

Summary of key issues raised to Preferred Option Consultation and Council's Response

The following sets out the key issues raised through the SADPD Preferred Option Consultation which took place between November 2010 and January 2011, and the Council's response. For more detailed summaries of the issues raised and the Council's responses, see the 'Summary of Responses to Site Allocations DPD Preferred Option Nov 2010-Jan 2011' Document. Consideration of the individual sites is set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper, which will support the Draft Submission Consultation.

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
The Overall Housing Target	
<p>A number of comments were received challenging the principle of planning for 10,780 new homes. Some considered the impact of the recession means that there is less demand for housing.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the recession has had any impact on the actual need for new homes. In fact the most recent population figures show the population rising at its highest rate since the post-war baby boom over 60 years ago. It is also important to remember that we are planning for our needs to 2026 and not even the most pessimistic predictions have the recession lasting that long. The main impact of the recession has been to reduce the availability of mortgages for many, including first time buyers, there has been an increase in the proportion of homes in the private rented sector.</p> <p>It is also clear that the government sees an increase in the level of housebuilding as an important element in securing the economic growth required to bring the country out of recession. This can be seen in the 'Plan for Growth' document produced at the time of the budget and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. The government is also now saying that where Councils don't have up to date plans in place, they should not refuse planning applications for new development.</p> <p>In order for the Council to be able to plan properly for our future development needs and ensure that we get the necessary infrastructure it is essential that we get plans in place for future growth. The 10,780 figure comes from the Councils Core Strategy which was adopted in 2008 and is in fact 2000 lower than the figure we were being required to provide through the South East Plan.</p>
How to Get Involved	
<p>A number of comments received related to the Council's method of consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation site was confusing, • Disadvantaged people who did not have access to a computer/internet, 	<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.</p> <p>Information provided at the exhibitions included a Map to show all the sites within Crowthorne and Binfield. A key map showing housing sites was included on the display boards and leaflets (copies of which people were able to</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedure for submitting comments on site too complicated, • Numerous supporting documents were too long and technical, • Timing of the consultation in the lead up to Christmas was to discourage comments being made, • Number of exhibitions were insufficient, • Consultation material was poor, • Lack of notification/awareness of people affected by the proposals. 	<p>take away from the exhibitions).</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 public exhibitions were held at a variety of locations across the Borough focusing on areas located near to the proposed sites, including evenings and Saturday mornings. 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. 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>Officers have reviewed the wording on the website and will seek to make future consultations more user-friendly but there are limits to how far this can be achieved due to the need to use specific terms to avoid ambiguity in planning policies. It will be important for the Draft Submission consultation that people are able to understand the 'tests of soundness' that apply to this stage in the process.</p>
General points	
Should consider the use of unused office space before look at development new sites in the countryside.	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.
Should be redeveloping the Town Centre instead of building in the countryside.	<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, and north of Cain Road, Binfield. In addition it is proposed to de-allocate 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</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	<p>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 create new employment opportunities.</p>
Sites contained in Policy SA1 – Previously Developed Land within Settlements	
In general there was support for the identification of these sites, being located within the defined settlement. Some comments were raised about specific sites, but these are detailed matters addressed through the Responses to the Preferred Option Document and in the Draft Submission Background Paper.	
Sites contained in Policy SA2 – Other Land within Settlements	
In general there was support for the identification of these sites, being located within the defined settlement. Some comments were raised about specific sites, but these are detailed matters addressed through the Responses to the Preferred Option Document and in the Draft Submission Background Paper.	
Sites contained in Policy SA3 – Edge of settlement sites	
Comments were raised about specific sites, but these are detailed matters addressed through the Responses to the Preferred Option Document and in the Draft Submission Background Paper	
A number of comments objected to the inclusion of the sites on the basis they had not been identified in the Core Strategy and would be contrary to it.	<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 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 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 (SHLAA). 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 to meet the housing target.</p>
Policy SA4 – Land at Broadmoor	
No need for additional development in Crowthorne,	It is acknowledged that some development has occurred in Crowthorne over the last few years. However, the population

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
<p>too much development is planned/development should be spread across the Borough.</p>	<p>of the Borough and number of households is projected to grow further and there is a need to provide additional housing.</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>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>Consideration of sites has taken account of a wide ranging evidence base, including transport work, landscape analysis and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<p>Many issues were raised in relation to transport, in particular, access onto Foresters Way and impact local roads, including Crowthorne High Street, and impact upon the strategic road network.</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>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. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration over the baseline situation that takes account of background traffic growth and the additional traffic that the new development will generate and that 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</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles.
Concern was also raised regarding the relationship of development planned in Wokingham, and whether the cumulative impacts of developments (Broadmoor, TRL and those in Wokingham) had been undertaken, including cross-boundary working with Wokingham.	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.
Concerns regarding the impact of development upon local facilities/services	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's (IDP), and have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be.</p> <p>The infrastructure required to mitigate proposed development is set out in the IDP which supports the SADPD. This would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), at the planning application stage.</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.</p>
Issues were also raised with respect to the relationship of the proposals with the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area, as parts of the site are within the 400m to the SPA	<p>Natural England has not objected to the proposals in relation to the proximity of the development to a SSSI/SPA.</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 Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (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>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 Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) in order to mitigate the impact of the proposals upon the SPA.</p>
Object to the proposals as it would merge Crowthorne with Sandhurst and will result in the loss of the	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 development will

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
character of the village and its sense of community	<p>be contained to the walled kitchen garden. The new hospital redevelopment would be related to existing buildings on the northern part of the site.</p> <p>Broadmoor is not considered 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>
Impact upon heritage assets within the site: Listed Buildings and the Registered Historic Park and Garden	<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. Redevelopment will need to be sympathetic to the site's heritage assets and there will be a requirement for a Conservation Management Plan as part of the policy.</p> <p>Redevelopment would provide a new hospital that is fit for purpose and would retain a significant local employer offering a wide range of job opportunities within the Borough. It would also help to secure the future of a Listed Building and the regeneration of a historic park of Crowthorne. Further consideration of this issue will be set out in the Draft Submission Background Paper. The proposed policy wording makes it clear that the number of homes within the walled garden area may need to be reduced in order to satisfactorily demonstrate that harm to the integrity of the site's heritage assets is minimised.</p>
SA5 – Land at Transport Research Laboratory	
No need for additional development in Crowthorne, too much development is planned/development should be spread across the Borough.	<p>It is acknowledged 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>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>In allocating sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. Whilst</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	<p>it is acknowledged that the proposals equate to an increase of approximately 30% in the number of properties in Crowthorne as a whole, however, 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>Consideration of sites has taken account of a wide ranging evidence base, including transport work, landscape analysis and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<p>Many issues were raised in relation to transport, in particular, impact upon local road and the strategic road network.</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. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration over the baseline situation that takes account of background traffic growth and the additional traffic that the new development will generate and that 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>Concern was also raised regarding the relationship of development planned in Wokingham, and whether the cumulative impacts of developments (Broadmoor, TRL and those in Wokingham) had been undertaken, including cross-boundary working with Wokingham.</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>Concerns regarding the impact of development upon local facilities/services</p>	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's (IDP), so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be.</p> <p>The infrastructure required to mitigate proposed development is set out in the IDP which supports the SADPD. This would be secured through a Section 106</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	<p>Legal Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), at the planning application stage.</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.</p>
<p>Issues were also raised with respect to the relationship of the proposals with the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area, as parts of the site are within the 400m to the SPA</p>	<p>Natural England has not objected to the proposals in relation to the proximity of the development to a SSSI/SPA.</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 Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (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>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 SANG in order to mitigate the impact of the proposals upon the SPA.</p>
<p>Impact of the proposals upon the gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell/disposition of uses within the site.</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>Many residents also queried why this site is being promoted given the Council's success at defending on appeal a previous scheme.</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>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 alternative locations. Due to the scale of housing that remains to be</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	<p>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>
SA6 – Land at Amen Corner North	
<p>No need for additional development in Binfield, too much development is planned.</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, 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>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.</p> <p>In allocating sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. The Council's proposals also include a number of sites in other parts of the Borough including large sites at Broadmoor and TRL, Crowthorne. The capacity of available sites in other parts of the Borough is not sufficient to accommodate all future development needs.</p> <p>Consideration of sites has taken account of a wide ranging evidence base, including transport work, landscape analysis and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<p>Many issues were raised in relation to transport, in particular, impact local roads and impact upon the strategic road network.</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 is working closely with the Highways Agency regarding the impact on the Strategic Road Network. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration over the baseline situation that takes account of background traffic growth and the additional traffic that the new development will generate and that 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</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	movement, encourage more sustainable modes of transport and ensure good access to community facilities – reducing the need to travel by private vehicles.
Concerns regarding the impact of development upon local facilities/services	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's (IDP), so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be.</p> <p>The infrastructure required to mitigate proposed development is set out in the IDP which supports the SADPD. This would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), at the planning application stage.</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.</p>
Impact of the proposals upon the gaps between Binfield and Bracknell, and Bracknell and Wokingham.	This site was identified as having a poorer landscape condition compared to the wider area, due to its relationship with development along London Road. Furthermore, two large treed areas (Blackmans Copse and Pockets Copse) act as physical barriers to development, and provide a visual barrier between London Road and open agricultural land to the north/Binfield Village. As development of the site would also need to provide SANG as mitigation upon the SPA, these could be located so as to maintain a buffer between settlements and reinforce the gap.
SA7 – Land at Blue Mountain	
No need for additional development in Binfield, too much development is planned.	<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, 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>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.</p> <p>In allocating sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. The Council's proposals also include a number of sites in other parts of the Borough including large sites at Broadmoor and TRL, Crowthorne. The capacity of available sites in other parts of the Borough is not sufficient to accommodate all future development needs.</p> <p>Consideration of sites has taken account of a wide ranging evidence base, including transport work, landscape analysis</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	and Sustainability Appraisal.
<p>Many issues were raised in relation to transport, in particular, impact local roads and impact upon the strategic road network.</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 is working closely with the Highways Agency regarding the impact on the Strategic Road Network. The model demonstrates that the proposed improvements will not lead to a deterioration over the baseline situation that takes account of background traffic growth and the additional traffic that the new development will generate and that 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>Concerns regarding the impact of development upon local facilities/services</p>	<p>Service providers have been involved from the early stages of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's (IDP), so they have had the information to establish what the likely pressures on their service will be.</p> <p>The infrastructure required to mitigate proposed development is set out in the IDP which supports the SADPD. This would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), at the planning application stage.</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.</p>
<p>Impact of the proposals upon the gaps between Binfield and Bracknell.</p>	<p>Development will focused in the southern part of the site (to the north of Temple Way) to form an urban extension to Bracknell so as to maximise accessibility and reduce the potential impact on the existing community of Binfield. SANG to mitigate the impact of the proposals upon the SPA will be located in the northern part of the site (south of Forest Road) in order to maintain a buffer between Binfield and Bracknell.</p>
<p>Object to relocation of Bracknell Town Football club.</p>	<p>Relocation of the club will enable the redevelopment of the existing site close to Bracknell Town Centre for high density housing, reducing the need for additional greenfield allocations. The site proposed for the new ground is visually very well contained and is already occupied by a floodlit</p>

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
	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.
Object to the loss of the existing golf club.	The proposals will result in the loss of a significant part of the open space currently occupied by the golf course. Evidence is being sought on the level of golf provision in the area. However, the proposals for the site include a new ground for Bracknell Town FC, and do allow for an extensive area of fully accessible open space and SANG across the northern part of the site, which will be publicly accessible for recreation, which is not the current case. The Blue Mountain site is available for development and is being actively promoted for development by its owners.
SA8 – Land at Amen Corner South	
<p>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 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. 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). 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
A number of comments were raised in respect of impact upon infrastructure and gaps between settlements.	The principle of redevelopment of Amen Corner South has been established through the Core Strategy. The adopted Amen Corner SPD provides further guidance.
Some of the land owners commented that they did not consider that the site could be developed at 50dph, achieve the 725	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

Summary of Main Issues Raised	Council's Response
dwellings as set out in the Core Strategy, and that employment space should be considered for alternative housing use.	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.
SA9 – Land at Warfield	
<p>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. 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). 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.</p>	
The majority of comments related to objection to the principle of development.	A comprehensive development at Warfield was agreed in principle in early 2008 following extensive consultation and an examination of the Core Strategy.
A significant number of also objected to development on Cabbage Hill and West End Lane.	<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>It remains the Council's intention that the majority of Cabbage Hill should remain as open land and provide a significant area of publicly accessible open space as an asset for all.</p>
Many of the other comments received raised related to detailed matters.	This occurred as the Council ran two concurrent consultations - one on the SADPD and one on the Warfield SPD. Detailed matters raised have been considered through the responses to the Warfield SPD. The SADPD only deals with the strategic matters in respect of Warfield SPD.
Other policies relating to retail and employment	
<p>No significant issues were raised to the content of the SADPD in respect of these matters. A comment was received from English Heritage in relation to the wording of the RMA policy with respect to heritage assets (as the site contains listed buildings). The policy wording will be amended accordingly. In general terms a number of comments related to the Council should be identified unused employment space for new housing development (this point is addressed in general issues above).</p>	