt is not guaranteed and therefore without certainty it is not appropriate to include additional text in a policy which at the moment is aspirational. However, this should not detract from the Council's support for a scheme if further progress is made on the issue. The Amen Corner SPD (March 2010) provides a planning framework to achieve this intention.</p>
Mr A Scott, and Mr M Morrison (land owners of part of site)	
Generally supportive of proposed policy, site is available for redevelopment.	Noted.
<p>Council documents confirm there is a considerable oversupply of employment land within the Borough, and there is no urgent need for additional employment land. The opportunity now exists to revise the requirement for new employment development as part of the Amen Corner redevelopment (in particular for the land currently used as a golf driving range to be identified as either residential or employment uses).</p> <p>The ability to spread houses over a larger part of the site would allow greater flexibility in the density of development in the overall masterplan area. The Council is urged to allow greater flexibility as set out in AC9 by permitting a density between 35-50dph.</p>	<p>Policy SA9 provides for "<i>up to 35,000 square metres of employment and leisure floor space</i>". This is perceived to be flexible to allow for less employment space to accommodate the housing elements at a lower density if need be. Therefore it is not necessary to make any further changes. It is not necessary to specify specific locations for types of development in the policy. This will allow flexibility to deliver a high quality scheme across the site taking account of other policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and/or other material considerations.</p>

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Point 9 of SA8 should be revised to say "other requirements as set out in the adopted Amen Corner SPD or as subsequently agreed with the LPA".	This proposed text adds flexibility to the Policy and it is agreed that point 9 of SA8 is revised. Action: Amend to read as "Other requirements as set out in the adopted Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document" or as subsequently agreed with the LPA".
Point 1 of SA8 should be revised to say "at least 700 new houses".	The term "at least 725 dwellings" is consistent to the Amen Corner SPD which provides detailed guidance to the Core Strategy DPD and identifies "about 725 dwellings".
Pegasus Planning (for Charles Church Southern)	
Due to land acquisition issues it is extremely unlikely that this site will be developed within the timeframe given in the SPD (725 houses by the end of the second phase), the SADPD should be amended to give a more realistic phasing of the development as it will have implications for the delivery of Amen Corner North	The Council has reviewed the trajectory for Amen Corner through the production of the SPD and the SADPD. The Council will continue to review the trajectory for the next publication version of the SADPD.
Charles Church (on behalf of SHLAA ref 251 - not land owner of the site)	
Understood that land not yet been taken to market for developer consideration, therefore, delivery timescale set out in adopted SPD will not realistically be achieved, therefore unlikely that 725 dwellings will be introduced by the end of the second phase of the plan period. This will have implications for the subsequent delivery of Amen Corner North. Proposed change: amend phasing of Amen Corner to reflect the above.	The Council has reviewed the trajectory for Amen Corner through the production of the SPD and the SADPD. The Council will continue to review the trajectory for the next publication version of the SADPD.
Croudace Strategic Ltd (on behalf of SHLAA ref 24 - not land owner of this site)	
This policy cannot be said to replace Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy, as to replace any adopted Core Strategy policy would require	Agreed.

Developer/Landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
a review of the Core Strategy. Policy SA8 can however supplement and expand upon CS4.	Action: amend text throughout SADPD to state that Policy SA8 supplements Core Strategy Policy CS4 and that Policy SA9 supplements Policy CS5.

Land at Warfield

Notwithstanding that Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy establishes the principle of development at this site, a large number of representations were made in respect of this policy. Many comments were made in the context of the wider development proposals at Binfield and/or Warfield (e.g. Policies SA6, SA7 and SA8) or related to the Concept Plan (Map 7), which identifies which specific areas of the site might be developed.

A number of comments supported higher densities/a greater extent of development on other sites identified in the SADPD (most notably, Blue Mountain in Binfield and TRL in Crowthorne) in order to protect land at West End Lane from development. Many residents objected to the lack of consultation exhibitions in Warfield, in contrast to those held around Binfield and Warfield, and these are recorded under comments to the consultation generally/procedurally (see 'Responses to Introduction').

Running concurrently with the SADPD consultation was a consultation relating to the 'Warfield Supplementary Planning Document' (Warfield SPD), and as a result there has been some overlap in the comments made on the Site Allocations DPD also being applicable to the Warfield SPD (and vice versa). All comments received have been considered against both documents. However, the SADPD primarily deals with the principle of allocating this site for 2,200 houses and includes the Illustrative Concept Plan (Map 7). It is primarily the comments that related to these matters that are summarised below. Comments which relate to matters of detail as identified in the emerging Warfield SPD (such as specific layout proposals, density etc) are summarised in the 'Responses to Warfield SPD' document (see <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/warfield>). The comments below therefore need to be read in conjunction with those made on the draft Warfield SPD.

During the consultation, confusion arose about the status of the two major locations for growth identified within the Core Strategy, that are included for allocation in the SADPD. During consultation on the SADPD Preferred Option (November 2010 - January 2011), the Council issued a '[Planning Policy Status](#)' note to clarify the position, which is summarised (in part) below:

The Core Strategy is the principal DPD for Bracknell Forest, and was adopted in February 2008. As a DPD, the approach taken was subject to examination by an Inspector to check that it had been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and was sound. The approach includes giving direction about where development should go in broad terms and more specifically for two major locations of growth - land at Amen Corner and land North of Whitegrove and Quelm Park (now known as Warfield). Policies CS4 and CS5 were included in the Plan to deal specifically with these areas and give an indication of the expected requirements. The supporting text (para 24) states the level of housing that was assumed on the sites in the overall strategy.

The Core Strategy DPD was produced under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. In accordance with government guidance, the Core Strategy sets out broad allocations for land use; detailed site specific allocations are left to subsequent Development Plan Documents (such as the Proposed Site Allocations Policy). The Core Strategy does however establish the principle of development for those two areas in the Development Plan. The broad extent of the land to which these policies apply is indicated on the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map which also forms part of the Development Plan.

The emerging Warfield SPD, once adopted, although not part of the Development Plan for the purposes of Section 38 will provide detailed guidance regarding the implementation of a policy in a parent DPD, namely Core Strategy Policy CS5. It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications affecting land at Warfield. In accordance with national legislation and guidance, any submitted application that is consistent with Policy CS5 and the detail included in the Warfield SPD should be acceptable and granted permission unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. Further information on the Warfield SPD can be found on this link: www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/warfield

Table 2.21 - Policy SA9 (Land at Warfield) - Residents' Responses

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Scale / Principle of development</p>	
<p>Hundreds of houses in the surrounding area remain empty unsold and are a blight on the landscape, yet over development of this area is still proposed.</p> <p>No need for development in Warfield considering the slow housing market.</p> <p>Building shouldn't take place in the current economic climate.</p>	<p>Adverse economic conditions have had an impact on the housing market. The limited availability of mortgages has suppressed demand but not need. Although house prices fell during 2008/2009 they have subsequently recovered slightly. Affordability remains an issue. There is no evidence that there are hundreds of empty houses. Developers at The Parks and Jennetts Park suggest that they have few houses that have been completed but that aren't sold. Construction continues on both sites.</p> <p>The SADPD is a long term strategy covering the period to 2026 during which period the economy will hopefully recover. Household projections suggest that there is a need for more homes in the Borough and the Government has made it clear that a key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes.</p> <p>The development planned takes account of the need to use land efficiently or in a sustainable manner including taking account of associated open space, infrastructure and transport needs.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Object to the number of green sites being proposed for development. These sites are important for leisure activities (vital to health and wellbeing).</p> <p>Object to the loss of a 'green lung' / dog walking areas.</p> <p>Lark's Hill is used by local people for exercising, dog walking, cycling, and other leisure activities. The newly laid out pitches at Priory Field may be lost.</p>	<p>The Council prioritised suitably located brownfield (or previously developed) sites in defined settlements that are genuinely available for development at the time of the progression of the Core Strategy. This approach has been repeated in the SADPD in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2. However there are insufficient previously developed sites or other land within existing settlements to meet the growth requirements and the Council is therefore proposing extensions to the Borough's most sustainable settlements, where land is available (including a previously developed site at TRL).</p> <p>All urban extensions will include a significant amount of green space (SANG and OSPV) that will be accessible to the public. The location of the green space will assist in providing buffers between settlements. At Warfield, new open spaces including 2 new river parks and a substantial part of Cabbage Hill will be provided for recreational uses including dog walking.</p> <p>Larks Hill and Priory Field will not be lost but retained and enhanced as specified in paragraphs 2.5, 4.23, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and Development Principle W5 of the Draft Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The Government does not recommend building on greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Government is stressing the importance of the environment.</p>	<p>The previous Government encouraged the prioritisation of previously developed land for development (PPS3).</p> <p>The current Government announced changes relating to previously-developed land and buildings in the Growth Review. This has been taken forward in the draft NPPF. The Government wishes to localise choice about the use of previously developed land by removing the national target for the amount</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>of housing development that should take place on previously developed land (the 'Brownfield target').</p> <p>In a Written Ministerial Statement issued on 23rd March 2011 the Minister of State for Decentralisation stated 'Local planning authorities should therefore press ahead without delay in preparing up-to-date development plans, and should use that opportunity to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that this country needs. They should make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth, taking full account of relevant economic signals such as land prices'. Furthermore, the draft NPPF makes it clear that a key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes.</p>
<p>Object to the high levels of development proposed at Binfield and Warfield (by the Council and in conjunction with proposals by Wokingham BC) due to effect on Binfield (would no longer be a separate village from Bracknell) and because as roads and infrastructure are unable to cope already</p>	<p>Wokingham Borough Council is in a similar position to Bracknell Forest Council in that it is involved in the process of allocating sites to meet its housing needs over the period to 2026. Its Core Strategy (January 2010) makes provision for the development of 13,230 dwellings. This has included allocating land for Strategic Development Locations including areas south and north of Wokingham. The site at Warfield was agreed some time ago through the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>The sites at Binfield were included in the Preferred Option following an assessment of all available sites against the locational sequence established in Core Strategy Policy CS2, taking into account responses to the earlier consultation, the results of Technical Studies and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Both Wokingham and Bracknell Forest Borough Councils are aware of one anothers proposals and are exchanging information.</p> <p>Measures will be provided to maintain necessary separation such as through open space, planting and other means. The development will provide necessary transport and infrastructure measures to mitigate the impact of the development as detailed in the emerging Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Binfield and Warfield should not have to accommodate the bulk of new development. Development should be spread around the Borough / why have areas to the south of the Borough been removed?</p> <p>There are alternatives to Warfield.</p>	<p>The principle of development at Warfield was agreed through the Core Strategy when it was adopted in 2008. However, further sites are required to meet growth needs.</p> <p>Following the completion of the SHLAA, which provided an indication of other sites that might be available for housing development over the plan period, various sites were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage. These included sites in the southern part of the Borough, such as Broad Area 1: South West Sandhurst. The findings in relation to all sites are set out in the Background Paper to the Preferred Option consultation.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure is more difficult if development is spread across the Borough. Due to environmental constraints and availability of land, there are limited options for a more dispersed approach. Further data on the spread of development is included in the Background Paper.</p>
<p>Bracknell has had enough development (Jennett's Park, Staff College, Met Office) without the infrastructure to support it / what will happen if the money runs out again and the developer can't provide the facilities?</p>	<p>There was a 16% growth in households between 1991 and 2001 and an estimated 9% increase between 2001 and 2008 in Bracknell Forest.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Infrastructure has been provided to support recent new developments e.g. Country park at Jennetts Park. However, the pace of provision has been slow due to a decrease in the rate of construction. In many cases, triggers relate to the completion of x number of dwellings before a particular form of infrastructure needs to be provided.</p>
<p>Object due to loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The area is full of wildlife that enriches the community.</p>	<p>The existing recreational features such as Larks Hill, Garth Meadow and Priory Fields will be retained. The development will provide new publicly accessible open spaces e.g. at Cabbage Hill and in two new river parks. In respect of habitat, detailed surveys are required which will ensure that valuable trees and features are retained and enhanced where possible. New planting and provision will also be required. However there will be a loss of some green fields and features.</p>
<p>Development at Warfield is unacceptable due to pressure on local services and objections from residents.</p>	<p>The development at Warfield will provide the necessary infrastructure and services commensurate with the demand its population will create. This will be planned for through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to agreed timings with the developer.</p> <p>Where on-site provision of facilities is not justified, the development will make contributions to support existing facilities. The Warfield SPD and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the provision of necessary infrastructure in full.</p>
<p>Object to the unfair allocation of 2,200 houses of green field land</p>	<p>A comprehensive development at Warfield was agreed in principle in early 2008 following extensive consultation and an examination of the Core Strategy. Further consultation has been carried out on the details through the SADPD and the Draft Warfield SPD. Planning</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>for new communities is a difficult process that results in difficult choices including providing for housing needs.</p>
<p>Building should be directed to brownfield sites (offices and warehouses around the town centre) so that houses don't have to be built at Warfield.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the town centre should provide the housing.</p>	<p>The Council has prioritised the Town Centre (where 1,000 new homes are planned) and other suitably located brownfield sites within defined settlements that are genuinely available for development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2. The latter include sites that are currently in employment use in the wider urban area of Bracknell. However, there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet development needs and the Council has therefore proposed extensions to the Borough's most sustainable urban areas.</p>
<p>Bracknell Town Centre needs to be improved before the development takes place, to support the new houses proposed. The existing Town Centre can't cope with thousands more shoppers.</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a priority for the Council. It will be developed in parallel with other elements of the strategy, including the provision of new housing. The Council is making progress on the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre and planning applications have recently been approved/submitted for a new food store, a new health space and for enhancements to the Princess Square shopping mall.</p>
<p>The level of housing proposed is unsustainable - around 500 houses would be more suitable</p>	<p>A larger development provides a critical mass of housing which generates the need and can facilitate the provision of vital and necessary services and facilities, for example, new school provision. A smaller development of 500 dwellings can not do so.</p>
<p>Evidence is needed that the 2,200 proposed homes are needed and that building on this greenfield site is justified and reasonable.</p> <p>2,200 new houses would increase housing in the area by 70%.</p>	<p>The Council understands the emotive feelings and opposition there is to further development. The Council has a duty to balance the need for providing new homes, economic growth</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Do not want to see yet more development in this area. The area is already "saturated"</p> <p>Does the Council understand the overwhelming opposition and depth of feeling there is to these proposals.</p>	<p>and the protection the environment. It is always a difficult task involving difficult choices.</p> <p>A comprehensive development at Warfield was agreed in principle in early 2008 following extensive consultation and an examination of the Core Strategy. Further consultation has been carried out subsequently on the details - SADPD and Draft Warfield SPD.</p> <p>The evidence base does not suggest a decline in household growth. The SHLAA and other technical studies suggests that there is further land available for development that could accommodate viable suitable schemes that mitigate their impact on the area.</p>
<p>The proposed density is unacceptably high; the plans would create a concrete jungle</p>	<p>The development will include existing and new open space as set out in the Draft Warfield SPD. Within the built areas there will need to be further green infrastructure and the development will have to conform to other Council planning documents such as the Streetscene SPD which aims to create attractive areas in and around new residential places. Efficient (PPS3) or optimum use (Draft NPPF) of land must be made.</p>
<p>The development conflicts with the priorities in the Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-14, particularly "nurturing the next generation", "protecting the environment", "travelling around the Borough" and "enjoying life"</p>	<p>The development at Warfield is in accordance with the Sustainable Communities Plan for example, Priority 2a Sustainable Development. Furthermore, the development is in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD which itself was produced in accordance with the Sustainable Community Plan at that time. The development will provide necessary services and facilities which will also contribute to priorities in the SCP.</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Area has a good network of old hedgerows, mature trees, copses and a varied wildlife habitat enjoyed by local residents.</p>	<p>Detailed surveys are required which will ensure that valuable trees and features are retained and enhanced where possible. New planting will also be required.</p>
<p>The countryside is important to the character of existing communities. People choose to live here for relative peace and quiet.</p>	<p>The countryside contributes to the character of an area. However, growth needs must be accommodated.</p> <p>The development will seek to incorporate as many green and semi-natural features as possible including sizeable open spaces such as much of Cabbage Hill, Larks Hill and the Cut. Many of the residents live in the relatively new housing at Whitegrove/Quelm Park which was created in the same way.</p>
<p>Bracknell must not loose its rural communities, by blurring the boundaries of towns and villages.</p>	<p>The development will be expected to incorporate greenspace which will help to act as a buffer between existing communities. Designs will also need to take account of the Bracknell Forest Character Area Assessments SPD which considers both settlements which about the Warfield SPD site which are Area A Newell Green and Area B1 Warfield Street. The SPD sets out the built and landscape character, boundary treatments and makes recommendations on how new development in and around should be considered.</p>
<p>DEFRA data confirms that if the Warfield consortium fail to bring forward enough land for development their proposal will fail to meet sustainability criteria.</p>	<p>It is unclear as to what is meant by DEFRA data so the comment cannot be fully responded to in this respect. The development is being brought forward by a consortium of land owners, a specific developer and a number of 3rd parties. The Council has undertaken further work which relates to the capacity of the site in terms of development, infrastructure and open space. This work is informing the final version of the Warfield SPD which will also meet sustainability objectives for the site.</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Piecemeal development will mean that new transport links, infrastructure and community facilities do not get completed until the final phase of the development. In the meantime existing facilities will be put under increasing pressure.</p>	<p>The Council is seeking a comprehensive development at Warfield with agreed phasing and timescales for necessary infrastructure, services and facilities. The Warfield SPD will contain more details.</p>
<p>Cabbage Hill development should be excluded as it is a known flood plain.</p>	<p>The development proposals for Warfield as shown on the indicative masterplan do not propose development within the identified floodplain. The Warfield SPD states that, where appropriate, the flood zones should form the two river parks required as part of the development. Development proposals will also be developed with measures included to control levels of run-off from the sites to avoid making any problems of surface water flooding worse within the sites and downstream of them.</p>
<p>Oppose development at Cabbage Hill and West End Lane because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land fronting the brook is flood plain. • The land to the rear of West End has natural beauty and abundant wildlife. • Previous Council pledges that villages and towns would have distinct boundaries. The proposal will merge Warfield with Binfield. • It will be impossible to safely access the area on horseback. <p>Areas of development on the south side of Cabbage Hill accessed from Harvest Rise seem more logical with other areas of infill within Warfield where appropriate.</p> <p>West End should be protected and the original houses kept as much as possible by making them into a cul-de-sac.</p>	<p>These are detailed matters which have all been considered in the Warfield SPD process. These responses and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Matters of detail (comments on Map 7: Illustrative Concept Plan)</p>	

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Development at West End Lane could be avoided by increasing the density of housing proposed in the eastern area of Policy SA9 (and/or at other sites proposed in the SADPD).</p>	<p>Detail on how the development will be brought forward including changes to the Concept Plan have been considered through the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement which will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p> <p>Further capacity work has demonstrated that the site can accommodate 2,200 dwellings and therefore there is no need to look for alternative sites to accommodate any shortfall in numbers. The capacity of other sites promoted through the SADPD is considered within the relevant sections of the Background Paper.</p>
<p>Object to development shown at West End Lane as this conflicts with Map 34 (where this land is shown as 'open space of public value') and with the Landscape Analysis of Gaps/Green Wedges (a background document to the Core Strategy) which identified the area west of The Cut at West End Lane as being of landscape significance.</p> <p>Land within the site is protected as a River Corridor under Policy EN14 and for its landscape importance under EN10 - development would conflict with these policies / this land should be protected.</p>	<p>Map 34 does not show any Open Space of Public Value designations. The SADPD proposes to remove OSPV from the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map. Core Strategy Policy CS8, supported by its explanatory text, will still apply.</p> <p>The designations affecting Cabbage Hill shown on Map 34 are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Whilst some development may be appropriate west of The Cut, this should be confined to the extent of the existing buildings at Park Farm.</p>	<p>The extent of the development within the site is a detailed matter which has been considered through the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>New development will be out of character with old development (such as at West End Lane) - higher densities should be proposed in less sensitive areas to avoid this.</p>	<p>New development can be juxtaposed with existing development with sensitive design. Specifically, this is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Decision to build into Cabbage Hill totally contradicts assurances given at a previous Full Council meeting in 2006</p>	<p>The Full Council meeting in October 2006 approved the Submission version of the Core Strategy DPD and included an additional resolution to that recommended as follows: <i>"That in approving the submission Core Strategy DPD the Council recognised the burden to fall on Warfield and Binfield Parishes to help meet the Government's housing numbers and committed to protect the area, ensuring any development will be sympathetic and appropriate to its semi-rural nature, whilst enhancing existing, important local open spaces."</i></p> <p>Evidence included with the Submission Core Strategy DPD was the Major Locations For Growth Background Paper which indicated that some development could go on Cabbage Hill depending on topography. The rationale for promoting some development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill has been considered in the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Watersplash Lane is the last 'safe haven' for dog walkers and horse riders. It has a rural feel to it (being a dead end with no through traffic or street lights) and the plans to upgrade the size/importance of the road would have a significant, detrimental impact on the area.</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement which will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Development would result in the loss of some great local facilities, including the community orchard and the historical Quelm Stone</p>	<p>Both the Community Orchard and the Quelm Stone will be retained. However, this is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Why does it have to be so densely populated / even the 'low density housing' will be tightly packed.</p>	<p>There is a need to balance the density of the development with other uses on the site such as open space, schools and a neighbourhood centre. Further work underpinning a revised Concept Plan in the Warfield SPD has reviewed densities across the site. Any changes including a revised Concept Plan will be provided in the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Why is this development proposed on land that is green belt/fields, when these designations are supposed to protect them? Why can the boundaries be moved ?</p>	<p>The site has been identified as a Major Location for Growth in the Core Strategy DPD (2008). Policies and boundaries have to be reviewed every so often to meet growth needs. The land is not designated as Green Belt. It was designated as land outside defined settlements on the Local Plan Proposals Map. However following the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD in 2008 the area is not designated on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map as a Major Location for</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Growth. The site is green field but it was accepted at the examination into the Core Strategy that the Council could only deliver its housing allocation through a combination of brown field and green field sites.</p>
<p>Query whether the possibility of using brownfield sites has been considered, so that development at Warfield is not required.</p>	<p>The Council considered options for locating its development needs in the production of the Core Strategy DPD. This included considering brownfield options and sites. The independent inspector at the Core Strategy examination concluded that the Core Strategy DPD was sound which encompassed the identification of Warfield as a major location for growth. Since then, the Council has continued (through the SADPD) to prioritise suitably located brownfield sites that are genuinely available for development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS2 and has identified a number of these to help meet development needs. However there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet requirements.</p>
<p>Not clear from consultation material whether the Priory Lane playing pitches are to be retained or not.</p>	<p>The Council confirms that the playing field called Priory Field is being retained with other open spaces in the area. This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The development would include different styles of housing and would not be attractive.</p>	<p>The Council through its urban design function has tried to improve design standards on new development and will continue to do so using published guidance, expertise and through negotiations with developers. The design rationale for the site was set out in Chapter 4 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. Any changes to this design rationale will be provided in the final Warfield SPD</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Remove West End, Cabbage Hill (lower land and abutting Avery Lane).</p>	<p>The extent of the development within the site is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Relocate neighbourhood centre opposite Brownlow Hall where it will be more centrally located.</p>	<p>The Council has reviewed alternative locations and it is agreed that the centre should be located closer to Brownlow Hall in the centre of the site. The preferred location and rationale will be provided in the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Do not provide north/south link road.</p>	<p>The north/south link road is a necessary transport requirement which will serve the development and wider transport network needs insofar as it will help relieve the pressure on the current route of the A3095. Therefore, it is intended to continue to seek the provision of the link road as required in Policy SA9. However, should an alternative solution be acceptable in transport and planning terms the text in Policy SA9 should be made more flexible.</p> <p>Action: amend Policy SA9 to cover the possibility of an alternative solution.</p>
<p>Potential for increased flood risk in the area as more green fields are developed</p> <p>Areas identified for development will upset the local water table.</p>	<p>The development will need to demonstrate and ensure that there will be an adequate drainage system including natural drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems. A detailed flood risk assessment to support planning applications is a requirement for the consideration of planning applications affecting the site.</p>
<p>Brideways and byways in Quelm Lane, Avery Lane and Hedge Lane must be retained as green corridors</p>	<p>Agreed. However, this is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement which will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD and reflected in the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>It was previously outlined that any development west of West End Lane would be done sympathetically so as to maintain its semi-rural nature, but this proposal will have a significant detrimental impact</p>	<p>Further detail on the extent, design and look of any development in the vicinity of this area including changes to the Concept Plan have been considered in the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
Infrastructure	
General	
<p>The existing infrastructure should be updated for the existing residents before taking on additional residents.</p>	<p>In accordance with Government Circular 05/05 new development will pay for the infrastructure requirements necessary to allow the development to go ahead. Existing deficits in provision is a matter for the relevant service provider to resolve/manage.</p>
<p>There is insufficient infrastructure (schools, parks, play areas, open space, dentists or hospitals).</p> <p>The inclusion of a couple of schools and a new road won't address the current shortfall in school places nor the traffic problems - it will simply generate worse conditions for all.</p>	<p>The development will provide the necessary measures as detailed in the emerging Warfield SPD. For example, the development will provide two new primary schools, two new river parks, necessary play areas, new open space, a community building, transport infrastructure and a neighbourhood centre. Further details on these matters have been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Request further information on what infrastructure will be necessary to support the development, what the environmental impacts of the development would be and how traffic will be managed</p>	<p>Information on infrastructure provision are provided in the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) and in the Warfield SPD. The environmental impacts have and will continue to be assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal. The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft details the draft transport measures required. Further detailed modelling to support necessary measures is also being undertaken. Further work on the IDP, Sustainability Appraisal and transport provision will be consulted upon in the next stage of the SADPD</p>
<p>Other sites have not delivered infrastructure in the past (e.g. since development of The Parks the Horse and Groom roundabout is a nightmare and the school has still not been built at Jennett's Park)</p>	<p>Other sites have or are programmed to provide the necessary infrastructure in accordance with their respective S106 Agreements. For example, the primary school has just been built at Jennett's Park in line with the agreed trigger point in the S106 Agreement which related to the completion of a certain number of dwellings on the site. Unfortunately the pace of development slowed on-site due to adverse market conditions which meant the trigger point for construction took longer to reach.</p>
<p>The cycle routes, green walkways, play areas etc which are proposed are only the minimum that should be expected. This would not compensate for the loss of green field and agricultural land, wildlife and recreation areas, and the adverse impact on local traffic and social infrastructure</p>	<p>The provisions of cycleways and green infrastructure is not meant to be compensation for the loss of green fields and agricultural land but provision for the new development and community like that provided when Whitegrove was developed during the 1990's. There will be a need to incorporate mitigation measures relating to biodiversity and habitat. This is set out in Development Principle W7. Existing recreation areas will be retained and additional accessible open space will be provided. Appropriate and necessary transport, infrastructure and services will also be provided. Detail on such provision will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Transport</p>	

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Traffic is already unbearable and this development will worsen congestion, make the streets more dangerous and add to pollution in the area.</p> <p>The existing roads cannot cope.</p>	<p>The development will be required to make transport improvements to minimise congestion whilst ensuring safety on the roads and that pollution is mitigated. Further detail on this matter has been considered through the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>New roads will be unsightly and consume countryside.</p>	<p>A new road is proposed that will link Harvest Ride to the 3 Legged Cross. This has been a longstanding desire of the Council and was originally identified to be provided when Harvest Ride was built. A network of internal roads, footpaths and cycleways will also be necessary to accommodate the development. The Council will strive to ensure that high quality streets are provided in accordance with the Council's guidance on this issue called the Streetscene SPD.</p>
<p>The condition of the roads and pathways in Warfield has declined resulting in damage to residents' cars. The Council cannot maintain the roads with existing traffic levels so how will it do so with the additional traffic?</p>	<p>Maintaining the condition of the Boroughs highway network is part of the Transport Asset Management Plan in line with Local Transport Plan 3. This maintenance strategy will seek to improve the condition of the network in line with customer demands, within budgetary constraints and to affordable levels of service. New additions to the public highway will be adopted with a contribution (commuted sum) for its future maintenance.</p>
<p>The area has to endure speed limits, traffic lights and queues; building 2200 homes will make congestion and traffic safety worse.</p>	<p>For safety reasons, speed limits are necessary on roads. This development would worsen congestion if it did not provide any transport related measures. However, the development will be required to make a number of transport improvements including a new road, junction improvements, pedestrian and cycle improvements etc. as detailed in the Warfield SPD. These measures</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>have been tested in the Council's transport model which shows that the development will not add to congestion levels. The development will also provide design and other measures which will slow the current speed of Harvest Ride as detailed in the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Concern expressed regarding impact of the additional traffic on motorways and hence noise levels.</p>	<p>One of the key aims of the Council's headline document called the Core Strategy DPD is to ensure that development looks towards Bracknell Town Centre rather than focusing journeys elsewhere. This coupled with transport related improvements associated with the development will look to minimise the impact upon the motorways (M3 and M4).</p>
<p>While developers will contribute to the cost of the spine road, it is the community who will be funding a large proportion of the road improvements (via Council Tax).</p>	<p>The development will be required to mitigate the transport impacts it will cause. Therefore it will pay for all necessary measures required as a result of the development.</p>
<p>There will only be one exit - Forest Road, The three main routes into Warfield are already congested - esp during summer holidays (LegoLand).</p>	<p>The development at Warfield will provide the necessary transport measures to ensure that the site does not have a detrimental effect on the existing network. The site will be fully connected to the existing road network including Harvest Ride, Forest Road and beyond. The Council will indicate access points in the final version of the Warfield SPD. The exact detail of these junctions will be determined at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Harvest Ride is already difficult to cross / join at peak times.</p>	<p>The Warfield SPD has a stated requirement in paragraph 4.17 to slow Harvest Ride, one measure will be crossing points. The activity on a slower road will allow easier access and egress from feeding junctions existing and new.</p>
<p>Provision for buses, cycleways etc cannot be relied upon to decrease traffic flows.</p>	<p>Public transport, cycle ways and pedestrian footpaths can contribute towards decreasing traffic flows. Other measures will also be necessary such as travel plans. The Council</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>is looking at the whole network in a comprehensive manner including junction upgrades required by all the developments which is detailed in the SADPD.</p>
<p>Wish to see results of transport modelling as soon as possible.</p> <p>There will be considerably more traffic on Harvest Ride and County Lane, which are already very busy.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken comprehensive traffic modelling of the Bracknell Forest network which shows that with capacity and junction measures, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate traffic at peak times when the development is completed. Further detail on this matter has been considered through the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Watersplash Lane is too small to cope with additional traffic. The lane is enjoyed by families, dog walkers and horse riders</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Education and services</p>	
<p>The schools in the Warfield area are already full so they will not be able to cope with extra children.</p>	<p>The development will need to make appropriate provision for all levels of schooling. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The new primary schools will have to be operational before a house is sold, as the local schools are full.</p>	<p>The timing of the new primary schools will have to be agreed with the Local Education Authority as required in Development Principle</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>W8 of the Warfield SPD. There may be a need to provide temporary accommodation until the new schools are fully operational.</p>
<p>It is inappropriate to send children from this development to a school on Blue Mountain as the site is unsuitable for a school (in a low density housing area accessed via a B road and single lane hump back bridge controlled by traffic lights).</p>	<p>The route to the new school is not yet determined, however it is more likely that the route will be along Harvest Ride. The development will need to ensure that there is also convenient pedestrian and cycle links to the new school. Detail on such provision will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Where will the secondary school children go while the new school is being built? Garth Hill will be overcrowded in a short time.</p> <p>A secondary school must be delivered first as Garth Hill is oversubscribed. Surplus land at Garth should be retained for future expansion.</p>	<p>The development will contribute towards a new secondary school at the Blue Mountain site (see Policy SA7). It may be necessary to make temporary provision until the school is constructed.</p> <p>It is not possible to retain surplus land at Garth for education purposes for financial reasons.</p>
<p>Health</p>	
<p>Doctors' surgeries built to support the Whitegrove community are very busy - the situation will get worse.</p>	<p>The Council has consulted with the relevant health providers in respect to this site during the production of the Core Strategy DPD, Warfield SPD and this SAPDPD. They have indicated that health provision should be accommodated in Bracknell's new HealthSpace. If this situation changes, and a health care deficit is identified as a result of future development, subject to suitable evidence being provided by the PCT, the Council will consider seeking in kind facilities from developers. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposal will impact on the already poor hospital services - Heatherwood has already downsized to the detriment of existing residents.</p> <p>A proper hospital is needed, and this should be more of a priority than building more homes.</p>	<p>The provision of hospital services is upto the relevant health trust (Wexham Park and Heatherwood) in association with central government. At no time during consultations on the Core Strategy DPD, Warfield SPD or this SADPD has the health trust indicated that the capacity of existing hospitals is a major limiting factor for new development.</p> <p>However, a new healthspace is being provided in the Town Centre. There is a need to ensure that there is convenient access to the healthspace and to the hospitals in Slough, Ascot, Frimley Park and Reading.</p>
Separation of settlements	
<p>The new estate will join Warfield village so existing residents will lose their green vistas.</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Binfield / Warfield / Winkfield / Maiden's Green / Wokingham / Crowthorne / Bracknell (varied by response) will all merge.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy sets out the strategy for meeting the long term growth requirements of the Borough. This includes locational principles for the allocation of land. These principles include the possibility of extensions to settlements. It is therefore accepted that it may be necessary to allocate land that is currently outside defined settlements for development. Policy CS9 also seeks to protect gaps within or adjoining the Borough from development. Whilst the proposed development will decrease the extent of the gaps between settlements, the urban extensions will include greenspace which will be located to help maintain visual and physical separation of the settlements.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Warfield will no longer be in the country - it will become an extension of sprawling Bracknell.</p>	<p>Due to the popularity of the area as a place to live and work, Bracknell has gradually expanded outwards e.g. Whitegrove. As a result the nature of the area has evolved and there has had to be a loss of countryside.</p>
<p>This area was supposed to be a rural belt, protected by planning policies. Why is this now being ignored?</p>	<p>The Council is not ignoring planning policies. The site at Warfield has been identified in the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 as a major location for growth. This document took over 4 years to produce, was subject to extensive consultation and a public examination. The Core Strategy and all its policies were found to be sound and the document was adopted in February 2008. The next stages are to ensure that the Site Allocations DPD regularises the allocation of the site and that a detailed framework for development is produced which - the Warfield SPD. Both are subject to consultation. The SADPD also subject to a public examination.</p>
<p>A landscape buffer between the rear of the properties on Forest Road and the proposed low density housing should be included. This buffer would help address the visual intrusion and proximity of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Proposals will have to take account of the Character Area Assessment SPD in respect of retaining the character of Warfield Street and Newell Green. Specific detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Building on these fields contradicts the Council's promise (at the time when Quelm Park was built) that the fields would never be built on in order to separate Bracknell and Warfield.</p> <p>The green fields mark the end of the built up area of Bracknell and are a psychological backdrop to the town.</p>	<p>This may have been a decision in a previous administration, however, the Council reluctantly decided that part of the development needs strategy for the Borough was a sustainable urban extension in Warfield. Therefore, the Council has promoted development in Warfield throughout the Core Strategy DPD process which started in 2004 and was completed in 2008. Further</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Object to loss of the already narrow 'green belt' separating Warfield from Bracknell.</p>	<p>commitment has been made in progressing the Site Allocations DPD and the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Community/Character</p>	
<p>The development will destroy the existing community.</p> <p>The area will become too large to create a feeling of a community - the existing community spirit will be lost</p>	<p>The development aims to create a sustainable community with a range of services and facilities. The existing community will remain and be largely unaffected in many respects e.g. access to existing open space and other facilities. The new development will also include new facilities which will be accessible to new and existing residents. Some of these will help sustain a sense of community.</p>
<p>Access to open space is a fundamental right.</p>	<p>The development will protect existing open space and provide new open space. For example new publicly accessible open space such as part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided. Further detail on such provision is in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The semi-rural nature of the area will be destroyed.</p>	<p>The development will urbanise part of the site. However, there is enough land within the site to provide substantial new open space and recreational areas including new semi natural elements. Existing open spaces are to be retained e.g. Larks Hill which will therefore contribute to the softening of any urbanisation. Further detail on such provision is in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure of the draft Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The 'country feel' of Warfield is what gives it its character and makes it a sought after area. This will be destroyed by the housing and make it a less attractive place for those who already live there.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the character of the area will change. The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection of the countryside. The country feel of Warfield was not destroyed when the previous and larger development took place. This new development will look to retain as many semi natural features as possible and make areas such as Cabbage Hill publicly accessible.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The 'village feel' of Warfield will be lost, it will become too cramped.</p>	<p>The Council has to balance the needs of protecting the countryside and growth. There is no reason why the "village feel" of Warfield which includes development constructed in the 1990s cannot be retained. The development will provide housing, open space and other facilities across a large area. However, some areas will seem more urbanised than others.</p>
<p>The development will destroy the historic character of the area.</p>	<p>The development will need to ensure that any heritage assets within or near the site are considered and sensitively treated. For example, the setting of listed buildings will need to be addressed in development schemes. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Warfield currently has a balance of housing and green spaces, which makes it a good place to live. This character will be destroyed by building so many extra houses on green field sites.</p>	<p>The development like the previous development before will have its own distinctive character. Examples of this are that the development will provide substantial open spaces and other green infrastructure which will add to character. Proposals will have to take account of the Character Area Assessment Supplementary Planning Document in respect to retaining the character of Warfield Street and Newell Green. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Loss of open space on Larks Hill opposite Quelm Park, which is crucial to the character and wellbeing of residents. Council's web site explains the importance of this open space. This does not correlate with plans to build medium density housing.</p>	<p>The development will retain Larks Hill as stated in the draft Warfield SPD. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Loss of local views.	Some existing views may be affected. Paragraph 4.23 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft specifies key views to and from Cabbage Hill that should be provided. However, assessment work will support the final SPD which will seek to identify and then protect key views into, from and across the site as best as possible.
Support leaving the western facing edge of Cabbage Hill and Wyevale area green as the views from and across here are important.	Support is noted. However the detail of where development, green areas and the key views are to be protected will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Ecology	
The land is an important recreational feature and ecological habitat.	The existing recreational features will be retained and new publicly accessible open spaces will be provided. Detailed habitat surveys are required which will ensure that valuable trees and habitat features are retained and enhanced. New provision of habitat will also be required. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
The area for development is SANG and should be protected.	SANG is land that is provided by development as mitigation for the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. There is currently no SANG on the Warfield site. The development has to provide SANG in addition to normal open space requirements to a standard of at least 8 hectares per 1000 persons as described in Policy SA9. Further detail on SPA avoidance and mitigation measures will also be in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure of the Warfield SPD.

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Development here should not even be considered as it is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. In any event the area of SANG proposed is not sufficient.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared, consulted and adopted a Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy which was used in evidence to support the production of the Core Strategy DPD. Adopted Core Strategy DPD Policy CS14 states that development beyond 400m from the SPA will be permitted providing that it can provide necessary avoidance and mitigation measures. For land at Warfield this will be through a bespoke SANG of at least 8 ha per 1,000 new population and a contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring as stated in SADPD Policy SA9. Further details on SPA avoidance and mitigation measures will also be in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The development will have an adverse impact on the varied wildlife and habitats (including that which is supported by The Cut).</p>	<p>The development will be required to assess habitat, flora and fauna during the preparation of detailed planning applications. Necessary mitigation and compensation measures will also be required . Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Development will affect the SPA birds as well as result in a decline in other species such as bats, owls, deer, water voles, badgers, dormouse, kingfishers, bullfinch, stag beetle, dragonfly, damselfly and great crested newts.</p>	<p>The development must demonstrate that it does not harm the integrity of the SPA to allow planning permission to be granted as required by Core Strategy Policy CS5. Policy SA9 also requires necessary avoidance and mitigation measures to be provided. The development will be required to assess habitat, flora and fauna during the preparation of detailed planning applications. Necessary mitigation and compensation measures will also be required . Further detail on these matters has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield</p>

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Cabbage Hill (local landscape importance) and The Cut (river corridor) should be protected - these are supposed to be SANG and most, if not all, of it will be taken.	Most of Cabbage Hill will be retained and made publicly accessible. New SANGs are open spaces provided by development. The Cut is to be protected and enhanced as a new River Park. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
A reason for moving to Warfield was the parks and green spaces which we currently enjoy - if this development goes ahead these will be lost. Instead they should be preserved for future generations	The development will increase access to open space such as part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
The community orchard should be protected and not built on.	The Community Orchard will be retained in the retained Larks Hill open space. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Drainage / Flooding	
The Cut already floods and development will exacerbate flooding problems at West End Lane.	The development will need to demonstrate that appropriate and necessary drainage is put in place and that flood risk is minimised. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Since Qulem Park was built the water table has risen resulting in waterlogged fields and higher water levels in The Cut. The development will make this worse as there will be less farmland to absorb the rain.</p>	<p>The development will need to demonstrate that appropriate and necessary drainage is put in place and that flood risk is minimised. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The North Bracknell Sewage Pumping Station will need to be upgraded (which will take time and money).</p>	<p>It may be necessary for developers to contribute towards necessary improvements as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which includes timing of provision. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The site is in the floodplain.</p>	<p>Parts of the sites are in the functional flood plan. However, the flood zones around both The Cut and Bullbrook will be converted into river parks. The development will also provide necessary drainage after fully assessing floodrisk. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The land is designated as part of a river corridor.</p>	<p>Some of the land is designated as River Corridor on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map but this does not necessarily preclude development. It will therefore be a consideration at the detailed planning application stage.</p>
Procedure / phasing	

Policy SA9 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The SPD sets out detailed proposals, and the SADPD seeks to allocate the land, but this is before approval has been given for the development. We are left feeling mistrustful of democracy.</p> <p>Why are people being consulted about detailed plans when the site has not yet been approved - premature.</p> <p>Development of land at Warfield has not been approved for so it should be subject to the same consultation as the sites in Crowthorne and Binfield (including meetings/exhibitions).</p> <p>Lack of information/opportunity to express views/no consultation event.</p>	<p>The principle of development has been established in Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD. During the many consultations on the Core Strategy DPD similar consultation events were held to those more recently for Binfield and Crowthorne.</p> <p>The formal allocation of land will take place in the SADPD. Because the principle is established detailed guidance is being prepared to provide a strong development framework to judge planning applications.</p>
<p>The education facilities should be built at Warfield, which will come forward earlier, even if it means more housing at Blue Mountain.</p>	<p>Warfield is also greenfield, and due to the multiplicity of land ownerships and its scale, may take longer to fully develop than Blue Mountain which is almost entirely within single ownership.</p>
<p>The development at Warfield seems to be dependent on the school at Blue Mountain - there is a danger the school will not be built until after it is needed.</p>	<p>A new secondary school is needed in the north of the Borough to meet needs arising from a number of new developments (Amen Corner, Amen Corner North, Blue Mountain and Warfield and a number of smaller sites) and from the population already resident in the area. The Council will endeavour to secure provision of the school in a timely manner to cater for all the identified needs. A contingency plan of temporary school provision may be necessary if there are timing problems with providing the school.</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Good provision must be made for the elderly, in order to be a "sustainable mixed use development"</p>	<p>A mix of dwelling types and sizes will need to be provided. Although a specific site has not been allocated for the elderly, the market will provide such accommodation within the development if there is demand.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Family equine livery business will not survive given the development and resultant traffic congestion in the area.</p> <p>Loss of local facilities such as horse riding centres.</p>	<p>It is unfortunate if such a business is lost. However, the Council must provide for the growth needs of the Borough. If there is demand for such facilities, it is possible that alternative sites will be identified and open (subject to any necessary planning permission).</p>
<p>The development will put strain on the local Tesco, which should be given extended opening hours to serve the residents of the new development.</p>	<p>This is a matter for Tescos to assess. Planning permission will be necessary and any application will be assessed on its merits.</p>
<p>The Council cannot afford more than twice weekly bin collections. How will the increase in environmental waste, resulting from these proposals, be managed?</p>	<p>The collection of waste and recycling material is a matter for the Council to consider and provide. The relevant officers dealing with waste collection have and will continue to be consulted.</p>
<p>The police won't be able to cope with the residents, which will lead to an increase in car theft, anti-social behaviour and burglary.</p>	<p>The Police are a statutory consultee who have been consulted at each and every stage of the Core Strategy DPD, SADPD and Warfield SPD. They have not indicated that they will not be able to cope with extra residents. This is a matter for the Police to resolve. A police point will be accommodated in the new community hub to facilitate local policing.</p>
<p>The development/construction will devalue existing house prices.</p>	<p>Adverse economic conditions have had an impact on the housing market. The limited availability of mortgages has suppressed demand but not need. Although house prices fell during 2008/2009 they have subsequently recovered slightly. Affordability remains an issue. Developers will not build houses if schemes are not viable. There is no evidence that the development will devalue existing houses in the long term. In any event, the value of a property is not a planning matter.</p>
<p>Tesco's Warfield is already unable to cope, with queues at checkouts and full car park / an alternative supermarket should be provided.</p>	<p>The new neighbourhood centre will include relatively small scale retail floorspace. It is not intended to provide a new supermarket. A new supermarket is being provided in</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>Bracknell Town Centre and possibly a small supermarket at Amen Corner South. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Further housing will result in more superstores, which is something nobody wants.</p>	<p>The proposal does not include a site for a new superstore.</p>
<p>The existing small amenity centre around Tesco's doesn't even have a post office - how will it support the extra people?</p>	<p>The development will provide a new neighbourhood centre. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Object to the proposed neighbourhood centre - experience has shown that these do not work (e.g. Great Hollands).</p>	<p>There are a number of centres which do work in the Borough including Great Hollands. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Object as low cost housing will bring down the higher value areas.</p>	<p>The Council's policy is to provide affordable housing where possible. The development will provide a mix and range of size, type and tenures and will balance higher value with lower value properties.</p>
<p>There will be less employment for local people as more people will be chasing few jobs.</p>	<p>The Council's policy is to plan for a balance of housing and employment growth. There are already an excess of jobs over the resident workforce.</p>
<p>The construction will cause extra CO2 which, together with the loss of trees, will worsen global warming.</p>	<p>In respect to reducing CO2 and mitigating the effects of global warming, the development will be required to provide homes at the best environmental standards possible. The development will also need to provide an element of on-site renewable energy generation. The development will also be</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
	<p>required to provide planting and trees which will also have a mitigating effect. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The additional noise and air pollution will impact on health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>The development will be required to assess noise and air quality impacts and ensure necessary mitigation and measures are in place as required by Development Principle W16 Site Investigation and Pollution Remediation of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>There will be even more litter and fly tipping than at present.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest this will be the case.</p>
<p>Object to the large number of social houses which the development would provide.</p>	<p>The Council's policy is to provide affordable housing where possible. The development will provide a mix and range of size, type and tenures. The majority of housing provided will be provided at market value to owner occupiers.</p>
<p>Object to the area being a building site for the next 15 years.</p> <p>Construction will cause disruption, noise, and traffic chaos, and will therefore be dangerous for existing residents</p>	<p>The development will be required to minimise any disruption caused during the construction phases. Such measures will be secured by conditions attached to any planning permissions. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Development would conflict with the Council's vision and objectives as set out on its website</p>	<p>The development is a product of the Council's Core Strategy DPD (Policy CS5). The Core Strategy is a spatial expression of the Council's vision and is therefore compatible with the Council's Sustainable Communities Plan.</p>
<p>Object to the new housing as there aren't enough jobs for people living in the Borough at the moment</p>	<p>The development a product of the Council's Core Strategy DPD (Policy CS5). The Core Strategy is a spatial expression of the Council's vision and considers all growth needs such as housing and employment. Furthermore, during the construction phase there will be employment opportunities for local trades people.</p>

<p>Policy SA9</p> <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Urge the Council to turn down the developer's cash and stand up for its residents.</p> <p>Query who stands to gain from the sale of the green fields for development.</p> <p>The proposed development will only benefit the Council, not Bracknell Forest residents.</p>	<p>Any financial contributions from developers is tied down in S106 Agreements and goes towards necessary infrastructure, facilities and services required to mitigate the impact of the development. The Council advocates a plan-led system rather than one that involves a reactive and ad-hoc approach involving costly appeals.</p> <p>In the instance of Warfield, land owners and developers will gain financially - they would not progress a development unless there was an element of profit. New and existing residents will benefit from the development through, for example, new homes, infrastructure, schools and open space.</p>
<p>Object to the development as it would not be compliant with current EU pollution codes</p>	<p>The development will need to demonstrate it meets necessary standards which will deal with pollution issues such as noise, and air quality. Further detail on this matter has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>This policy cannot replace the Core Strategy policy, it can only supplement it.</p>	<p>This point is agreed and the text throughout the Site Allocations DPD will be amended to state that Policy SA9 supplements Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 and that Policy SA8 supplements Policy CS4.</p> <p>ACTION - delete reference to 'replaced' and add 'supplement'</p>

Table 2.22 - Policy SA9 (Land at Warfield) - Developer Responses

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Scale / Principle of development	
Support the allocation of the land for 2,200 dwellings. Particularly important in view of the need to pursue the housing requirement set out in the South East Plan.	Noted.
Support the general thrust and content of Policy SA9.	Noted.
The status of Warfield and Amen Corner South is not clear.	<p>This will be made clearer in the next versions of the documents.</p> <p>ACTION: additional text will be added to the 'Approach to housing to read 'policies for each of these sites are included in the next section. These formalise the allocation of these sites and build upon the principles tested and set out in Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS5. The Council has adopted the Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document and anticipates adopting the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document early in 2012. These together with up to date evidence, will help to determine future planning applications on these sites.</p>
Map 7 (Illustrative Concept Plan)	
Suggest removal of indicative densities from Map 7 (which are in any event considered to be too low to deliver 2,200 dwellings, as currently shown).	The densities across the site are being considered in further detail in the emerging Warfield SPD. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
The Policy should allow for multi functional use of the SANG, as is accepted by Natural England and common practice elsewhere.	The Council's view is that new SANG should be delivered at Warfield to the standard of 8 hectares per 1000 people and new OSPV at 4.3 hectares per 1000 people. Natural England supports the Council's position and enough land has been identified within the broad area to deliver this amount. Therefore, Policy SA9 should not be amended in this respect.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The terms 'low' and 'medium' density should be defined.	It is agreed that further clarification should be provided. Further work on densities and the Concept Plan has been undertaken in the preparation of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Phasing	
Question whether Warfield and Amen Corner allocations will deliver 2,925 dwellings in 15 years given land equalisation issues.	The Council is confident that both sites will yield the necessary amount of development within the plan period. However further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Support Policy SA9 but feel that the concept plan should be worked up to a full masterplan to be included in the Warfield SPD (rather than simply reproduced in the SPD).	Further work on the Concept Plan has been undertaken in the preparation of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. A revised Concept Plan will also be provided in the Warfield SPD.
Further detail is needed on phasing as the order in which various parcels of land are expected to come forward is not clear.	Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
The Policy should include a mechanism to allow sites that are not dependent on the wider development at Warfield to come forward in	This is a detailed matter for the Warfield SPD to consider. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
advance of the main development of the area. Grove Gardens is such a site being in single ownership and available immediately.	Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
The phasing should be amended as the development may not be completed by the end of the plan period. Phasing schedules are different in SADPD and SPD	<p>It is considered reasonable that the development will be completed before 2026. Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. The phasing schedules will be revised to ensure consistency in both documents.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectories in Warfield SPD and SADPD</p>
Infrastructure	
Justification for the provision of 2 new primary schools has not been provided in the evidence base.	The Local Education Authority has evidence that the site will generate the demand for around 4 years of entry (however the depends on the mix of dwellings and number of bedrooms). Therefore there is evidence that the primary school provision is necessary and related to the level of proposed development on the site. Whilst it is not possible to include all evidence for all service areas within the IDP, the information will be available on request.
The percentage of affordable housing sought should be specified	The approach to affordable housing involves a mix of more recent national policy (PPS3), the saved Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan policy and guidance in the Housing Strategy. The draft NPPF is also a material consideration.
Ecology	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Seek removal of the point 'a package of additional measures to manage any additional pressures on the TBH SPA' . The bespoke on-site SANG will do this.	<p>The policy will reflect the required avoidance and mitigation measures including the need for a contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Policy SA9 has been revised to take account of the next stage of the Appropriate Assessment for the SADPD and other considerations. See the revised Policy SA9 for further details.</p> <p>ACTION: amend wording for Thames Basin Heaths mitigation in Policy SA9</p>
For consistency with the Warfield SPD reference should be made to the potential for alternative, off-site SANG provision.	<p>This is agreed and Policy SA9 is to be amended to include reference to a potential alternative SPA solution subject to agreement and an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>ACTION: amend wording for Thames Basin Heaths mitigation in Policy SA9</p>
<p>SHLAA site 298: Land at Yaffles, Warfield Street, Warfield</p> <p>(On behalf of site owner, Alfred Homes)</p>	
Need a flexible approach to meeting the objectives of the Core Strategy. Policy must not preclude the potential for small scale extensions within the Warfield area coming forward independently where they are not detrimental to the delivery of the Master Plan. Appropriate contributions can be secured to infrastructure through S106 Agreements.	<p>The policy and detailed framework for bringing the site forward should be made to be as flexible as possible whilst ensuring a comprehensive development is provided for. The final version of the Warfield SPD will detail such a provision. Therefore further consideration of this matter is considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
Also made comments on Policy SA3.	Noted. See relevant comments in Policy SA3.
<p>SHLAA site 198 &199: Land to the east of Jig's Lane (Maple Cottage)</p>	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Support provisions of Policy SA9, in particular inclusion of SHLAA sites 198 & 199.	Noted.
Object to housing trajectory which states that SA9 will not begin to deliver until 2014/15.	<p>Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the trajectories in the SADPD and Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectories in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)</p>
The the site to be sustainably located. Does not require significant infrastructure to be put in place. It could come forward early in the plan period (in advance of the wider SA9 development) given the Council's lack of 5 year housing land supply.	<p>The Council has set out in Policy CS5 the need for comprehensive development across the site. The Council will ensure that the Warfield SPD is flexible in its requirements in respect to delivering comprehensive development. However piecemeal development is not accepted nor is it a sustainable way to meeting the requirements of the Core Strategy DPD. Further consideration of this matter is considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
The Council should incorporate a tariff approach to ensure delivery of infrastructure.	<p>The Infrastructure Development Plan associated with the Warfield SPD and the SADPD will detail the infrastructure requirements required by the Warfield development. Details or securing contributions and works in kind are provided in the relevant Development Principles in the Warfield SPD. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
SHLAA site 55 Berkeley Strategic	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Inconsistencies between Map 1 and Map 7 of SADPD should be rectified i.e. the extent of the built up area.	<p>This is agreed and Map 1 was published in error as it did not accurately reflect Map 7 or the concept plan in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. This will be omitted in the draft submission version of the SADPD.</p> <p>ACTION: remove Warfield Concept Plan from SADPD</p>
The housing trajectory in SADPD and WSPD are different. This should be rectified.	<p>Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. The phasing schedules will be revised to ensure consistency in both documents.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectory in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)</p>
This policy cannot replace CS5. The word replace should be substituted by elaborates.	<p>This point is agreed and the text throughout the Site Allocations DPD will be amended to state that Policy SA9 supplements Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 and that Policy SA8 supplements Policy CS4.</p> <p>ACTION: substitute 'supplements' for 'replaced' in respect of Policy SA9.</p>
The concept plans in WSPD and SADPD should be consistent.	<p>The Concept Plan has evolved as consultations have taken place. Further detail on the extent, design and look of any development in the vicinity of this area including changes to the Concept Plan has been considered in the next stages of the production of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>A detailed capacity assessment has been undertaken and the results show that the site can accommodate 2,000 dwellings, not 2,200 as referred to in the SADPD.</p>	<p>The detailed capacity assessment quoted does not include the whole extent of the site and therefore the results are bound to differ from that to which the emerging policy relates. The Council has undertaken further work on the capacity of the site in terms of development, infrastructure and open space. This work has informed the final version of the Warfield SPD. The site should remain as capable of providing 2,200 dwellings.</p>
<p>Para 2.1.1 to 2.1.3 are confusing and do not show that Warfield and Amen Corner South have a different status to other sites to be allocated through the SADPD. The logical sequence for the SADPD should be :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allocate and facilitate the delivery of existing commitments (which includes Core Strategy policy sites CS4 and CS5) and 2. Make provision for the remaining 3,626 homes. <p>Revised wording suggested.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Preferred Option version of SADPD is confusing in this respect. The wording of the SADPD will be revised accordingly to clarify matters in respect of existing commitments.</p> <p>ACTION: additional text will be added to the 'Approach to housing to read 'policies for each of these sites are included in the next section. These formalise the allocation of these sites and build upon the principles tested and set out in Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS5. The Council has adopted the Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document and anticipates adopting the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document early in 2012. These together with up to date evidence, will help to determine future planning applications on these sites.</p>
<p>The concept plan should achieve the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a robust framework against which planning applications can be prepared and determined • Enable planning applications for the development to come forward incrementally while ensuring that they accord with the delivery of the comprehensive development 	<p>The Warfield SPD aims to achieve all of these objectives. Further detail on the extent, design and look of any development in the vicinity of this area including changes to the Concept Plan have been considered in the next stages of the production of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable infrastructure costs to be equalised across the development area • Avoid the need to prepare a further detailed comprehensive masterplan subsequent to the SPD 	
<p>BS support the immediate release of the site and agrees that the site could start to deliver housing from 2012/13 onwards.</p> <p>Housing trajectories differ in SADPD and WSPD. Trajectories should be consistent.</p>	<p>Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. The phasing schedules will be revised to ensure consistency in both documents.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectory in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)</p>
<p>The WSPD acknowledges that interim arrangements can be made prior to the development of the new secondary school to allow some development to proceed at Warfield. The sentence should be redrafted to recognise that there may be surplus capacity in other infrastructure areas sufficient to allow initial phases of development to proceed in advance of new infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter for the Warfield SPD to consider. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Para 5.3.4 BS recommends the reference to 'land values' is replaced with infrastructure cost.</p>	<p>For clarification it is agreed that such a change is made.</p> <p>ACTION: delete reference to "land values"</p>
<p>Para 5.3.11 BS supports the reference to the need to identify infrastructure requirements for planned development early. BS also welcome the need to be flexible in the way in which sites and planning obligations are delivered, taking into account site viability, competing demands and constraints.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Map 34 BS recommends that Map 34 is updated to remove / revise older designations and add those adopted in the WSPD in July 2011. The EN10 designation in particular will need revising to reflect the WSPD concept plan.	It is proposed to remove the OSPV notation from the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map. However, other designations will remain until the extent of the built up area has been clarified.
Walsingham Planning (on behalf of Ms D Hambidge land at Beggars Roost, Strawberry Hill, Warfield)	
Support land at Warfield being allocated for development.	Noted.
Map 34 - support the extent of land shown on map 34 to be allocated for comprehensive mixed use development.	Noted.
Detailed comments on phasing and infrastructure requirements can be found in the response to Warfield Consultation document.	Noted please see Council response to all comments under Rep No. 48 in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement.
Wallsingham Planning (on behalf of land at Oaklands Farm, Maize Lane Warfield)	
Support identification of land at Warfield for development and allocation of the land through this document.	Noted.
Boyer Planning (on behalf of Millgate Homes - SHLAA sites 224, 227, 138)	
Support bringing land at Warfield forward for 2,200 units and consider that the reinstatement of the South East Plan adds impetus to ensuring that the land comes forward within 5 years to contribute towards the Council's 5 year housing land supply.	Noted.
Policy SA9 should allow for self-contained sites to come forward in the Warfield development area ahead of the anticipated trajectory - this includes land at Sumanga Farm and Newell Green Farm which do not rely on the provision of wider infrastructure requirements and could form a 'rounding off' development to Newell Green. These would	Development must accord with Core Strategy Policy CS5 which requires comprehensive development. Schemes produced in isolation will not be able to demonstrate they meet the comprehensive aims of the policy. For example, it is difficult to agree that Sumanga Farm and Newell Green Farm could "round off" Newell Green without consideration of the fields next to the farm which also abut

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
provide contributions to 'pump prime' infrastructure delivery when required to bring the rest of the development forward.	Newell Green. Further work on the Warfield SPD is being undertaken which will consider further detailed masterplanning, infrastructure requirements and a mechanism to allow blocks of development to come forward consistent with a comprehensive development. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
Charles Church (on behalf of SHLAA ref 251 - not land owner of the site)	
<p>Due to number of land owners involved, considered insufficient time to enable 2,200 dwellings to be delivered during the plan period. If site is delivered as per phasing as set out in Appendix 2 (Land Supply Data), it will only be completed during the last year of the plan period, as a result any slippage will result in delivery after the plan period.</p> <p>Note that phasing of delivery is different to that set out in the consultation draft of the Warfield SPD (which includes an earlier commencement date, so more unrealistic).</p> <p>Proposed change: amend housing delivery figures for Warfield to introduce recognition that site is likely to continue to deliver part of the allocation beyond the plan period.</p>	<p>The Council is confident that both sites will yield the necessary amount of development within the plan period. However further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectory in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)</p>
Croudace Strategic Ltd (on behalf of SHLAA ref 24 - not land owner of this site)	
This policy cannot be said to replace Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy, as to replace any adopted Core Strategy policy would require a review of the Core Strategy. Policy SA9 can however supplement and expand upon CS5.	<p>This point is agreed and the text throughout the Site Allocations DPD will be amended to state that Policy SA9 supplements Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 and that Policy SA8 supplements Policy CS4.</p> <p>ACTION: substitute 'supplements' for 'replaced' in respect of Policy SA9.</p>
Persimmon/Redrow (on behalf of Jennetts Park - SHLAA ref 66, not landowner of this site)	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Phasing of delivery different to that set out in the consultation draft of the Warfield SPD (which includes an earlier commencement date, so more unrealistic).	Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. ACTION: amend trajectory in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)
If trajectory in SADPD is followed, concerns raised about relying upon completions to the end of the plan period (200 dwellings assumed in the final year). The SADPD provides no contingency for slippage.	The Council is confident that both sites will yield the necessary amount of development within the plan period to 2026. However further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Should allow for a contingency by allocating additional site at Jennetts Park.	This issue has been considered in the responses to Policy SA2.
CPRE	
The area known as Cabbage Hill forms one of the most attractive countryside features in East Berkshire and the committee is opposed to development on this area which is identified in the BFBLP 2002 under Policy EN10.	The majority of Cabbage Hill will be retained as open space.
Boyer Planning - Millgate Homes -Manor Farm SHLAA site 54	
As the Cala Homes judgement resolved that the South East Plan forms part of the Development Plan the housing requirement should be 12,780 net additional dwellings to 2026.	Advice from central Government is that, on revocation of the RSS, Local Authorities will be required to set locally-derived housing targets which are fully justified and founded on a robust evidence base. The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism by which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned in the Borough. A review is proposed following Examination of the SADPD when a new housing target will be assessed, to a period beyond 2026, which will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p>
<p>South East Policy WCBV1 identifies Bracknell as a second tier (sub-regional) hub. The policy states that "to the extent that development cannot be satisfactorily accommodated in the built-up areas, sustainable urban extensions will be promoted at selected settlements." It specifies that sustainable greenfield allocations should be mainly focused on the periphery of those hubs where other constraints do not prevent this and identifies Bracknell as one of these hubs.</p>	<p>The Council recognised this principle in developing the Core Strategy DPD. Policy CS5 and emerging Policy SA9 are consistent with WCBV1.</p>
<p>Support the objective of bringing the land forward for development for circa 2,200 units.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Do not object to trajectory in principle however in order for the council to meet its timetable and ensure the provision of a five year housing supply further detail is needed. Policy SA9 should provide a mechanism to allow sites within the Warfield development area, which are not directly dependents on wider development as Warfield, to come forward in advance of the main development of the area.</p>	<p>The development must accord with Core Strategy Policy CS5 which requires comprehensive development. Developers producing their own schemes in isolation would not be able to demonstrate they meet the comprehensive aims of the policy. Further work on the Warfield SPD is being undertaken which will consider further detailed masterplanning, infrastructure requirements and a mechanism to allow blocks of development to come forward consistent with a comprehensive development. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
It is considered a greater proportion of the site is suitable for housing than currently shown on the concept plan. (please see drawing ref 10-156/601 for further details)	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
It is considered that the only reason the developable area of site 272 is 0.33ha is due to the floodzone of the Cut. Peter Brett Associates have been commissioned to investigate the issue of flooding at Manor Farm. In consultation with the Environment Agency it has been established that an area of approx 1ha falls outside the anticipated 1 in 100 year flood area. (see drawing 22856/001/002 by PBA for more details). Drawing 10.156/652 shows the comparable extents of development.	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
SHLAA site 270 Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	
Map 1 and Map 7 should be consistent. Map 1 should extend the limit of the intended development area further west.	This is agreed and Map 1 was published in error as it did not accurately reflect Map 7 or the concept plan in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. The \Concept Plan will be removed from the draft submission version of the SADPD. ACTION: delete Concept Plan from Draft Submission version.
There is scope to provide additional housing at Warfield. Persimmon suggests that the Council reconsiders land on the western side of Cabbage Hill for housing development.	The Council has undertaken comprehensive work on capacity including detailed masterplanning. A mechanism will be included to allow blocks of development to come forward consistent with a comprehensive development. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
SA9 does not continue the vision set out in Policy CS5 for a mixed use development. The SADPD and Warfield SPD do not report the recommendations of CS5 accurately or provide an explanation as to why the	It has never been the intention to provide large scale employment on the site. For example the illustrative concept plan in the Major Locations for Growth Background Paper which was used as evidence at the

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>recommendations were not followed. Therefore some additional employment opportunities should be provided at the Warfield Urban Extension consistent with Policy CS5 and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review (2009).</p>	<p>Core Strategy DPD examination showed small scale employment in the neighbourhood centre. Large scale employment here is not supported by the ELR.</p>
<p>Object to the statement that contributions will be pooled with other contributions. The reference to pooling contributions should be removed as this mean contributing with other developers on unrelated phases of the development to collectively paying for strategic infrastructure.</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter relating to paragraph 6.4 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Policy SA9 should either specify the amount of affordable housing that will normally be sought or cross refer to the actual policy that it should accord with.</p>	<p>The approach to affordable housing involves a mix of more recent national policy (PPS3), the saved Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan policy and guidance in the Housing Strategy. The draft NPPF is also a material consideration.</p>
<p>Cabbage Hill/Long Copse - should state that built development will not normally be acceptable except where it is required in connection with or to support the proposed SANG/open space.</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>Policy SA9 should confirm that on-site provision of SANG is the preferred solution for mitigation/avoiding impact on the SPA, and that this should be located at Cabbage Hill.</p>	<p>It is preferred that open space and SANGs are provided on site with an element on Cabbage Hill. However this does not preclude off-site provision which passed an Appropriate Assessment. However the Council feels that an on-site solution is preferable. This will be reflected in the Warfield SPD.</p> <p>ACTION: amend Policy SA9 to state that the preferred solution to providing SANGs for the site is on-site provision at Cabbage Hill. Part of the solution could be off-site</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	subject to agreement with the Council, Natural England and which passes an Appropriate Assessment.
<p>Housing trajectory - the inconsistencies between trajectories in SADPD and Warfield SPD need to be addressed. Given the uncertainties affecting this site (and others) the Council should provide for a contingency allowance by allocating additional land for housing.</p>	<p>Further consideration is being given to phasing and timing in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD. The phasing schedules will be revised to ensure consistency in both documents.</p> <p>ACTION: amend trajectory in SADPD (and Warfield SPD)</p>
Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Daborn SHLAA site 140 Grove Gardens	
<p>Agree with the overall principles of Policy SA9, however there should be greater flexibility to allow smaller sites within the Warfield development area to come forward for development in advance of the main development.</p>	<p>The development must accord with Core Strategy Policy CS5 which requires comprehensive development. Developers producing their own schemes in isolation will not be able to demonstrate they meet the comprehensive aims of the policy. Further work on the Warfield SPD is being undertaken which will consider further detailed masterplanning, infrastructure requirements and a mechanism to allow blocks of development to come forward consistent with a comprehensive development. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.</p>
<p>The land at Grove Gardens can be developed independently of the rest of the Warfield development area due to its remote location away from the main development areas in the Warfield area.</p>	<p>The Council consider that Grove Gardens is an integral part of developing a comprehensive development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS5 and emerging SADPD Policy SA9. For example, Grove Gardens may be required to deliver an improved junction (currently known as the 5 ways junction) and contribute land to the river park. However, full consideration will be given</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	to this issue in the production of the Warfield SPD. Further detail will be in the final Warfield SPD.
The concept plan should be amended to provide a larger housing development area (approx. 0.63 ha) at Grove Gardens, as shown on drawing number 10.234/601 and 10.234/651. The increase in the developable area should coincide with limits of the flood zone of the Bull Brook.	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.
Increasing the development area and allowing the maximisation of development on land beyond the flood zone of the Bull Brook, will encourage landowners to come forward to provide land for the Bull Brook River Park.	This is a detailed matter which has been considered in the progression of the Warfield SPD. The response and any changes to the Warfield SPD as a consequence will be published in the Warfield SPD Consultation Statement. This statement will be published with the final version of the Warfield SPD.

2.6 Phasing and delivery

The responses received in respect of draft Policy SA10 were primarily from Developers.

Table 2.23 - Policy SA10 (Phasing and Delivery)

<p>Policy SA10</p> <p>Developer / landowner responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Request deletion of this policy as the constant rate of development envisaged is not realistic. All the sites should be brought forward as quickly as possible and brownfield sites should not be prioritised over greenfield ones.</p> <p>The policy is too back end loaded and runs the risk of not meeting the requirement. Delete phasing programme and monitor 5 year supply against the residual requirement. PPS3 no longer makes reference to phasing.</p> <p>Each phase should be allocated an equal amount of development, small/medium/greenfield sites could be brought forward to the first phase to help address the shortfall.</p> <p>Do not support concept of housing sites being released on a phased basis. Attempts to phase developments in recent years have not been successful and delay completions. Larger sites have a longer lead in time due to increased infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Larger greenfield sites are often better placed to deliver larger amounts of affordable housing and strategic infrastructure of benefit to existing community/residents of the development, and should not be held back.</p> <p>Policy should allow for greater flexibility and allow allocated and non-allocated sites to come forward to assist in maintaining a 5 year supply of deliverable sites.</p>	<p>PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify sufficient broad locations and specific sites to provide for the continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption of a DPD. Para 61 states that Local Development Documents should set out the arrangements for managing the release of land. Para 60 does however mention the need to draw upon allocated sites, as necessary, to update the five years supply of deliverable sites.</p> <p>The draft NPPF refers to a supply of specific deliverable, developable sites or broad locations for growth for a similar period. A rolling 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites is required plus an additional allowance of 20% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. No specific priority is given to developing previously developed sites although sustainable development is advocated. There is an emphasis on flexibility and pro-actively supporting an increase in the delivery of new homes.</p> <p>In view of the need to incorporate more flexibility and respond positively to development proposals, it has been decided to remove the phasing policy from the SADPD. A housing trajectory will be included for the plan period that sets out the expected rate of delivery from individual sites. This will be monitored through the AMR.</p> <p>ACTION: Remove phasing policy. Retain housing trajectory giving an indication of expected years of delivery</p>

<p>Policy SA10</p> <p>Developer / landowner responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>If phasing is to be used then additional housing over and above the residual housing requirement should be included to allow for non implementation.</p>	
<p>Whilst the allowance for windfall sites over the plan period is small, it is not considered appropriate to include this as PPS3 specifically advises against this and. There is no evidence base to justify an exception to PPS3.</p>	<p>Para 59 of PPS3 states that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. An allowance for small sites was included as the Bracknell Forest SHLAA does not identify small sites. However, on the basis of recent appeal decisions and comments made by Inspectors at DPD Examinations, an allowance for the first 10 years has been removed. An allowance remains for small sites for years 10 - 15. The SHLAA contains justification for the rate of small site windfalls allowed.</p> <p>ACTION: Remove small site windfall allowance for first 10 years. Amend housing trajectory accordingly.</p>
<p>Small sites such as edge of settlement sites are not dependent on infrastructure and their release should not be dependent on an arbitrary phasing requirement.</p>	<p>Proposals relating to the smaller sites must mitigate their impact on services and facilities in the same way as larger sites. However, it is agreed that the scale of infrastructure and method of provision may be different. In any event, the phasing policy is to be deleted.</p> <p>ACTION: Remove phasing policy. Retain housing trajectory giving an indication of expected years of delivery</p>
<p>Policy SA10</p> <p>Residents' responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>

Policy SA10 Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>An annual review of projected demand should be put in place and all brownfield sites completed before building on countryside, open space and sports facilities.</p>	<p>The Council monitors the position through the compilation of an Annual Monitoring Report. The draft NPPF no longer gives priority to the development of previously developed land.</p>
<p>The phasing should include a measure to slow down land being released, if previous phases are incomplete/unnecessary.</p>	<p>PPS3 states that the Council must maintain an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, based on the requirement. The draft NPPF refers to the need to maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites, based on the requirement plus an additional allowance of at least 20% to ensure choice and competition. The Government's key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. It is not possible to slow down the rate of release.</p> <p>The Council will monitor how many sites from the five year supply of deliverable sites have been delivered annually. If sites are no longer deliverable, consideration will need to be given to alternative sites.</p>
<p>There's no need for more than 100 dwellings a year. Dwellings at Jennetts Park and The Parks are not selling and there are enough undeveloped plots on these sites to meet the demands of the next decade.</p>	<p>Population and household projections suggest the need for more housing (in excess of 100 dwellings per year). There is no evidence that new homes being built at Jennetts Park and The Parks are not being sold and occupied. The rate at which these sites have been developed has decreased during adverse market conditions, however, the need for new homes still exists.</p>
<p>Development at Blue Mountain should be phased so that it is the very last greenfield site to be lost to an "urban extension". Therefore, it is not appropriate to locate educational facilities on the site - Warfield would be preferable as it will come forward earlier.</p>	<p>There is a need for a new secondary school to serve North Bracknell and the site at Blue Mountain is conveniently located for the catchment that it needs to serve and is more deliverable than other sites. The priority previously given in national policy to the development of previously developed sites over green field is disappearing.</p>

3 Responses to 'Employment'

General comments

Fewer comments were made in relation to the proposed employment policies, than to Section 2 'Housing'. Of those comments made, the majority were made by local businesses / landowners, rather than members of the public.

Table 3.1 - Employment

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The Council should act strategically to attract employers in growth sectors (such as renewable energy) and ensure that local colleges offer appropriate, subsidised, training courses.</p> <p>The Council should offer tax concessions to renewable energy companies to attract employers to Bracknell.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council can assist in helping to create the right conditions, it cannot influence business decisions - much is beyond the remit of the Council.</p>
<p>This section is without substance and does nothing to show that the Council is committed to improving Bracknell for its current or future residents.</p> <p>Improve the town centre. Businesses will then come to the area and employment opportunities will increase.</p>	<p>This section deals with the extent of land designated for employment purposes taking account of existing provision and future needs. It seeks to maintain a balance between the level of housing and the number of jobs available in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council is committed to improving Bracknell - please see section 4 'Responses to 'Retail'' for information regarding the progress of Bracknell Town Centre.</p>
<p>There is an over supply of office floorspace in the Borough. Empty office blocks should be redeveloped for housing.</p>	<p>The ELR looked at the quantitative and qualitative need for business, industrial and warehousing floorspace. Whilst it suggested that there may be a need for a slight increase in industrial and warehousing floorspace, it concluded that there was already sufficient office floorspace to meet needs over the plan period. The Council has investigated the potential for under-used employment sites to be used for housing. Some sites were included in the SADPD Preferred Option e.g.</p>
<p>There is more than enough employment land in the Borough to support future employment needs.</p>	
<p>Relocate businesses currently on the Southern Industrial Area to existing empty offices or the offices proposed at Amen</p>	

Residents' responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Corner. Build houses on the Southern Industrial Area.</p> <p>The empty offices and lack of progress with the town centre indicate that new housing is not required to anything like the level proposed in the SADPD.</p>	<p>TRL, Farley Hall. Since the Preferred Option, the Council has done further work on this issue. However, not all employment sites are suitable for housing as they may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • form important parts of existing employment areas • be poorly located for residential use • in areas likely to flood <p>It should also be noted that it is not possible to allocate sites that are not genuinely available. Some employment land is required to ensure the continuing prosperity of the area. However, the Draft Submission document does propose some additional employment sites for housing.</p> <p>The household projections support the strategy of planning for 10,780 new homes over the plan period.</p>
<p>Improve the evening economy in the town centre. People will then be more positive about living near the town centre and some of the empty office blocks could be used for housing. Would be perfect for affordable housing as close to public transport, retail and medical facilities.</p>	<p>The planned regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre will improve the night-time economy due to the mix of uses proposed. Additional housing is planned which will include a proportion of affordable housing.</p>
<p>Resist the change of designation of TRL to housing, because business use will not have as great an impact in terms of traffic and flooding as 1,000 houses.</p>	<p>The overall number of trips generated would be broadly similar to that which the B1 use would generate. However the pattern of the trips would be different, for example, the inbound and outbound peaks will be at different times to that of the B1 use and this is why improvements to the junctions surrounding the site will be required. The scheme will include SUDS which will address flooding issues.</p>

Table 3.2

<p>Developer/landowner responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Kings Wood should be recognised as an existing major employment development outside the defined settlement boundary. This would provide flexibility and help maintain high quality, fit for purpose employment floorspace on the site. Suggest a similar policy to that put forward for the RMA.</p>	<p>Kings Wood is in the Green Belt. SADPD does not address matters relating to the Green Belt. In any event, it would be whether or not evidence suggested that it justified being treated as a major developed site in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The considerations that apply to the Royal Military Academy are very different in that the facility is located outside the Green Belt and is a unique facility of national importance with particular operational requirements.</p>
<p>Designated employment areas need to be dynamic and flexible in order to support economic development, especially in terms of the PPS4 definition of economic development.</p>	<p>PPS4 was published in 2009 i.e. subsequent to the adoption of the Core Strategy. Policies in PPS4 are taken into account in the determination of applications. Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Core Strategy currently deal with employment development as defined in the DPD. Uses that fall outside the definition of 'employment' are catered for in para 224 of Policy CS20. Any changes required to the Core Strategy policies, including those to reflect up to date national policy, will need to be taken into account in a review of the Core Strategy.</p>
<p>The strategy is regarded as generally appropriate although the importance of the regeneration of the town centre should be given wider recognition.</p>	<p>Please see section 4 'Responses to 'Retail''</p>
<p>Welcome the absence of further employment allocations but consider that a more rigorous examination of the existing designations should be undertaken. The strategy does not seek to address the oversupply of office space in any meaningful way.</p>	<p>The Council has investigated the potential for under-used employment sites to be used for housing. Some sites were included in the SADPD Preferred Option e.g. TRL, Farley Hall. Since the Preferred Option, the Council has done further work on this issue. However, not all employment sites are suitable for housing as they may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • form important parts of existing employment areas
<p>Object to removal of land at Foundation House from an employment designation and object to any allocation of this land that would preclude its redevelopment for commercial purposes.</p>	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be poorly located for residential use • in areas likely to flood <p>It should also be noted that it is not possible to allocate sites that are not genuinely available. Some employment land is required to ensure the continuing prosperity of the area. However, the Draft Submission document does propose some additional employment sites for housing. It is therefore proposed to remove a number of employment designations, as a consequence.</p> <p>Foundation House: since the receipt of the quoted response to SADPDPO, the owner has confirmed that the site is now available (July 2011). Planning permission for a commercial scheme on the site expired earlier this year.</p>
<p>The area centred on Easthampstead Road, west of the town centre, should be designated as a mixed use economic development area to foster stronger economic growth.</p>	<p>This area is currently a defined employment area and therefore Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Core Strategy are particularly relevant. Uses that fall outside the definition of 'employment' are catered for in para 224 of Policy CS20.</p> <p>Since the adoption of the Core Strategy, national policy has suggested a wider interpretation of 'employment' than that included in the Core Strategy. The current Government has published various statements stressing the importance of facilitating economic growth. Plan for Growth: Ministerial Statement issued on 23rd March 2011 stated that the 'Government's top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy'. The draft NPPF (para. 73) refers to the need to support existing</p>

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>and new or emerging business sectors. These are material considerations in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Any changes required to local policies will be addressed in a review of the Core Strategy, once national policy has become clearer.</p>
Persimmon/Redrow (on behalf of Jennetts Park - SHLAA ref 66, not landowner of this site)	
<p>Support the general approach of not identifying major employment sites, and recognition that housing can be provided on employment land to maintain a suitable balance between homes and jobs.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Site promoted for development at Jennetts Park has planning permission for employment (B1 use), however site is not needed for employment and is better suited to residential. The site does not form part of a protected employment area.</p>	<p>The Legal Agreement for Peacock Farm (Jennetts Park) reserves part of the site for small business units (0.5 ha to have not less than 1500 sq m of of B1 floorspace). The remainder of the commercial area is restricted by condition 47 of the Outline Planning Permission. This condition restricts the the amount of B1 and B2 foorspace to 8,000 sq m (this floorspace is inclusive of the floorspace for the small business units). Subsequently to add flexibility one of the parcels C3 is able to be either B1/B2 or Hotel use.</p> <p>Although the Employment Land Review points to an over supply of offices, it (Pg 41) shows that there will be a steady market for small and medium units. It is therefore argued that the 0.5 ha of land protected by the Legal Agreement has an important role to play.</p> <p>The gross site area is 2.6ha. If the 0.5ha of land required for small business units is deducted, this equates to a 2.1ha developable site area. In view of the priority need for housing, it is considered acceptable to propose the remaining area for residential</p>
<p>More appropriate to allocate the land at Jennetts Park for housing, rather than release land which forms part of an existing established employment area.</p>	

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>development. Full consideration of this site will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p> <p>Action: allocate the area referred to above for residential development.</p>
Pegasus (on behalf of Persimmon SHLAA site 270)	
<p>For consistency with Policy CS5 and the Employment Land Review (2009) some additional employment opportunities should be provided at the Warfield Urban Extension.</p>	<p>Employment floorspace will be encouraged as part of the Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Action: refer to employment floorspace within Policy SA9</p>

3.3 Employment sites outside defined settlement boundaries

Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst

Comments received on draft Policy SA11 are summarised below. No responses to this Policy were received from members of the public.

Table 3.3 - Policy SA11 (Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst)

Policy SA11 Developer / landowner comments: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Support inclusion of Policy SA11 and welcome recognition of the importance of the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Question the need for the final paragraph of the suggested policy as all policies and proposals should be considered as part of the planning policy framework - therefore question why this sentence has been applied to this policy only.</p>	<p>Agreed, this is inconsistent with other policies and not necessary.</p> <p>ACTION - delete final sentence of policy.</p>
<p>The setting of heritage assets can extend for some distance and it is therefore inappropriate for the policy to be limited to protecting the settings of those assets that are within or adjoin the site.</p> <p>PPS5 (Policy HE10.2) states that local planning authorities should identify opportunities for changes in the setting to enhance or better reveal the significance of a heritage asset, rather than just safeguarding against harm.</p>	<p>The objective is to protect the setting of any heritage assets that could be affected by development on the RMA site. The wording could be beneficially amended to better reflect this and to seek opportunities to enhance the settings of heritage assets.</p> <p>ACTION - delete point i. And replace with -</p> <p>i. The site's heritage assets are sustained and, where possible, enhanced and the setting of any heritage assets, either within or outside the site, are safeguarded from harm and, where possible, enhanced or changed to better reveal the significance of the heritage asset.</p>

4 Responses to 'Retail'

General comments

The majority of comments on this section related to the planned regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre and in particular the lack of progress that has been made so far. In addition comments were received identifying that the Town Centre should be regenerated prior to the commencement of any housing.

Table 4.1 - Retail

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.1.3	
<p>Minimal progress has been made by the Council and its consultants on the Town Centre over the past nine years, including during more prosperous years. This plan is dependent on the delivery of the Town Centre for retail and infrastructure elements - regeneration needs to take place first.</p> <p>Regeneration of Town Centre must be a priority.</p> <p>Without the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre, new residents will need to travel further to go shopping (pollution, congestion).</p> <p>The Town Centre is unattractive to prospective employers compared to Reading, Green Park, Winnersh Triangle, etc</p>	<p>The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring the scheme forward despite the difficult economic climate.</p> <p>In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration.</p> <p>The past few months have seen significant steps forward in realising plans to regenerate the town centre. Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site (work has already started on site). Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases.</p>
Paragraph 4.2.1	
<p>If the Iron Duke site in Crowthorne is developed for housing there should be</p>	<p>This site is currently the subject of a planning application (11/00001/FUL). The scheme under consideration includes an element of</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>somewhere for individual retailers such as those in the Bakehouse to relocate</p>	<p>retail provision. Retaining an element of retail provision on this site would be supported by the Council.</p> <p>The units contained in Old Bakehouse Court are currently vacant.</p> <p>Action: Amend wording of profile to include: Provision/retention of retail floorspace along High Street frontage at ground floor level.</p>

Table 4.2

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Support the allocation of Bracknell Town Centre as the first priority for new retail development as the most accessible location in the Borough.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Support the deletion of the Peel Centre from the Town Centre Boundary - it's a retail warehousing development.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Persimmon/Redrow (on behalf of Jennetts Park - SHLAA ref 66)</p>	
<p>Support the commitment to regenerate the Town Centre. Allocation of the site for additional housing rather than employment at Jennetts Park would support the development to the Town Centre.</p>	<p>Full consideration of this site is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper.</p>
<p>Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon (SHLAA site 270 Manor Farm)</p>	
<p>The status of the proposed centre at Warfield is unclear. The SADPD refers to it as a Local Centre whilst the Warfield SPD refers to it as a Local Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>If a Local Centre is to be identified at Warfield, it should be included in the retail chapter of the SADPD.</p>	<p>This centre located at Warfield along with the centres on the other strategic allocations will be of purely neighbourhood significance and therefore do not meet the definition of centres for the purposes of PPS4 and therefore do not need to be designated within the retail chapter of the SADPD or shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Action - remove wording Local Centre and replace with Neighbourhood Centre</p>

Bracknell Town Centre

Many comments received to the SADPD related to the regeneration of the town centre: a) to achieve its regeneration prior to the development of new housing sites and b) to deliver housing on brownfield sites in and around the town centre before the consideration of greenfield sites. These comments are outlined briefly below but for a full summary please refer to Section 2 'Housing' and Appendix 2. Policy SA12 relates to the allocation of Bracknell Town Centre for a mixed use development - comments on this policy are summarised below.

Table 4.3 - Policy SA12 (Bracknell Town Centre)

Policy SA12 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
No other sites should be developed for housing until the town centre is regenerated	The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre is a key objective for the Council and Bracknell Regeneration Partnership (BRP) and work is continuing in order to bring the scheme forward despite the difficult economic climate. In September 2010, a planning application to extend the length of the current permission for the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre was approved, providing BRP and other third parties with additional time to complete the processes necessary prior to regeneration. The past few months have seen significant steps forward in realising plans to regenerate the town centre. Detailed plans have been approved for the development of a food store on the Imation House site (work has already started on site). Applications have also been submitted for a new Health Space and improvements to Princess Square entrance. The land assembly process for the regeneration is underway, including the Council using its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the interests required for the next phases.
The regeneration of Bracknell town centre needs to take place to support the proposed housing sites in the Borough	
Regeneration of the town centre should not take place in a piecemeal fashion	
There are empty offices and buildings in the town centre which would be perfect for low-cost housing, near to buses and trains, medical centres and shopping	The Council have investigated the potential for under used employment sites to be used for housing and identified some in the SADPD such as the Crowthorne Business Park and

Policy SA12 Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	changes to the Eastern Industrial Area in Bracknell. Not all employment sites are suitable for residential use. It is also important that some employment land is retained in order to provide employment opportunities for residents.

Table 4.4

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Support the allocation of Bracknell Town Centre as the first priority for new retail development as the most accessible location in the Borough.	Noted
Support the inclusion of Policy SA12 and the policy recognition that is given to delivering the amount and form of development approved by the outline planning permission.	Noted
Welcome the inclusion of Policy SA12	Noted
Amended wording proposed to recognise that there may be subsequent amendments to the current masterplan.	Noted Action - New wording ".... The adopted masterplan, or any subsequently agreed amendments, agreed framework and strategies. Any proposals must contain measures to mitigate the impact of development."

The Peel Centre

Comments on Policy SA13, which relates to the designation of the Peel Centre as an 'edge of centre' site, were received solely from local businesses and operators (no responses were received from local residents).

Table 4.5 - Policy SA13 (The Peel Centre)

<p>Policy SA13</p> <p>Developer/landowner responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Object to exclusion of the Peel Centre from the Bracknell Town Centre designation, as the Morrison's store helps maintain the vitality of the centre and thereby reduces the need for and frequency of unsustainable trips to alternative, out of centre stores. Furthermore the Peel Centre is fully integrated with existing public transport infrastructure that serves the town centre.</p>	<p>Under the PPS4 definition edge-of-centre locations are well connected to, but not contiguous with the primary shopping area. Edge-of-Centre locations will be within an easy walking distance of the primary shopping area. The Peel Centre is consistent with the definition in PPS4 (and the emerging National Planning Policy Framework) and therefore is proposed as an edge-of-centre location.</p>
<p>The Peel Centre is strongly connected to the town centre and there are complementary town centre uses en-route - it should therefore be included within the defined town centre.</p>	
<p>Object to the identification of the Peel Centre as a 'retail park' - this ignores the food shopping role played by the Morrison's store</p>	<p>The primary function of the Peel Centre is as a retail park. The Peel Centre is an appropriate location for retail warehousing. This would not affect the current use and function of the Morrison's supermarket for providing convenience shopping needs.</p>
<p>Object to requirement for applications to demonstrate 'need' as this is contrary to PPS4.</p>	<p>Applications will not be required to undertake a needs assessment, however they will be required to undertake a sequential assessment and an impact assessment in line with PPS4.</p> <p>Action: Delete reference to 'need' in the Policy</p>
<p>Welcome the removal of the Peel Centre from the defined Town Centre boundary as it meets the definition in PPS4 as edge-of-centre.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The form and function of the Peel Centre as a retail development should be maintained. Any proposals which would allow modification or sub-division of existing units should be subject to the tests set out in PPS4, in particular the sequential and impact tests to ensure that the proposals do not undermine</p>	<p>PPS 4 only requires impact assessments where there is a net increase in floorspace (over 200m² for sequential assessments, and over 2500m² for impact assessment).</p>

<p>Policy SA13</p> <p>Developer/landowner responses:</p> <p>Summary of main issues raised</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>the planned investment for the regeneration of the Town Centre.</p>	
<p>The SADPD should make it clear that edge of centre sites should still be subject to Policy CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>	<p>This is not necessary as CS22 of the Core Strategy will still be part of the Development Plan after adoption of Site Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>The following policy wording changes are suggested:</p>	
<p>The Peel Centre is identified as an edge of centre retail warehouse park that is sustainably located</p>	<p>As an edge-of-centre location the Peel Centre is sustainably located, close to public transport hubs and within easy walking distance of the primary shopping area of Bracknell Town Centre. As this is a factual statement it is agreed that reference to this should be removed.</p> <p>Action: Remove reference to sustainably located.</p>
<p>Development at <u>At</u> the Peel Centre development that reinforces its role and character as a retail warehouse park will be favourably considered</p>	<p>Suggested wording agreed.</p> <p>Action: Amend Policy wording</p>
<p>Development will only be permitted if it does not adversely affect the retail warehouse character or function of the park. Qualifying applications will need to be supported by information relating to the sequential test and need, and retail impact in accordance with national planning policy guidance.</p>	<p>Noted and change agreed. References to impact assessment to be added in and need in this wording will be removed to continue to be consistent with PPS4.</p> <p>Action: Amend policy wording to delete reference to need and add in reference to impact assessment.</p>
<p>Development proposals <u>will be assessed against Core Strategy Policy CS22 to ensure that any new retail development cannot in the first instance be accommodated within a sequentially preferable location, and the ensure that they would</u> should have no serious effect <u>impact</u> (either on its own or cumulatively)</p>	<p>It is not necessary to refer to Policy CS22 under SA12 as CS22 would apply to applications outside the Town Centre. The Core Strategy will still be current Planning Policy after the adoption of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>

Policy SA13 Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>with other similar permissions) upon viability of Bracknell Town Centre, as a whole.</p>	
<p>Links between the Peel Centre and the rest of the town centre should be maintained and improved.</p>	<p>Changing the boundary for the Town Centre will not affect the existing links between the Town Centre and the Peel Centre.</p>
<p>Object to removal of the Peel Centre from the town centre designation as it falls within the PPS4 definition of town centres. Removing it dismisses its contribution to the vitality and viability of the town as a whole.</p>	<p>The definition under PPS4 of Town Centre is " Defined area, including the primary shopping area and areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area." As the Peel Centre is not within or adjacent to the primary shopping area as defined it does not meet the definition of Town Centre under PPS4. However the Peel Centre does fall within the definition of Edge-of-Centre location as defined by PPS4 " For retail purposes, a location that is well connect to and within easy walking distance (ie up to 300m) of the primary shopping area". Therefore it is consistent with PPS4</p>
<p>The car park and access to the Peel Centre are busy. Additional people will make the problem worse.</p>	<p>This policy changes the designation of the Peel Centre to an edge-of-centre location, it does not affect the layout of the Peel Centre.</p>

5 Responses to 'Other Considerations'

General comments

Those comments relating to this part of the document are summarised in the table below. For comments relating to Section 5.3 'Infrastructure', see comments under 'Responses to Infrastructure Delivery Plan'.

Table 5.1 - Other considerations

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Need to consider the spiritual needs of new arrivals in planned developments	
Paragraph 5.1.1	
The Council acknowledges that amendments to the settlement boundaries are required to accommodate the required growth. The HFC Bank site is surrounded on three sides by the Green Belt Village boundary and should be included within it as part of the review of settlement boundaries	The site is located within the Green Belt. It is not proposed to make any changes to the Green Belt boundary, which would require a review of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, this site will remain within the Green Belt. In any case, planning permission (with a Legal Agreement) for 22 detached dwellings, was granted permission in July 2011 (Ref: 10/00801/FUL).
Support proposal to revise the settlement boundary of Binfield to include land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage	Noted
Paragraph 5.1.2	
Ascot Heath Infant and Junior School, Rhododendron Walk, Ascot, should be included within the settlement boundary as it relates visually to existing development in North Ascot	The school is located within the Green Belt. It is not proposed to make any changes to the Green Belt boundary, which would require a review of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, this school will remain within the Green Belt.
Paragraph 5.2.1 and 5.2.2	
The opportunity should be taken to make provision for allotments in Crowthorne - an assessment should be made of potential demand given that there is already a waiting list	The issue of allotment provision will be addressed in more detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
The Council are not providing alternative OSPV to that which will be lost; instead they	Sites which would result in loss of OSPV would require some replacement

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
will replace the OSPV with a much smaller area, in line with the minimum requirements, for the new housing - a disgrace	space/facilities. These matters are addressed in the responses to individual housing sites (see 2 'Responses to 'Housing"') and are also addressed in the responses to matters raised by Sport England (see 17 'Specific Consultee Comments')
Assume these amendments are being made to hide the fact BFC are proposing to develop on OSPV	<p>Whilst the OSPV notation would be removed from the Proposals Map, the Policy would continue to apply to all sites that contain features that meet the OSPV definition in Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The reason this issue was included in the Preferred Option and will be carried forward through the Draft Submission SADPD is that whilst the notation alerts potential applicants to the need to consider Policy CS8, the application of the notation on the Proposals Map is not comprehensive. Policy CS8 is a Borough wide Policy and is triggered when a site includes any features set out in the definition of 'Recreational Facilities', irrespective of whether or not it is shown as OSPV on the Proposals Map. These inconsistencies cause continuing confusion, which is why it is proposed to remove the OSPV notation from the Proposals Map.</p>
Paragraph 5.3.1	
Experience of other new development - Jennett's Park and The Parks is that they have not been considerably developed e.g. some improvements have been made to the highway network but there is still major congestion. There is still no school at Jennett's Park	See 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan" section and individual site allocations (in 2 'Responses to 'Housing"') for responses to infrastructure provision.
Express concern that the Council are bringing forward major developments without the infrastructure required to support it.	
Putting this number of additional vehicles on the roads directly contradicts the councils green agenda.	

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
The policies and supporting documents need to make reference to infrastructure to support existing as well as new development e.g. Broadmoor Hospital	
How do BFBC intend to cope with c25% increase in waste disposal. There should be a thorough explanation of how BFBC intends to deal with the waste from an additional 25,000 people, yet still meet its green targets to avoid EU fines.	
Paragraph 5.3.5	
Due to central government cuts there will not be sufficient funding for improvements to the highways under the control of the Highways Agency e.g. M3 and M4.	See response to Highway Agency representations, in section 17 'Specific Consultee Comments'
Paragraph 5.3.6	
Would be preferable to have a swimming pool or built sports facilities on Blue Mountain, rather than a Football Club	See Responses to 11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan" section and individual site allocations (in Responses to) for responses to infrastructure provision.
Understand the benefits of adding housing to existing communities where infrastructure exists, however the transport requirements will be huge and can see no modelling or reference to improving bus services	Definition of Infrastructure now to be included in the Glossary and to include reference to places of worship.
The travel survey is flawed because it only considers how people will travel to Bracknell town centre, whereas people work in for example Reading and Wokingham and drive to work as there is no quick or cheap alternative	Action: Add reference to places of worship within the definition of infrastructure.
As the population of Crowthorne is relatively affluent it is likely that the housing proposed there will lead to higher levels of car ownership (and consequent congestion)	
Suggest amendments to the wording of this paragraph to make it consistent with the Glossary definition of infrastructure i.e. include recreational facilities	

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Suggest the definition of community facilities is amended to include faith groups to bring it into line with PPS1 which requires consideration of religious needs	
If junctions are 'improved' a greater volume of vehicles will be added to them and there will just be more times when the junction is at a stand still	
This section ignores the point that this area of Berkshire cannot continue absorbing more houses ad infinitum	
Paragraph 5.3.11	
Express concern that if the developer cannot provide the required infrastructure in the future, BFC will have to allow more houses to prevent unforeseen costs of infrastructure provision falling to them	See Responses to '11 'Responses to ' Infrastructure Delivery Plan'" section and individual site allocations (in 2 'Responses to 'Housing") for responses to infrastructure provision.
Note that increasing congestion in the Borough will worsen as a result of the new housing proposed and if the empty offices ever become used again	

Table 5.2

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Paragraph 5.1.1	
Land south of The Limes, Forest Road, Warfield should be allocated for development and included within the list of settlement boundary changes	This site relates to SHLAA site 165, and is an excluded site, the rational for the exclusion of the this site is set out in the Site Allocations Preferred Option Background Paper (pages 61 and 62), and is also addressed in 'omission sites' in relation to responses to comments made on Policy SA3 (see 2 'Responses to 'Housing"
Paragraph 5.2.2	
Wellington College/Eagle House School:	Whilst the OSPV notation would be removed from the Proposals Map, the Policy (CS8 of

Developer / landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
Support removal of CS8 designation from Proposals Map, but would wish wording of last sentence of paragraph to be changed so that it is clear that it relates to features within sites rather than the sites as a whole.	the Core Strategy) would continue to apply to all sites that contain features set out in the definition of 'Recreational Facilities'.
SHLAA site 270 Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	
Persimmon Homes support the recognition at paragraph 5.3.4 that when dealing with large sites which have multiple land ownerships, it is important that planning is coordinated to equalise land values for the required uses across a development. This should include SANG provision.	Noted

Appendices

1 Responses to 'Appendix 1: Stages and timetable for Site Allocations'

No responses were made to Appendix 1.

2 Responses to 'Appendix 2: Housing'

Appendix 2: Housing

2.1 All the responses below related to the relative proportion of development within the Borough than is planned for on brownfield land, in particular the use of office sites within and close to Bracknell town centre and as part of the regeneration of the town centre.

2.2 Some additional comments were made which related specifically to land at Amen Corner North - these points are addressed within the responses to Policy SA6.

Table 2.1 - Appendix 2: Housing

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>The proposed greenfield development at Binfield is directly contrary to the Council's policy of redeveloping brownfield sites.</p> <p>There is a surplus of brownfield sites in the town centre. Brownfield sites should be exhausted before greenfield sites are used.</p> <p>There are empty offices and buildings in the town centre which would be perfect for low-cost housing, near to buses, trains, medical centres and shops.</p> <p>There are many empty properties in the Western Industrial Area which could be redeveloped for housing. This would ensure that the multitude of empty offices around Bracknell are filled.</p> <p>Greenfield land should not be released for development until all urban land has been regenerated and brownfield sites used.</p>	<p>The search for sites has been based on the SHLAA and the sequence set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. Other sources of evidence such as responses from consultations and the results of technical studies have also fed into the process. In terms of location, Bracknell Town Centre is the first priority (where approx 1,000 dwellings are planned) followed by other brownfield sites in urban areas that are considered genuinely available for development. However, there are insufficient brownfield sites within defined settlements to meet the Borough's housing requirement and therefore urban extensions are proposed to the Borough's most sustainable settlements (Bracknell and Crowthorne). Some of the urban sites include those that have been in employment use.</p>
<p>Good housing should not be demolished and replaced with blocks of flats that are out of keeping with their surroundings e.g. in Crowthorne.</p>	<p>The re-issued PPS3 removes residential curtilages from the definition of 'previously developed land' and deletes the national indicative minimum density. PPS3 (para. 45) still refers to the need to use land efficiently and the draft NPPF (para 116) refers to optimising the use of sites. The need to respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings is also</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	<p>mentioned as long as 'appropriate innovation' is not prevented. Core Strategy Policy CS 7 deals with design. Further detail is also set out in BFBLP saved Policy EN20. The Council has published a Character Area Assessments SPD which aims to identify areas with distinctive and positive character or where development pressures may come forward.</p>
<p>The assumptions regarding employment growth in Bracknell (and consequent need for housing) should be revised following the Airtrack proposals being put on hold, and the increase in the retirement age.</p>	<p>BAA has scrapped plans to build the multi-million pound Airtrack rail link connecting Heathrow to the south-west due to lack of funds and other priorities for Heathrow.</p> <p>Employment forecasts by Oxford Economics (see Bracknell Forest HNA) indicate that total employment in Berkshire is expected to recover to peak levels from 2013 onwards. The Plan covers the period to 2026, so it is important to plan for the complete economic cycle.</p> <p>A Written Ministerial Statement 23rd March 2011 (Planning for Growth) states: 'Local planning authorities should therefore press ahead without delay in preparing up-to-date development plans, and should use that opportunity to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that this country needs. They should make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth, taking full account of relevant economic signals such as land prices'.</p>
<p>The Council must get on with the town centre redevelopment. Justification for the redevelopment must not depend on building more houses.</p> <p>The commercial element of the town centre scheme should be scaled down, thereby allowing more housing in the town centre.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the Town Centre is a Council priority. The planning permission for the regeneration scheme has been extended. The scheme includes approx 1,000 residential units, commercial, retail and leisure uses. Whilst adverse economic conditions have had an impact on the implementation of the scheme, there is now increased interest in various elements of the development and it</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	is likely that it will come forward in a phased manner. Its commencement is not dependent on further housing being developed in the area. It is accepted that there is already a need for a regenerated centre.
Can't understand the need for additional housing when developers are struggling to sell houses at Jennetts Park.	Evidence indicates that the number of completed but unsold properties at Jennett's Park is very low.
<p>The scale of the developments in 3 main areas (Binfield, Warfield and Crowthorne) would be unsustainable.</p> <p>The proposals would create an endless urban sprawl with no visible green gaps between settlements.</p> <p>Would be more sustainable to have new housing spread fairly throughout the Borough on small scale sensitive developments that minimised the impact on villages and the countryside.</p>	<p>Developers will be required to mitigate the impact of their developments. This will include contributing towards improving existing services and facilities where there is a need. Requirements will be set out in the IDP. The Council has worked with service providers to produce the IDP. Such measures will help provide sustainable developments.</p> <p>Sites within Bracknell Town Centre and the urban areas have been prioritised in accordance with the sequence set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. However this does not provide for sufficient housing to meet the Borough's needs, so four new major urban extensions are proposed to Bracknell and Crowthorne. These urban extensions (which include greenspace to assist in providing buffers) have been identified following consideration of a number of sites that were put forward through SHLAA and justification for the selection of these sites is contained within the Background Paper. The latter also contains a pie chart showing the distribution of development by Parish.</p>
<p>The Council should delay the proposals and re-asses in light of the new legislation.</p> <p>The Borough should revise its housing numbers down to reflect changing housing requirements.</p>	The Government has stated that it is important for Councils to continue to plan for growth in their areas. The draft NPPF makes it clear that the Government's key objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. The Ministerial foreword to the document states that sustainable development

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
<p>Headline figure of of 10,780 is based on data that is no longer relevant to the prevailing economic, social or environmental circumstances.</p> <p>The total housing requirement unjustified and unjust given the current financial circumstances.</p> <p>The Council should have reassessed the housing requirement and paid more consideration to the views and concerns of the residents of the area.</p>	<p>is about positive growth. The Government wishes the Council to press ahead without delay in preparing an up-to-date development plan. The Council must therefore continue to progress the SADPD to deliver the housing which is needed in the Borough.</p> <p>The most recent household projections do not suggest that we should be planning for fewer homes. A review of the Core Strategy is the most appropriate mechanism under which to consider any changes to the total number of dwellings planned for in the Borough. A review is proposed to commence in 2012 (see Council's LDS) when the housing requirement will be re-assessed. Such a review will need to be supported by a robust and locally justified evidence base.</p>
<p>Some of the infrastructure (e.g. enhanced bus service) appears to be explicitly linked to regeneration of the town centre - implying that the improved service will not go ahead unless/until the town centre is developed. This appears illogical.</p> <p>Infrastructure (roads, railways and open land for recreation) should take priority over additional houses.</p>	<p>The infrastructure required is directly related to the scale and nature of each development taking account of the capacity of existing services and facilities in the area. Development cannot be required to address existing deficiencies (under Circular 05/05A planning obligations used to secure infrastructure must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) relevant to planning; (ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; (iii) directly related to the proposed development; (iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and (v) reasonable in all other respects). <p>The timing of the provision of the infrastructure needs to be co-ordinated with the development. Due to the economics of development it is not practical to expect all infrastructure to be provided in advance.</p>

Residents responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
	The Council's strategy is to ensure that the urban extensions have good links to the rest of the urban area, particularly centres containing services and facilities. Bracknell Town Centre already acts as a transport hub.
The emphasis has moved away from housing targets and towards 'localism' . Communities can now choose their local policies and decide what development to allow. Bracknell is fine at its current size and the green spaces should be protected.	Localism forms a key part of the Government's new planning system. However, the draft NPPF (para 50) states that the ambition of a neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.
Appendix 2 para 11 The reliance on windfall assumptions to deliver 480 dwellings demonstrates the fragility of the housing land supply. Even including optimistic increases on windfall sources, the housing land supply exceeds the housing requirement by only 7 dwellings. This highlights the importance of bringing forward existing commitments, such as Warfield.	Since the Preferred Option, the Council has re-considered the land supply situation in the light of various appeal decisions and Inspectors' reports/letters concerned with the examination of DPDs plus emerging government guidance. As a result, the windfall allowance has been confined to the latter years of the plan and additional sites/capacities of existing sites have been changed, resulting in increased flexibility. ACTION: amend housing land supply figures

Table 2.2

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
The South East Plan housing target should be planned for until revocation takes place. 12,780 should be used rather than 10,780.	Policy CS15 is based on a locally-derived figure (the 'option 1' figure that the Government has stated may be appropriate) and the Core Strategy was found sound by an Inspector. Whilst the household projections that were published in 2010 suggest a slightly higher number of households than currently

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
	being planned for, those projections do not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. There is a possibility that they may over estimate the number of households. Consequently, the Council will continue to plan for the requirement set out in the Core Strategy but will review the position through a review of the Core Strategy (see LDS).
It is unrealistic to expect all identified sites to come forward during the plan period. A non-implementation allowance of 10% should be applied to Homes on Sites in Existing Settlements (901).	<p>Throughout the process of preparing the SADPD the Council have been talking to land owners and developers and is confident that the identified sites are deliverable. The viability of sites proposed has also been tested through work undertaken by independent consultants.</p> <p>However, the Council has re-assessed the land supply situation since the Preferred Option consultation and is including greater flexibility.</p> <p>ACTION: amend housing land supply figures</p>
Disagree that the 359 homes carried forward from the previous plan period are no longer relevant - these are included in the adopted Core Strategy and the Council should address the shortfall or explain in more detail why these dwellings are not being planned for.	Advice from Government Office for the South East, following adoption of the Core Strategy, was that no allowance needs to be made for the 359 shortfall as these figures were reflected in the South East Plan numbers.
Support the minimum density target of 30dph and note that the capacity assessments take account of local landform, trees and hedges. Consider that with these parameters land at The Limes, Warfield could deliver some 15 dwellings and should allocated for this number	Noted. Land at The Limes (SHLAA ref 165) is considered under the responses to Policy SA3.
The proposal to include policies for the three types of development (sites in existing	Noted.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
settlements, in edge of settlement locations, and urban extensions) is supported	
It will only be possible to achieve the envisaged density of development with higher rise development which has little or no soft landscaping. There is an oversupply of flats in Crowthorne and given the desire to respect existing character, it is not felt that the suggested capacity of sites will be achieved. As such there is a need to allocate more land in the SADPD.	<p>The indicative capacity of each site in the SADPD has been calculated using density multipliers according to location. Whilst acknowledging that the national indicative minimum density of 30dph has been removed from PPS3, there remains a requirement to use land efficiently. There is also a need to provide a mix of size and type of dwellings across the plan period, including a significant proportion of smaller units (see Bracknell Forest HNA).</p> <p>Additional flexibility is being built into the SADPD.</p> <p>ACTION: amend housing land supply figures</p>
Support the site selection criteria.	Noted.
Two of the urban extension sites should be deleted (Broadmoor and TRL) as they will have a harmful impact upon the SPA. These sites should be replaced with alternative sites such as land at Chavey Down.	The proposed developments at Broadmoor and TRL contain measures to mitigate the impact of future occupiers of dwellings on the SPA. These measures are supported by Natural England. For a number of reasons land at Chavey Down (Broad Area 7) is not considered suitable for development - these are explained in the Preferred Options Background Paper.
Table 2	
The timetable for delivery on identified sites should be set out (not simply assumed that they will be built out over the next 16 years).	The timetable for delivery on identified sites is set out in the Housing Trajectory which is included as an Appendix to the DPD.
Object to the inclusion of windfalls over 16 years of the plan period, as this is contrary to PPS3 and there is no specific evidence to justify a departure.	No windfall allowance has been included for large and medium sites. The small site allowance is being removed from the first 10 years of supply.

Developer/landowner responses: Summary of main issues raised	Response
General	
<p>Windfall sites should not be included within the first 10 years' land supply and reliance on unidentified sites in the SADPD should therefore be avoided.</p> <p>There is no robust evidence, as required by PPS3, to support 30 dwellings a year on windfall sites.</p>	<p>As the SHLAA did not consider small sites (less than 10 dwellings), and because the Council has a comprehensive set of data on permissions and completions on small sites which shows that such sites have contributed to housing supply in the past, it is considered appropriate to include an allowance for the latter years of the plan period.</p>
<p>Inadequate provision for housing is made in Table 2: given the exclusion of garden land from the PPS3 definition of brownfield, the allowance made for windfall sites will fall short of the requirement. The Council should therefore allocate additional sites (including land at The Limes, Warfield)</p>	<p>Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy sets out the priority sequence for new development. The effect of removing private residential gardens from the definition of brownfield is that this category of land moves down the priority sequence from the second to the third location of search - however such sites are still acceptable in principle where they lie within existing defined settlements. It is not anticipated that the number of small windfall sites will alter significantly. In any event, the allowance for small windfall sites is being removed from the first 10 years of supply.</p> <p>Land at The Limes (SHLAA ref 165) is considered under the responses to Policy SA3.</p>
SHLAA site 270 Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	
<p>If additional land needs to be identified, then the Council should reconsider current allocations (including the Warfield Urban Extension) as well as new sites. Land on the western side of Cabbage Hill may be appropriate for housing (with alternative solutions for SANG).</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with under Policy SA9 Warfield.</p>

3 Responses to 'Appendix 3: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on previously developed land with defined settlements'

3.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the sites listed in Policy SA1. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the Policy: see Table 2.3 'Residents responses to Policy SA1 (Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements).' for main issues and the Council's response.

4 Responses to 'Appendix 4: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on other land within defined settlements'

4.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the sites listed in Policy SA2. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the Policy: see Table 2.5 'Residents Responses to Policy SA2 (Other Land within Defined Settlements)' for main issues and the Council's response.

5 Responses to 'Appendix 5: Profiles of sites proposed for housing on edge of settlements'

5.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the sites listed in Policy SA3. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the Policy: see Table 2.8 'Residents Responses to Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)' for main issues and the Council's response.

6 Responses to 'Appendix 6: New urban extension Proposals Map extracts'

6.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the urban extension sites listed in Policies SA4 to SA9. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the relevant Policy.

7 Responses to 'Appendix 7: Employment area Proposals Map extracts'

7.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the proposed amendments to employment areas as a result of sites listed in Policies SA1, SA2, and SA11. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the relevant Policy.

8 Responses to 'Appendix 8: Retail area maps'

8.1 The comments made in respect of Appendix 8 (and which are summarised below) should be read in conjunction with those made in relation to Section 4 Retail (including Policies SA12 and SA13) - see 4 'Responses to 'Retail''

Table 8.1

Paragraph Number	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Map 40	Welcome the amendment to the Town Centre Boundary in particular the deletion of the Peel Centre from the Town Centre Boundary.	Noted.
	Support the re-alignment and minor amendments to the defined Primary Shopping Frontages and the extent of the Primary Shopping Area.	Noted.
	Flexibility should be included in the Primary Shopping area designation to allow future updates to be made to these frontages to reflect the phased delivery of the regeneration of the Town Centre.	PPS4 requires Local Planning Authorities to designate and distinguish between primary and secondary frontages. Primary Frontages as defined by PPS4 contain a high proportion of retail uses. The Primary Shopping area, which Local Planning Authorities are also required to designate, comprise of of the primary and those secondary frontages which are closely related to the primary shopping frontage.

9 Responses to 'Appendix 9: Housing site settlement boundary changes Proposals Map extracts'

9.1 The maps contained within this Appendix related to the sites listed in Policy SA3. Where comments were made in relation to the maps, for the purposes of summarising the main issues raised, these are included in the responses to the Policy: see Table 2.8 'Residents Responses to Policy SA3 (Edge of Settlement Sites)' for main issues and the Council's response.

10 Responses to 'Appendix 10: Education sites settlement boundary changes Proposals Map extracts'

10.1 No responses were made in relation to Appendix 10.

11 Responses to 'Appendix 11: Existing Development Plan policies to be replaced'

11.1 No responses were made in relation to Appendix 11.

12 Summary of issues raised at Preferred Option exhibitions

12.1 The following provides a summary of the issues raised at the exhibitions that were held around the Borough during the Preferred Option consultation. The following is purely a summary for the main issues, and does not provide a response to these issues, which are covered within other sections of this document.

Feedback from SADPD Exhibitions – Preferred Option (Nov-Dec 2010)

<p>Binfield Binfield Primary School Wednesday 17 November 2010 6pm-9pm</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once policies have been set, they should not be changed e.g. gap between Bracknell and Binfield • What was the justification for dropping the 4 areas and keeping 2 in Binfield • Road network cannot cope with additional traffic and the improvements suggested will not be sufficient • Bracknell Town Centre is totally inadequate • There should be housing in Bracknell Town Centre • Cynicism regarding whether the Town Centre redevelopment will take place • Long history of developers failing to deliver infrastructure • Need to re-assess plans in view of the economic downturn • The empty office blocks should be used for housing • 10,780 homes is not based on up to date evidence • Why do we need additional housing, area already cramped/congested • What evidence has the Council got to refute the suggestion that it is encouraging ghost towns • Other areas around the Borough including Winkfield and SW Sandhurst appear to have been dropped for political reasons • Cynicism regarding the process and procedures and whether they are democratic • The scale of development proposed will swamp the existing community • Want accessible health facilities • An elderly persons' care village should be incorporated in the plans • Want some assurance that there won't be high density flats • TRL is a good site for housing • What about all the other housing sites that have not yet been completed • Too much information – technical and complicated. • Confusion regarding two associated consultations – the Preferred Option and Draft Sustainability Appraisal
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making process is not democratic • Relationship with employment uses - should be looking at vacant office sites • Pointless process – comments are not taken into consideration, it is a fait accompli • Wanted to know what (planning) issues can/cannot be taken into consideration • Already lots of housing being built which is unoccupied i.e. Jennetts Park, why do we need more • Maps misleading – don't know all sites • What is the phasing of the developments – when will they start being built (if the document is adopted)? • Promised infrastructure will not be delivered <p><u>General – Binfield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's claims that it is not developer led are wrong as these plans include everything that the developers want, and are based on developer sites that have been submitted through SHLAA – the mix of uses at Blue Mountain reflects what was on Luff's plans • Fear that Binfield will soon be joined to Wokingham • Loss of gaps, too much development and encroachment of Binfield Village • Loss of village character/identity • Cumulative impact of developments around Binfield not properly considered • There doesn't appear to be joined up thinking, cross boundary working with Wokingham Borough <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How will the A329M cope with both developments? ○ What are the intended highway improvements? • 2 incidents of land shown for development not being available by owners • The Binfield area has a lot of clay in the ground therefore how will this be addressed when building new homes? • What about the water courses? • It would be better to add more housing to the larger sites than allocate small sites as well
--	---

	<p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the existing roads cope with the additional demand? • Can development provide improvements to the highway network? • The current public transport provision is inadequate. How can this be improved? • Can contributions towards improved bus service be sought via the planning process? • How can the utility companies respond to the increase in demand? • How can we guarantee that sufficient health care provisions are in place? • Want evidence that it is possible to extend the doctors' surgery in Binfield • Public transport to/from Binfield is poor • Binfield has few facilities • Will there be a new access onto Temple Way and will it be subject to traffic calming measures? <p><u>Blue Mountain (Policy SA7)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the Blue Mountain site is in the flood plain • People already have access through the Blue Mountain site and use the conference facilities • Concerned about the scale of educational facilities proposed • Do not want vehicular access from Wood Lane onto Forest Road • Want the Council's interest in the Blue Mountain site explained • Open space is too small to provide an effective gap between Binfield and Bracknell • Blue Mountain was left undeveloped to buffer impact of Temple Park estate, therefore making that development more acceptable – when will it stop?! • Will the Public Rights of Way across the site be preserved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Football site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is already a football club in Binfield – don't want another one ○ A football ground should not be regarded as a leisure facility due to its limited appeal
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A football ground is no compensation for the loss of the golf course o Do not want a football ground – noise, lighting, traffic o Why does Bracknell Town Football Club need a new site? o What is happening to the current site? o How big will the stadium be? o Where will the access points be? o How will we deal with the traffic? o Will there be sufficient parking? o Like a lot of other clubs it will expand to the detriment of the area. o If the football stadium does not come forward, will it be replaced by housing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of golf course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development proposed at Blue Mountain will destroy views across the site o Why can't the Council develop Downshire golf course o Wrong to argue that the open space would compensate for the loss of the golf course o Golf course is a local landmark that would be lost o It's a very important local amenity • School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Why do we need new education facilities, and why do they need to be here? o There is no need for a secondary school as there is plenty of capacity in Bracknell Schools o Build the school on the Downshire Golf Course instead o Why can't the secondary school be on a different site o How will we manage the intake? o Will development be phased and how can we control this? o Will the school serve just new residents and if not how can this be controlled? o Where will the playing fields go? o Will the playing fields compromise some of the SANG area?
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Secondary School should be in Winkfield or on the Warfield site. o The school should be delivered before the housing. o There won't be enough money to build the school. <p><u>Amen Corner North (Policy SA6)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More homes should be put on Amen Corner North and then Blue Mountain wouldn't need to be built on. o The roads are already gridlocked – this will only make matters worse. o That's my land shaded for housing, I didn't give permission! <p><u>Small sites (site 24 & 93) (Policy SA3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding issues • Protected trees • Impact upon residential amenities • Previous appeal decisions – why is the situation different now • There are TPOs on the trees on the Murrell Hill Lane/Foxley Lane site. • How can Foxley Lane cope with the development of both small sites? • How will development on the Forest Road/Foxley Lane site access the highway network? • If these sites weren't suitable before why are they suitable now?
--	--

<p>Binfield Binfield Parish Council Offices Thursday 18 November 2010 2pm-5pm</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the justification for dropping the 4 areas and keeping 2 in Binfield • Bracknell Town Centre is totally inadequate • There should be housing in Bracknell Town Centre • Cynicism regarding whether the Town Centre redevelopment will take place • Need to re-assess plans in view of the economic downturn • The empty office blocks should be used for housing • How much of the allocation is previously developed land – should be 60%
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do we need additional housing, area already cramped/congested • Growth should be directed to other parts of the country • What evidence has the Council got to refute the suggestion that it is encouraging ghost towns • Cynicism regarding the process and procedures and whether they are democratic • Need affordable housing • Might as well take down all the signs for Binfield – it will all be Bracknell • Not clear how the findings of the employment land review have informed the process and where will people from the new developments work? • Its not consultation, its prescription • Concerned about changes to school catchment areas • Need housing for the older generation • Where will the people come from to occupy these developments • Where are the people coming from who are moving into Jennetts Park and Staff College • Why are we encouraging more people to move to the area? • Too much information – technical and complicated. • Confusion regarding two associated consultations – the Preferred Option and Draft Sustainability Appraisal • Pointless process – comments are not taken into consideration, its a fait accompli • Already lots of housing being built which is unoccupied i.e. Jennetts Park, why do we need more • What is the phasing of the developments – when will they start being built (if the document is adopted)? <p><u>General – Binfield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's claims that it is not developer led are wrong as these plans include everything that the developers want, and are based on developer sites that have been submitted through SHLAA – the mix of uses at Blue Mountain reflects what was on Luff's plans • Fear that Binfield will soon be joined to Wokingham
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Binfield village will just become another suburb of Bracknell • Loss of village character/identity • Concern about risk of flooding due to presence of clay <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long history of developers failing to deliver infrastructure e.g. Temple Park • Road network cannot cope with additional traffic and the improvements suggested will not be sufficient • Can development provide improvements to the highway network • The current public transport provision is inadequate. How can this be improved? • Public transport to/from Binfield is poor • How will the road network deal with both the proposed development in Binfield and that already earmarked in Wokingham? <p><u>Blue Mountain (Policy SA7)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the scale of educational facilities proposed • Want the Council's interest in the Blue Mountain site explained • Open space is too small to provide an effective gap between Binfield and Bracknell • An agreement signed in association with the Temple Park development was suppose to secure the site as a buffer between the 2 settlements forever • Will the Public Rights of Way (incl Wood Lane) across the site be preserved – popular paths and should have been shown on the plan • There may be great crested newts on the site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Football Ground <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A football ground should not be regarded as a leisure facility due to its limited appeal ○ Do not want a football ground – noise, lighting, traffic ○ Main driver seems to be making lots of money out of the redevelopment of its current site
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Concern about the size of the stadium o Will result in a large increase in traffic o Will there be sufficient parking? o The football ground would be better located at Amen Corner South, near the other leisure facilities o Can see the benefits of locating the football ground on this site as would be located where the already floodlit driving range is. o Why have Bracknell FC so close to Binfield FC? o Need to understand the cultural issues around moving Bracknell Town FC into Binfield <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of golf course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development proposed at Blue Mountain will destroy views across the site o Wrong to argue that the open space would compensate for the loss of the golf course o It's a very important local amenity • School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Why do we need new education facilities, and why do they need to be here? o Secondary school should be on a different site – Amen Corner North or Warfield o What area will the school serve? <p><u>Amen Corner North (Policy SA6)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More homes should be put on Amen Corner North and then Blue Mountain wouldn't need to be built on. o There's a badger set on the site and rare birds o Gap between this site and Wokingham is insignificant o Some people accepted that the development of Amen Corner North makes sense. <p><u>Transport Research Laboratory (Policy SA5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRL is a good site for housing
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible to demolish offices on the site and use it for housing • Need to think carefully about footpath links <p><u>Broadmoor (Policy SA4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about how the site might be accessed • Wants to make sure that existing footpaths are taken into account and enhanced – esp links from Crowthorne to Sandhurst <p><u>Small sites (Policy SA1)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about any potential loss of trees on the Farley Hall site and the type of development that might be proposed
<p>Binfield Binfield Parish Council Offices Saturday 20 November 10am-1pm</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does Bracknell need more housing when housing in existing developments is still unoccupied? • Statistics justifying additional housing don't stack up • Concerned about these proposals plus the Impact of Wokingham's proposals in terms of traffic and resulting pollution • Use all the empty office blocks for housing • Process is undemocratic - political boundary redefined in Binfield so that Binfield now comes under the jurisdiction of Maidenhead MP who does not care about Binfield. This is why Bracknell is stitching up Binfield because the Bracknell MP doesn't need their votes now. • Warfield should not be in the SADPD, It is not a preferred option • If more development was proposed for the Warfield site, particularly Cabbage Hill, less housing would be needed in Binfield. • New housing does not provide enough parking. Residents should be made to use their garages and developers should provide more storage within houses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is housing not being spread more evenly - nothing proposed for the Sandhurst area <p><u>General – Binfield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of village character/identity • Want to keep a buffer/gap between Binfield and Bracknell, do not want to be part of Bracknell • Binfield already has a football club - Binfield Football Club are a better team • No real joined up thinking with Wokingham Borough's housing proposals • Children should not have to go to St Crispin SS; majority of the school journeys made by car and are adding to traffic congestion • Many residents too frightened to cycle on roads around Binfield • Temple Park lacks a heart as it does not have shops and facilities. Do not make the same mistake again. <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Binfield used as a rat run to the M4 • How will increased demand for utilities be met • Existing health facilities are over subscribed. What new facilities will be provided? • Flooding issues in north Binfield • Make sure provision is made for large enough domestic bin storage areas • How will the utility companies respond to the increase in residents? <p><u>Blue Mountain Site (Policy SA7)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Mountain Golf Course provides a buffer between Binfield and Temple Park • Questioned type of housing proposed at Blue Mountain. What does 'executive' housing mean? • Land should be used efficiently to keep more areas undeveloped, therefore smaller homes and family accommodation should be provided in preference to large executive homes
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want affordable housing • Badgers use Blue Mountain for foraging. • Comments made that Golf Course not really that accessible to the public as a lot of the area is fenced off • The Council promised Temple Park residents that Blue Mountain Golf Course would always provide open space and a visual amenity – this should not be lost. The Council is going back on a promise, why should residents believe anything the Council says now? <p><u>Football Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of Bracknell Football Club to Binfield is not supported. Binfield already has a football club. • What other options have been looked at for the location of Bracknell Football Club and who is putting this forward as an option? • The levels and land are not suitable for a football pitch • Bracknell Football Club should relocate within Bracknell. <p><u>Amen Corner North (Policy SA6)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual property shown within the area proposed for housing without owner's permission • A few people were satisfied with the proposal. • Concerns regarding traffic especially in combination with development in Wokingham Borough. <p><u>Amen Corner South (Policy SA8 & Amen Corner SPD)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More houses should be put on Amen Corner, reducing the need for more sites in Binfield <p><u>Edge of settlement sites (Policy SA3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 93 considered to be a more obvious rounding off site with access onto Forest Road
--	--

<p>Crowthorne Crowthorne Baptist Church, High Street 23rd November 2010 10am-1pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity of site 24 was questioned as was the position of the access <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the phasing of the developments – when will they start being built (if the document is adopted)? • How will phasing be managed? • Don't want anymore housing - why is the Council progressing this document? Government says these issues should be dealt with at a local level. • Why is more housing being planned when existing developments are unoccupied i.e Jennett's Park. • New housing never has sufficient infrastructure – i.e. school on Jennett's Park. • Why is more housing being planned when the Town Centre is not being redeveloped? • When will Town Centre redevelopment take place, already been waiting 20-30 years. • What is happening on Warfield – Warfield SPD, when will consultation take place, when/where will houses be built? • Plans do not contain sufficient detail. • Plans misleading, as do not show all the housing sites <p><u>General –Crowthorne</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crowthorne is a village - its character will be destroyed with further expansion. • The High Street is very difficult to negotiate and parking is a real problem. • Object to the scale of development. • Lots of empty property in the area - why isn't the Council using the Empty Homes Act to make developers occupy them (example, flats above Lidl in Crowthorne High Street and large vacant houses). • Impact upon the SPA/SSSI – developments are too close to these areas.
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would cease to be a village if developments take place. • Cross-boundary issues with Wokingham Borough. Doesn't appear to be any dialogue between the two authorities regarding the location of housing. • Concerned about the disruption, traffic and noise that will come from construction traffic. • Loss of gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell -will merge built up areas (coupled with Wokingham development). • Will need extra parking in Crowthorne. The existing lack of parking will be made worse by the new developments – new residents will have at least 2 cars per household. • Should be either site, not both • Would like to see on street parking in the High Street – outside the shops. • Will there be any social housing • Don't want social housing in the area. <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing road network is already at capacity. How will it cope with extra traffic generated by urban extensions? • Increased congestion around Bracknell, Crowthorne, A329, Bracknell Road, Crowthorne Bypass and Peacock Lane. • Need new roads not just road improvements. • Need for street lighting along Nine Mile Ride (to east of junction with Old Wokingham Road) • Existing bus links are poor. • There are existing parking problems in Wellington Road, Cambridge Road and other roads in the Broadmoor Estate. • Upper Broadmoor Road is already restricted by parked cars – could be problems with access for emergency vehicles.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to widen Nine Mile Ride and put in proper cycle and pedestrian paths – overhanging trees make it dark and result in drivers driving near the middle of the road. • Putting in signals will cause more congestion than constructing roundabouts. • Will additional health facilities be provided? Hospitals are too far away. • Local doctors already at capacity – difficult to get an appointment. • There are flooding problems on this site and on surrounding roads such as Bracknell Road. • Existing schools have no spare capacity. • Should be thinking about new schools rather than accepting contributions/extensions to existing schools which are already strained. • People don't want to go to Easthampstead Park School • Parents can still choose a secondary schools so parents will want to send their children to Edgbarrow - won't be able to cope • Crowthorne residents who live in Wokingham B are concerned that pupils from the new developments will fill up Edgbarrow School resulting in a lack of places at Edgbarrow for their children - need to clarify what will happen about this issue. • Need to look at feasibility of installing sprinkler systems to all properties. • Junction of Easthampstead Road and Old Wokingham Rd should be redesigned with the oak tree retained in the centre of a new roundabout. <p><u>TRL Site (Policy SA5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the houses be built? • What is going to happen to the TRL track?. • Why is the Council Depot relocating.? • What uses are proposed at the relocated Depot? • Flooding issues (including Hatch Ride).
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more employment in Crowthorne, not loss of employment opportunities. • Where will people living on the new developments work as employment land is being built upon? • Why have the Council ignored the TRL appeal decision? • Why can't most of the traffic be directed towards Bracknell rather than towards Crowthorne? • Why can't an access road go through the SANG and out onto Bracknell Road? • What services/facilities will there be in the proposed local centre? Will there be a doctors surgery? • What proportion of the housing will be affordable housing? • The triangle south of Brookers Row is SPA and therefore the housing should be 400m from this. • Need a high level of on-site parking at TRL • Exit from Hatch Ride onto Old Wokingham Rd is very difficult, especially for turning right • The site should be developed to form an extension to Bracknell rather than Crowthorne <p><u>Broadmoor (Policy SA4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will local schools cope with additional pupils from the Broadmoor development. • What are the timescales for the Broadmoor development? • Will there be a new link road from Foresters Way – what traffic will be able to use this? • What are the access arrangements for the housing site? • Existing road network and links onto High Street will not cope with additional dwellings from Broadmoor. • Concept plan misleading as does not show additional 120 houses at Cricket Field Grove and School Hill. • Why is housing proposed at Broadmoor?
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage issues – impact upon Listed Building, Park and Garden. What comments have English Heritage made Loss of Broadmoor Farm. <p><u>Small Sites (Policy SA2)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are sites Site 76 & 113 not included within the overall Broadmoor site. Cricket Field Grove (site 76) used by Rugby Club. Will it be relocated? The façade of the Iron Duke (site 286) should be retained and the rear of the building redeveloped to provide low cost housing close to the village centre
<p>Crowthorne Crowthorne Baptist Church, High Street 27th November 2010 10am-1pm</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't want anymore housing and can't understand why it is needed Local people should be left to decide these issues Why is more housing being planned when there are empty houses in the Borough Don't need anymore sites as they are still building at Jennetts Park Promised infrastructure is never delivered with new housing e.g. school at Jennett's Park Do not like design of the new housing at Jennett's Park The redevelopment of Bracknell Town Centre is critical to this process – currently go to Wokingham, Reading or Camberley Want low cost homes – not 'affordable housing'. What about self build? Should be converting all the empty office blocks into flats Plans are misleading as those that have been published do not show the proposals in Wokingham Borough No evidence that Bracknell Forest is working with Wokingham on these proposals Localism is now the policy so why promote these developments when local people don't want

	<p>them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the point in responding when the decision has already been made Should have SA response forms available Consideration should be given to wider impacts of extreme weather events such as flooding or snow which cause traffic chaos in Crowthorne because not everyone living in Crowthorne works in Crowthorne. More people = more out commuters = more traffic problems in extreme weather events. <p><u>General – Crowthorne</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crowthorne is a village and its character will be destroyed by further expansion. Object to the scale of development proposed for Crowthorne. Concerned about the impact of proposed development on the SSSIs Loss of gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell and Wokingham – built up areas will merge Already a lack of parking in Crowthorne and these proposals will make it worse as future occupiers of the new developments will have cars. Should be one or the other of the sites not both <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should not be considered until the infrastructure is in place Bus service is poor and its too dangerous to cycle Existing road network is already congested and cannot cope with further traffic from the developments proposed e.g. Crowthorne Bypass, Old Wokingham Road, High Street and Nine Mile Ride Concerned about increase in traffic through Crowthorne as a result of the new roundabout at Jennetts Park and the proposed development in Wokingham Borough.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the scale proposed needs to be accompanied by new roads such as dual carriageways • Need to widen existing roads and put in proper cycle and pedestrian paths • Listed improvements to the transport network are vague and meaningless – there's insufficient information to comment on • Need additional health facilities. Not happy about a centralised facility in Bracknell – too remote. • Lack of capacity improvements identified to roads • Concerned about health facilities due to the demise of PCTs – need some certainty that improvements will happen • There's no spare capacity in the existing schools • What will happen to children who live in Wokingham but who go to school in Bracknell Forest – Edgbarrow Secondary School • All new homes should have green roofs • Need allotments • Brookers Corner and Broadmoor Road are too narrow to deal with the additional traffic that would be generated from the Broadmoor development • There are flooding issues on Bracknell Road where it runs alongside TRL • Wildmoor Heath School has no room to expand <p><u>TRL (Policy SA5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the houses be built? • Would prefer some employment to be retained – need jobs for new residents in Crowthorne • It is unacceptable that the Council is proposing development on a site that it fought an appeal over.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main access must be onto Nine Mile Ride • Do not need another local centre on Old Wokingham Road – there's already a local centre in Greenwood Road • Old Wokingham Road cannot take anymore traffic – junctions are inadequate • Development proposed will prejudice the gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne • Do not want development to relate to properties on Old Wokingham Road • A green boundary needs to be retained along Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride • What proportion of the housing will be affordable housing? • Exit from Hatch Ride onto Old Wokingham Rd is very difficult, especially if turning right • The site should be developed to link to Bracknell rather than Crowthorne • The site has flooding issues • TRL should not cause surface water flooding • Needs to be a commitment by the Council to retain the gap • Owners of properties along Old Wokingham Road do not want large roundabouts in front of their properties – need to consult on access details • TRL site was meant to provide a gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell • A new health facility should form part of proposed local centre • Why did the Council spend so much money on the appeal? <p><u>Broadmoor (Policy SA4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All traffic from the site needs to be directed to a new access onto the bypass • Roads around the Estate are already congested due to parking • Upper Broadmoor Road and Lower Broadmoor Road are inadequate as access points • The schools in the area are already full
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the timescales for the Broadmoor development. • Should not be proposing housing on the site – nobody will buy houses so close to the hospital • Concerned about what will happen to the historic gardens • Concerned about impact on heritage issues • Concerned about access to the surrounding land • It will be too expensive to relocate the playing field from Cricket Field grove to the open space as it is not flat and is boggy <p><u>Small Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the density of development on Cricket Field Grove (site 76) and the ability to re-locate the playing field (see above) • Concerned about traffic in the vicinity of the Broadmoor sites • How will Cricket Field Grove and School Hill be accessed • What is going to happen to the houses that are boarded up around the Broadmoor Estate? • Where is the Broadmoor nursery going to go? • Concerned about the relationship of development at the Iron Duke (Site 286) to residential properties in the cul de sac to the rear • What is going to happen at the Iron Duke (Site 286) • Why aren't the smaller sites on the display boards
<p>Crowthorne Crowthorne Parish Council Office 2nd December 2010 6pm - 9pm</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are opinions being sought now when they were ignored following the first round of consultation? • Seems to be a 'developer-led' process, rather than a 'plan-led' system.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and other supporting information should be better signposted – including references in the leaflet /site sheets • Too many complex documents have been produced • The consultation period is too short • The road map with improvements should be placed on the website • There are no page numbers in the SA Appendices document • Response forms should be handed to everybody who attends an exhibition • Pleased to see planners engaging with local residents • Don't need the scale of housing suggested for the Borough • Stop immigration and re-direct growth elsewhere • Should be using empty offices for housing • It would be preferable to develop a new town rather than develop sites around existing settlements • Quality of life is being destroyed • Don't like the appearance of Jennetts Park and the houses are badly constructed <p><u>General – Crowthorne</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is needed, the local community should be involved in formulating plans • Need to be clearer about level of development proposed in Crowthorne • The traffic in the High Street is already bad • Why hasn't the Council done anything about the completion of flats over Lidl. Concerned about an advert and its relationship with the flats • Density needs to reflect existing densities and design needs to reflect existing Victorian character
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinctive village character will be destroyed • The area does not need the houses proposed • Would rather have small in-fill development than large strategic sites • Further development will increase dangerous levels of nitrogen dioxide • Will housing that is suitable for 'first-time buyers' and the elderly, be provided? • Points made about Crowthorne were not accurately recorded at the May workshop held with Sandhurst and Crowthorne <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will the £1 million earmarked for Crowthorne High Street in the IDP be spent on? • Why have the plans been advanced without being sure that transport improvements will mitigate impact? • The infrastructure improvements required will be so expensive that it will make sites unviable. Expect developers to negotiate fewer highway improvements so that housing can be delivered • What can be done to improve the capacity of the surrounding roads? They're too narrow with constraints, e.g. trees and private property limit improvements that can be made • Existing bus services are poor • Where are the children going to go to school? • The proposed improvements to the highway network will not make any difference. • There don't seem to be any traffic calming measures proposed for some of the roads in Wokingham Without – they are used as rat runs and this problem will increase with further development • How will additional health provision be made • Additional health provision should be local – not in Bracknell
--	---

	<p><u>TRL (Policy SA5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roundabout being built on the A329(M) for Jennett's Park will create a cut through to Crowthorne down Old Wokingham Road (west of TRL site) – it will be busy and dangerous • Old Wokingham Road is not a suitable location for a new local centre as it is too busy • Do not want roundabouts along Old Wokingham Road • Development should be re-positioned so that it relates to land to the north of the site. The local centre would be better located along Nine Mile Ride. • Should form an urban extension to Bracknell not Crowthorne • Must retain a gap between Bracknell and Crowthorne • The site should be developed as an extension to Crowthorne not Bracknell • The site is not suitable for 1,000 dwellings - 600 would be more appropriate • The re-location of the Depot to this site will lead to many truck movements during unsociable hours – will cause a nuisance to local residents. • Concerns raised at the Urban Design workshop, run by Urban Initiatives, were supposedly recorded but were not included in the report. It is claimed that there was 'a general consensus' that the TRL development should be integrated into the grain of Wokingham Without – not true • Traffic problems at Brookers Corner identified • Provision should be made for two community minibuses to be accommodated securely within the development, as happens now • Will developers be able to build more than 1000 homes on TRL? • Schools in the area do not have any spare capacity, for example, Easthampstead Park. • Do not want development to relate to properties on Old Wokingham Road • Do not want new roundabouts on Old Wokingham Road • A strong green boundary needs to be retained along Old Wokingham Road and Nine Mile Ride
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer offices at TRL – less traffic generation • Appeal proposal was better • Why did the Council spend so much money on the appeal and then give in <p><u>Broadmoor (Policy SA4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing roads providing access are inadequate and unable to cope with any more traffic. • Has not been proved that 278 homes can be accommodated in such a limited area • What's going to happen to the listed building? • How have English Heritage been engaged in the process • The farm should be re-used as a community / children's farm • Will the existing walls be retained? • Will the new walls/fencing be built around the new hospital • There are parking/highway issues around Wildmoor Heath School • The original staff cottages are located where there are already flooding concerns. Water drains down from Broadmoor and collects in the gardens of the cottages on Lower Broadmoor Road. • There is insufficient capacity in the existing primary school on Lower Broadmoor Road. • Value of properties along Lower Broadmoor will decrease as a result of the proposal. • Lower Broadmoor Road will not be safe for people to walk up and down due to traffic • A road for staff access will cross open space, farmland and the Devils Highway • How will the open space be laid out <p><u>Small Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why aren't the SHLAA sites shown on the policy display boards?
--	---

Copies of this booklet may be obtained in large print, Braille, on audio cassette or in other languages. To obtain a copy in an alternative format please telephone 01344 352000

Nepali

यस प्रचारको सक्षेपं वा सार निचोड चाहिं दिइने छ ठूलो अक्षरमा, ब्रेल वा क्यासेट सून्नको लागी । अरु भाषाको नक्कल पनि हासिल गर्न सकिने छ । कृपया सम्पर्क गनुहोला ०१३४४ ३५२००० ।

Tagalog

Mga buod/ mga hango ng dokumentong ito ay makukuha sa malaking letra, limbag ng mga bulag o audio kasette. Mga kopya sa ibat-ibang wika ay inyo ring makakamtan. Makipag-alam sa 01344 352000

Urdu

اس دستاویز کے خلاصے یا مختصر متن جلی حروف، بریل لکھائی یا پھر آڈیو کیسٹ پر ریکارڈ شدہ صورت میں فراہم کئے جا سکتے ہیں۔ دیگر زبانوں میں اس کی کاپی بھی حاصل کی جا سکتی ہے۔ اس کے لیے براہ مہربانی ٹیلیفون نمبر 01344 352000 پر رابطہ کریں۔

Polish

Streszczenia lub fragmenty tego dokumentu mogą być dostępne w wersji napisanej dużym drukiem, pismem Brajla lub na kasecie audio. Można również otrzymać kopie w innych językach. Proszę skontaktować się z numerem 01344 352000.

Portuguese

Podemos disponibilizar resumos ou extractos deste documento em impressão grande, em Braille ou em audiocassete. Podem também ser obtidas cópias em outros idiomas. Por favor ligue para o 01344 352000.

Development Plan Team
Planning and Transport Policy
Environment, Culture and Communities
Bracknell Forest Council
Time Square
Market Street
Bracknell
RG12 1JD