



## **POST EXAMINATION DECISION STATEMENT**

This document is the 'Decision Statement', required to be prepared under Regulation 18(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended)<sup>1</sup>. It sets out the Council's response to each of the recommendations contained in the Report to Bracknell Forest Council of the Independent Examination of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Development Plan ("the Plan") by Independent Examiner, John Slater, which was received by the Council on 23 April 2020.

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Bracknell Forest Council ("the Council") has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood (development) plans and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum.
- 1.2 This statement confirms that the recommendations proposed in the Examiner's report have been considered and accepted, that the Plan has been altered as a result of it, and that it may now be submitted to local referendum.

### **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Plan relates to the area that was designated by the Council as a Neighbourhood Area on 11 February 2014. The area coincides with the area covered by Bracknell Town Parish and is entirely within Bracknell Forest.
- 2.2 Bracknell Town Council undertook pre-submission consultation on the draft Plan in accordance with Regulation 14 between 9 June and 20 August 2018.
- 2.3 Following the submission of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan, the Council publicised the submitted Plan for a six-week period and representations were invited in accordance with Regulation 16. The publicity period was undertaken between 7 January and 18 February 2019.

### **3.0 INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION**

- 3.1 The Council appointed Mr John Slater, with the consent of Bracknell Town Council, to undertake the examination of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.
- 3.2 The independent examination of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan has comprised several stages:

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/data.pdf>  
(June 2021)

- Following an initial assessment of the plan and accompanying documents, the Examiner held a public hearing on 14 May 2019.
- Following the hearing, the Examiner issued 'Interim Conclusions' (June 2019), and gave the Town Council three options. The Town Council decided to follow option 1. This was to reconfigure the submitted documents.
- In response to the Examiner's 'Interim Conclusions', Bracknell Town Council submitted an amended Plan, and Schedule of Changes. The Examiner then issued 'Further Comments' (November 2019).
- A focused consultation in response to the amended plan was held between 18 November and 16 December 2019.
- Following the focused consultation, the Examiner issued a 'Mapping and Document Issues' document (February 2020), which required the Town Council to address some specific requirements before the Examiner could issue their final report.

3.3 The Examiner's final report was received on 23 April 2020. The report concluded that subject to making the modifications recommended by the Examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum. The Examiner also recommended that the referendum area be based on the Neighbourhood Area that was designated by the Council on 11 February 2014.

#### **4.0 DECISION AND REASONS**

4.1 Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) requires a local planning authority to outline what actions it is intending to take in response to the recommendations in an Examiner's report.

4.2 Having considered each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and the reasons for them, the Council, with the consent of Bracknell Town Council, has decided to accept the modifications to the submitted Plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Council is satisfied that, subject to those changes/modifications which it considers should be made to the Plan, as set out in tables below, that the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with the provision made by or under 61E(2), 61J and 61L of the said Act.

4.3 Table 2 also includes some further modifications agreed by the Council, with the consent of Bracknell Town Council, in accordance with paragraphs 58 and 142 of the Examiner's report. These provide clarity, relate to consequential changes (as a result of other changes to the Plan), or factual corrections/updates, which are considered to be minor modifications, which do not change the nature of the plan which was subject to examination.

4.4 The Council is also required to consider whether to extend the area to which the referendum is to take place under Regulation 18(1e). The Examiner recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum based on the area that was designated by Bracknell Forest Council as a Neighbourhood Area on 11 February 2014. The Council has considered this recommendation and the reasons for it and has decided to accept it. The referendum on the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan will be based on the designated Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Area.

- 4.5 Regulation 18(2) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) refers to the need to publish the 'Decision Statement' on a local planning authority's website and in such other manner as is considered likely to bring the 'Decision Statement' to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the Neighbourhood Area. Normally, in addition to placing documents on the Council's website, paper copies would be made available at the Council's offices in Bracknell, and at Bracknell Town's Council's offices. However, due to the current restrictions in relation to COVID-19, documents will only be available on Bracknell Forest Council's and Bracknell Town Council's websites. A copy of the Plan will be available in hard copy (viewable by appointment) at Bracknell Central Library (Town Square).

The links to the relevant sections of the Councils' websites are as follows:

- Bracknell Forest Council Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Area page:  
<https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/bracknell-town-neighbourhood-area>
- Bracknell Town Council Neighbourhood Plan page:  
<https://bracknelltowncouncil.gov.uk/bracknell/bracknell-town-neighbourhood-plan/>

**Table 1: Schedule of Examiner's recommended modifications, the Council's decision on each of these and justification/reason for this decision**

BTNP = Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan (Interim Report version)

NB: the following refers to the Examiner's wording. However, due to the recommended deletion and merging of some policies, in the referendum version of the Plan there has been consequential updates to the policy and map numbering, which is not reflected in Table 1.

<b>BTNP Policy/ Para.</b>	<b>Examiner's Report ref</b>	<b>Examiner's recommendation(s)</b> <b>(changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)</b>	<b>Council's decision</b>	<b>Justification/reason</b>
EV1	Paras. 70-72	Omit Jubilee Gardens from the open space designation.	Agree	The site forms an existing allocation, which has already been compensated through alternative space (known as Station Green). Would not meet basic conditions in terms of sustainable development and conformity with strategic policies if the open space designation is maintained on this specific site.
EV1	After para. 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retitle Policy EV1 as "Open Space of Public Value"</li> <li>• In the first paragraph delete "Active" and replace the remainder of the paragraph after "provision" with "as shown on the Policy EV1 Open Space of Public Value Map"</li> <li>• In the third paragraph delete "Active".</li> <li>• Delete the final paragraph of the policy</li> </ul>	Agree	<p>Planning control does not differentiate between different types of open space, and to have separate policies for active and passive open space would raise expectations on how different areas can be used. The NPPF also refers to 'open space'.</p> <p>Merging the two policies which are almost identical will also simplify the policies.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><del>Active OSPV</del> <b><u>Open Space of Public Value</u></b></p> <p>Development proposals are expected to retain all Active Open Space of Public Value provision <b><u>as shown on the Policy EV1 Open Space of Public Value Map.</u></b> <del>including parks, play areas and sports pitches in Bracknell Town.</del></p> <p>Where there is sufficient quantity of existing provision, contributions will be sought from development towards their improvement if the improvement increases the capacity of the provision to meet the needs of the development.</p> <p>Proposals that would result in the loss of <del>Active</del> Open Space of Public Value will only be supported when alternative public open space is provided to address both the existing area of open space lost and any additional open space needs created by the development</p> <p>Alternative public open space provision proposed as part of such development proposals will be required to meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the scale of alternative provision must be of at least an equivalent scale to the existing public open space provision and</li> </ul>		

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any alternative site must be of at least an equivalent standard, or better, in terms of layout to the existing public open space provision and</li> <li>• ancillary uses which are required to complement the provision of the open space must not significantly reduce the overall area of open space and</li> <li>• the location of the alternative provision must be generally accessible by foot and within or adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Bracknell Town.</li> </ul> <p><del>This policy excludes OSPV that is designated as a Local Green Space in Policy EV3</del></p>		
EV1 Policy map	After para. 75	On revised Policy EV1 map, show all designated sites as OSPV	Agree	Clarity
Policy overview map	After para. 75	<p>Amend the Policy Overview Map to reflect designation as OSPV rather than as Community Leisure Provision and remove that cross hatching from land which is also designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>(In para. 73 of the Examiner's report the Examiner specifically refers to:  <i>"I have seen that on the Policy Overview Map that two areas that are shown as Local Green Space, namely Lily Hill Park and South Hill Park are also cross shaded so as to be covered by this policy. As local green space designation confers a higher level of</i></p>	Agree	<p>For clarity and to avoid ambiguity in which sites the policy applies to.</p> <p>Some areas of open space are also shown as Local Green Space (namely Lily Hill Park and South Hill Park). As Local Green Space designation confers a higher level of protection, there is no benefit in protecting them by both policies.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<i>protection there is no benefit in protecting them by both this policy as well as Policy EV3.”)</i>		
EV2	After para. 75	<p>Delete Policy EV2</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><del>Policy EV 2</del> <del>Community Leisure Provision</del></p> <p><del>Passive OSPV (Open Space of Public Value)</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals are expected to retain passive OSPV provision.</del> <del>Where there is a sufficient quantity of existing provision, contributions will be sought from development towards their improvement if the improvement increases the capacity of the provision to meet the needs of the development.</del></p> <p><del>Proposals that would result in the loss of Passive Open Space of Public Value will only be supported when alternative public open space is provided to address both the existing area of open space lost and any additional open space needs created by the development.</del></p> <p><del>Alternative public open space provision proposed as part of such development proposals will be required to meet the following criteria:</del></p>	Agree	See above.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<del>1. the scale of alternative provision must be at least of an equivalent scale to the existing public open space provision and</del> <del>2. ancillary uses which are required to complement the provision of the open space must not significantly reduce the overall area of open space and</del> <del>3. any alternative site must be of at least an equivalent standard, or better, in terms of layout to the existing public open space provision and</del> <del>4. the location of the alternative provision must be generally accessible by foot and within or adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Bracknell Town</del>		
EV3	After para. 79	On Revised Policy EV3 Overview Map's key replace "Green Space Justification Areas" with "Local Green Spaces".	Agree	For clarity.
EV3	After para. 79	Replace the wording on the last paragraph with "New Development on these Local Green Spaces is ruled out except in very special circumstances"  <b>Amended Policy wording:</b>  Protection and Maintenance of Local Green Spaces  The following areas as shown on the policies maps are designated as Local Green Spaces:  A: South Hill Park B: Lily Hill Park C: Easthampstead Park D: Great Hollands Recreation Ground	Agree	To better reflect the form of wording set out in para. 76 of the 2012 NPPF.



BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p>E: Jurassic Park (Great Hollands Playing Fields)  F: Mill Park and Wildridings Playing Fields  G: Harmans Water Playing Fields and The Parks Playing Fields  H: Calfridus Way Playing Fields  I: Braybrooke Recreation Ground  J: Queensway and Brook Green  K: The Elms Park</p> <p><b><u>New Development on these Local Green Spaces is ruled out except in very special circumstances.</u></b></p> <p><del>Proposals for built development on these Local Green Spaces must be consistent with policy for Green Belts and will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of that Local Green Space.</del></p>		
EV4	After para. 83	On the Revised Policy EV4 Maps, remove all trees and TPO trees and only show the avenues of trees to be protected by the policy. If possible show the avenues at a larger scale.	Agree	For clarity, and to avoid ambiguity in where the Policy is to be applied.
EV4	After para. 83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the policy, replace “policy maps” with “Revised Policy Maps EV4 (or such number as allocated following rationalisation of the policy and plan numbering)”</li> <li>• After “possible” insert “and where it is appropriate”</li> </ul>	Agree	For clarity.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Tree Heritage: Avenues of Trees</p> <p>Development proposals will be required to recognise the heritage value of avenues of trees in Bracknell Town as shown in the <b><u>Revised Policy Maps EV4 (or such number as allocated following rationalisation of the policy and plan numbering)</u></b> <del>policy map</del> by incorporating them within landscape design and, wherever possible, <b>and where it is appropriate</b>, to create new avenues of trees, tree lined corridors for roads, footpaths and cycleways.</p>		
EV5	After para. 87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retitle Policy EV5 "Protection of trees"</li> <li>• Replace Policy EV5 with new wording.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><b><u>Protection of Trees</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Development proposals will be expected to retain all trees of in good condition and which possess amenity value, especially ancient trees, which either individually, or collectively, contribute to the sylvan character of the immediate area and the town in general.</u></b></p> <p><del>Tree Landscape Character</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals must maintain and enhance the treed landscape character and canopy cover of Bracknell New Town as</del></p>	Agree	<p>Three policies previously which could lead to uncertainty at the development management stage as to reason trees are being retained and protected (for example an ancient tree could add to the treed character of an area, which in turn contributes to the sylvan character of the area.</p> <p>Policies therefore split into two new policies, one relating to protection, and one relating to tree planting as part of development proposals.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><del>evident in the extent and variety of its original, inherited and current, New Town tree planting.</del></p> <p><del>Where new tree planting is provided, it must support the existing, natural, wooded character of Bracknell New Town by generally increasing the overall canopy cover and favouring native species unless alternatives are shown to be beneficial, for instance for disease tolerance or for specific landscape design.</del></p>		
EV6	After para. 87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retitle Policy EV6 New Tree Planting</li> <li>• Replace Policy EV6 with new wording.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><b><u>New Tree Planting</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Wherever possible and where appropriate, all new development, particularly at gateway locations, will be expected to incorporate tree planting within their landscaping proposals, including trees of an appropriate size and species, that can make a significant contribution to enhancing the sylvan character of the town, as well as add to the visual amenity of the immediate area."</u></b></p> <p><del>Tree Heritage Protection</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals in Bracknell Town must not damage or result in the loss of ancient trees or trees of good arboricultural and amenity value. Proposals should be designed to retain</del></p>	Agree	See above.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<del>ancient trees or trees of arboricultural and amenity value. In such circumstances, proposals, should be accompanied by an arboricultural survey that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees and that identifies and demonstrates that those proposals will not harm any important trees.</del>		
EV7	After para. 87	<p>Delete Policy EV7.</p> <p><b>Amended policy wording:</b></p> <p>Trees as a Visual Amenity</p> <p><del>Development proposals in Bracknell Town will be expected to retain all trees making a significant contribution to the visual amenity and character of the area. The significance of any mature trees should be established through an arboricultural survey.</del></p> <p><del>Wherever possible, proposed developments in Bracknell Town that will plant new trees in highly visible locations, especially at "gateways" to Bracknell Town, except where these would have a detrimental impact on views or light, and that will use tree species that have sufficient potential size and longevity to enable them to provide a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area will be supported.</del></p>	Agree	See above.
EV8	After para. 89	On the Policy Overview Map show the extent of the South Road allotment site.	Agree	For clarity, and to avoid ambiguity in where the Policy is to be applied.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
EV9	After para. 90	<p>Delete the second sentence of the policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Cemetery Space</p> <p>The provision of further cemetery space to serve the needs of the population of Bracknell Town will be strongly supported. <del>This applies specifically to land adjacent to Larges Lane Cemetery but does not exclude future proposals for land elsewhere.</del></p>	Agree	No evidence has been submitted to indicate that the specific site referred to is a viable or practical option.
EV11	After para. 94	<p>Reword Policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Air Quality  <u>Development proposals which introduce new sensitive receptors (for example new dwellings) within and adjacent to Air Quality Management Area(s) will be expected to demonstrate that UK legislative limits for human health can be met within the development.</u></p> <p><del>Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate the following:</del></p> <p>A. <del>1 It is not likely to result in the breach of European Union or of UK legislation limits for air pollution and</del></p>	Agree	<p>As originally drafted the policy placed onerous requirements on all development within Bracknell Forest, where as the focus is to address the impact of air quality on development within or adjacent to air quality management areas</p> <p>The policy also needs to retain flexibility to allow it to apply to any AQMA which may be designated in the future.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<del>B. 2 If such limits are likely to be breached, then measures will be expected to be put in place to adequately mitigate this impact and ensure that air pollution levels are maintained below the limit.</del>		
EV12	After para. 96	On Revised Policy EV12 Map remove the extent of the LGS designation and the green shading and the key "Area Covered by Title Deed BK 256982".	Agree	A policy that supports development proposals, albeit for use as an art centre/theatre, on green space with the highest level of protection, would be contradictory and result in inconsistencies in how different policies relating to same site are applied.  Leasehold/freehold are not matters of planning consideration.
EV12	After para. 96	Revise the policy after "Park" to insert "as shown on Policy EV12 Map"  <b>Amended Policy wording:</b>  Arts Centre: South Hill Park  Development proposals that will help to retain the use of South Hill Park <b>as shown on Policy EV12 Map</b> as an arts centre/theatre by continuing to provide high quality, accessible, cultural, community resources will be strongly supported.	Agree	For clarity.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
EV13	After para 98	<p>Reword policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Colocation of Community Facilities</p> <p><b><u>Development that will allow for the introduction of a mix of complementary uses alongside both present and future neighbourhood community facilities, which maintain and enhance their primary community support function, will be strongly supported.</u></b></p> <p><del>Development proposals for the colocation of existing and future neighbourhood community facilities in Bracknell Town will be strongly supported.</del></p>	Agree	Policy amended to avoid ambiguity, and make more explicit that a mixed-use aspiration is supported.
HE1	After para. 100	<p>Reword policy:</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Protection of Parks and of Parkland Features of Historic Parks and Gardens</p> <p><b><u>Proposals that contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of Bracknell Town's historic parks, Lily Hill Park, Easthampstead Park and South Hill Park, as shown on Map HE1 will be supported.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Where development proposals will affect the parks or their setting, they will be required to provide analysis of the</u></b></p>	Agree	<p>Amend to reflect the wording proposed by Historic England which sets out with greater clarity the tests that development that affect the parks should meet.</p> <p>Not necessary to differentiate between the status of the three Parks, nor duplicate references in the policy to particular aspects of significance that need to be protected as they are covered by other policies in the Plan (such as the avenue of</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b><u>potential impact of proposals on the significance of these parks as heritage assets, including effects on the value of access by the community.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Proposals in these areas will be expected to demonstrate that they have sought to avoid or minimise conflict between the conservation of these heritage assets and any aspect of the proposal.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Great weight will be given to the conservation of South Hill Park, Lily Hill Park and Easthampstead Park to be considered alongside other potential benefits of development.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Proposals that would harm the significance of any of these heritage assets will only be permitted where it can be robustly justified, on the basis of the need to provide public benefits that outweigh the harm and cannot otherwise be delivered in a less harmful way.</u></b></p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to ensure that they do not have a detrimental impact on the parks and on the parkland features in Bracknell Town's historic parks and gardens: Easthampstead Park, Lily Hill Park and South Hill Park.</p> <p>In particular this concerns the avenue (especially the entrance from Peacock Lane to Easthampstead Park Conference Centre), lake and woodland at Easthampstead Park Conference Centre adjacent to Jennets Park Country Park.</p>		trees at the approach to Easthampstead Park).



BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
HE1	After para. 100	Retitle Policy HE1, HE2 and HE3 Map as "Policy HE1 Protection of Parks and of Parkland Features of Historic Parks and Gardens Map"	Agree	For clarity.
HE2	After para. 105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retitle policy "Protection of the setting of Heritage Assets"</li> <li>• Reword the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><b><u>Protection of the setting of Heritage Assets</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Development proposals which cause substantial harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported unless substantial public benefits outweigh that harm. Where proposals will cause less than substantial harm, that harm must be weighed against the public benefits arising from the development.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Development affecting the setting of a locally listed building will be assessed having regard to the scale of any harm against the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Development proposals which affect the setting of a listed building will be expected to enhance that setting, including that of any historic parks and gardens, through careful consideration of building heights, layout and materials, appropriate use of landscape buffers and the placement of open space.</u></b></p>	Agree	<p>Policy amended to reflect that there are local listed buildings.</p> <p>In relation to impact of views on the significance of assets, this has been amended to more appropriately relate to the impact of tall buildings which will impact on the setting of assets, so reference to building heights has been included.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><del>Protection of Heritage Assets</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals will demonstrate that negative impacts to the setting of heritage assets have been either avoided or minimised. Where the harm of any residual impacts of a proposed scheme is not justified by the public benefits that would be provided, it will not be supported.</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals will be required to sustain and enhance the setting of heritage assets in their vicinity, including views from historic parks and gardens, through the careful choice of building heights, layout and materials, use of landscape buffers and placement of green open space. These should avoid placing incongruous tall buildings in prominent locations in views that contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.</del></p>		
HE3	After para. 108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retitle Policy "Protection of Heritage Assets"</li> <li>• In the first paragraph remove "both" as well as "and non-designated"</li> <li>• Add a new paragraph "Developments affecting non-designated heritage assets will be expected to balance the scale of any loss or harm and the significance of the building."</li> <li>• Delete the final paragraph of the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><del>Heritage Assets: Historic Buildings &amp; Their Settings</del></p>	Agree	<p>The policy does not align well with the NPPF, so amended to reflect the balance sought by para. 197 of the 2012 NPPF, so that the policy will meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Second paragraph deleted as it is factually incorrect as proposals affecting Easthampstead Park will have to have regard to other planning Policies, including those within this Plan.</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b><u>Protection of Heritage Assets</u></b></p> <p>Development affecting <del>both designated and non-designated</del> heritage assets within Bracknell Town must pay special regard to the need to conserve and enhance them, taking into account their significance and the contribution they make to their environment, their settings and any special architectural or historical features of significance.</p> <p><b><u>Developments affecting non-designated heritage assets will be expected to balance the scale of any loss or harm and the significance of the building.</u></b></p> <p><del>Development proposals affecting Easthampstead Park and elsewhere will only be considered subject to the requirements of this policy.</del></p>		
HO1	After para. 109	<p>In the first paragraph, omit "including extensions and outbuildings" and replace "protect" with "not unacceptably adversely impact on"</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Infill and Backland Development</p> <p>All infill and backland development, <del>including extensions and outbuildings</del>, and redevelopment will <del>protect</del> <b><u>not unacceptably adversely impact on</u></b> the amenity of neighbours and reflect the scale, mass, height and form of neighbouring properties.</p>	Agree	<p>Amended to better reflect the 2012 NPPF which states that one of the overarching planning principles is that planning should seek to maintain "a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land".</p> <p>Remit of the policy amended by removing reference to extensions and outbuildings which fall outside of the generally recognised remit of "infill and backland development".</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		It will have a similar form of development to properties in the immediate surrounding area. This is particularly important for applications for two or more dwellings on a site currently or previously occupied by a single property.		
HO2	After para. 114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the first paragraph replace “not be permitted unless” with “be supported if”</li> <li>• Delete the first bullet point.</li> <li>• Delete the fourth and fifth bullet point</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)</p> <p>Applications submitted for changes of use to houses in multiple occupation (HMO) will <del>not be permitted unless</del> <b>be supported if:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the building, adjacent buildings or local landscape context and</del></li> <li>• the design, layout and intensity of use of the building would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenities and</li> <li>• internal and external amenity space, refuse storage and car and bicycle parking would be provided at an appropriate quantity and would be of a high standard so as not to harm visual amenity and</li> <li>• <del>the proposal would not cause unacceptable highway problems and</del></li> <li>• <del>the proposal would not result in an over concentration of HMOs in any one area of the town, to the extent that it</del></li> </ul>	Agree	<p>As written the policy is drafted as a negative policy, which states that permission will not be granted unless... the objectives of the policy can be achieved by rewording in a positive manner namely that ‘permission will be granted if’. This would align with the requirements of the NPFP which state that plans should “positively support local development, shaping and directing development in the area”.</p> <p>As the policy relates to change of use of an existing property, it is not considered that the particular usage of the property would be capable of harming the appearance of the building, adjacent buildings or local landscape context, therefore first bullet point is deleted.</p> <p>In relation to the fourth bullet point, it is considered that the requirement</p>

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><del>would change the character of the area or undermine the maintenance of a balanced and mixed local community</del></p>		<p>not to cause unacceptable highway problems would be difficult to predict when compared to the potential occupancy of a C3 residential use, especially where adequate car parking is provided, and is therefore deleted.</p> <p>The final element relates to an over concentration of HMOs in any one area of town. However, the policy does not define what would constitute an "over concentration" and over what area that would be assessed, so is therefore deleted.</p>
HO3	After para. 116	<p>In D delete "comfortably"</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Driveways and Hardstandings on Front Gardens</p> <p>Where proposed work to a front garden of an existing dwelling requires a planning application, this should demonstrate that it will:</p> <p>A. preserve the local character of and be in keeping with the existing planting in the streetscape,</p>	Agree	Referring to the spaces being of a size to "comfortably accommodate" the proposed number of vehicles is unnecessary, as it is essentially too vague.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p>B. provide level access, where appropriate, ensuring safety and</p> <p>C. where possible, use a permeable surface to drain rainwater</p> <p>D. be of sufficient size to comfortably accommodate the proposed number of vehicles without resulting in the near or total loss of the existing garden features.</p>		
HO4	After para. 117	<p>Insert "residential" before "development"</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Managing the Streetscape</p> <p>New <b>residential</b> development proposals will be expected to provide well designed, integrated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• external amenity space and</li> <li>• waste and recycling storage and</li> <li>• car and bicycle parking, as required by the Bracknell Forest Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document or any successor document,</li> </ul> <p>to ensure a high quality and well managed, co-ordinated, streetscape.</p>	Agree	The policy as written applies to "all new development". The requirement to relate to external amenity space is imprecise, especially in terms of what is expected by the term integrated external area. Therefore the policy amended to relate to 'residential' development'
HO5	After para. 118	<p>Reword policy:</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p>	Agree	For clarity, so that the expectations of the policy are clear.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p>Private Gardens: Green infrastructure and biodiversity networks</p> <p><b><u>On all future residential development, including any infill development, the configuration of private gardens, and their means of enclosure, should provide a degree of connectivity to enable wildlife such as hedgehogs, to travel between gardens and onto any adjacent areas of green space.</u></b></p> <p><del>The layout of private gardens in all future development should help to ensure the biodiversity of green infrastructure by providing this through the physical, visual connectivity of their design as well as linkages to adjoining green infrastructure. In infill development this will be provided by maintaining any existing connectivity or by implementing it.</del></p>		
HO6	After para. 119	<p>Delete policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><del>Safety in design of tall buildings.</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals for buildings more than 5 storeys high should demonstrate that the design of the building maximises the safety of the occupants and users of the building in the event of an emergency.</del></p>	Agree	This is a matter which falls within the Buildings Regulations regime, so is not a matter dealt with under planning policy.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
HO8	After para. 123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace “density” with “grain of development”</li> <li>• After “proposals” insert “within the Bracknell Town neighbourhoods” and then delete the subsequent “Bracknell Town”</li> </ul> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Buildings: Local Character</p> <p>Development proposals <b><u>within Bracknell Town neighbourhoods</u></b> are expected to demonstrate that they are in keeping with the, footprint, separation, scale and bulk of the buildings to the density <b><u>grain of development</u></b>, footprint, separation, scale and bulk of buildings in the particular <del>Bracknell Town</del> neighbourhoods, including neighbouring properties in particular, unless it can be demonstrated that the proposed development would not harm local character.</p>	Agree	<p>Density is a crude a measurement, the objective can be achieved by use of ‘grain of development’.</p> <p>For clarity, and to avoid ambiguity in where the Policy is to be applied.</p>
EC2	After para. 126	<p>Replace “can be made” with “is available to serve the development”</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Micro and Small Businesses</p> <p>Development proposals to provide B1 class floor space, (either new provision or change of use), including serviced offices, that is suitable for micro businesses will be strongly supported, subject to demonstrating that appropriate parking provision <b><u>is available to serve the development.</u></b> <del>can be made.</del></p>	Agree	<p>The policy as written implies that all proposals must demonstrate that adequate appropriate parking provision can be made. It may well be that in some locations such as in the town centre or where there are units created through the change of use of existing buildings that it is sufficient for the applicant to demonstrate that appropriate parking provision is available.</p>



BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
EC4	After para. 128	That the extent of the two sites be shown on the Policy Overview Map.  (relates to Bracknell and Wokingham College, and Bracknell Open Learning Centre)	Agree	For clarity, and to avoid ambiguity in where the Policy is to be applied.
EC5	After para. 129	Delete "not included in the current regeneration" and insert "as shown on Plan Overview Map" and after "housing" insert "leisure, offices"  <b>Amended Policy wording:</b>  Town Centre Future Development Sites: Mixed Housing and Retail Uses  Development proposals in the town centre, <b><u>as shown on the Plan Overview Map</u></b> <del>not included in the current regeneration</del> , that incorporate a mix of uses such as housing, <b><u>leisure, offices,</u></b> and retail will be strongly supported.	Agree	Reference to 'current regeneration' removed as this was more applicable when the plan was first being drafted.  Policy expanded to include other uses appropriate within town centres.
EC6	After para. 130	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the first sentence after "should be" insert "capable of being".</li> <li>• Delete the second sentence and "In such circumstances" from the final sentence.</li> </ul>	Agree	The policy requires the actual connection to the superfast broadband network, which is beyond the remit of most developers. The provision of a service including the necessary wiring is a matter for the telecommunication provider. Therefore, it is only reasonable to require the necessary broadband infrastructure to be provided such as

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Broadband</p> <p>All new residential, commercial and community properties within the Neighbourhood Plan area should be <b>capable of being</b> served by a superfast broadband (fibre optic) connection. <del>The only exception will be where it can be demonstrated, through consultation, that this would not be either possible, practical or economically viable. In such circumstances,</del> Sufficient and suitable ducting should be provided within the site and to the property to facilitate ease of installation, at a future date, on an open access basis.</p>		ducting so that the property is capable of connection to the network.
TR2	After para. 132	<p>Replace "maintain" with "retain"</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Cycleways and Footpaths</p> <p>Development proposals are expected to <del>maintain</del> <b>retain</b> and, where possible, enhance, improve and complete, unfinished, existing, cycleways and footpaths to Bracknell Town Centre, schools and between them and residential neighbourhoods.</p>	Agree	For clarity – the policy relates to "development proposals" rather than any specific sites where existing cycleways run through the scheme, which are required to be retained.
TR3	After para. 134	That the final sentence be deleted.	Agree	There is no evidence to justify such contributions being required to make a development acceptable.

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s) (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Cycle Racks</p> <p>The provision of cycle racks in the following locations in particular: Bracknell Town Centre at the bus station and elsewhere, at all the Neighbourhood Shopping Centres, on the Western and Southern Employment Areas and at Braybrooke, Great Hollands and Mill Park Recreation Grounds will be strongly supported. <del>Contributions will be sought towards new provision and the improvement of existing facilities.</del></p>		
TR6	After para 137	<p>Delete policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p><del>Buses</del></p> <p><del>Further development proposals in Bracknell Town Centre will be expected to contribute to the maintenance of existing and to the provision of new bus services where appropriate.</del></p>	Agree	There is no evidence submitted as to the need for such a policy and how this would meet the tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
TR8	After para. 139	<p>Reword policy.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Road and Transport: Traffic and the Environment</p> <p><b><u>Where a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement identifies that the proposed development will have a severe</u></b></p>		Policy reworded so that expectations are clear, and aligns with national advice (para. 32 of the 2012 NPPF).

BTNP Policy/ Para.	Examiner's Report ref	Examiner's recommendation(s)  (changes to policy wording, bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Council's decision	Justification/reason
		<p><b><u>residual cumulative impact on the highway network, the developer will be expected to carry out or contribute to such highway improvements or such traffic management measures as are necessary to address the extent to which their development will exacerbate any existing issues, including those due to lack of capacity or congestion, in particular on the A322 and A329.</u></b></p> <p><del>Where a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is required for new development proposals, it should, to the satisfaction of the highway authority, directly address and mitigate any cumulative highway capacity and traffic management issues and any, if applicable, in particular in relation to "standing traffic" and congestion on the A322 and on the A329.</del></p>		

**Table 2: Schedule of the Council’s modifications in accordance with para. 142 of the Examiner’s report and any factual updates required together with the justification/reason for these.**

BTNP = Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan (Interim Report version)

NB: Due to the recommended deletion and merging of some policies (in line with the Examiner’s recommendations, set out in Table 1), there has been consequential updates to the policy and map numbering (including consequential changes to policy/plan numbering within the Examiners recommended Policy wording), which is not reflected in Table 2.

<b>BTNDP Policy/ Para.</b>	<b>Council’s modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)</b>	<b>Justification/reason</b>
Whole document	<p>Due to some policies being deleted and/or merged, throughout the document, policy numbers, associated maps and cross references have been updated/renumbered.</p> <p>Where a policy is to be deleted/merged, the associated supporting text has also been deleted. This also has a knock on implication for changes to pagination.</p> <p>(Every instance of a renumbering is not set out within this table).</p>	Consequential modification.
Whole document	Paragraph numbers added.	Editorial modification.
Whole documents	‘Interim report’ version has been substituted with ‘Referendum version’	Factual modification.
Foreword	Additional thank yous included	Do not relate to the main content of the Plan, therefore no implications.
Introduction	<p>‘A note on the future’ added:</p> <p><b><u>Under the 2020 Corona Virus pandemic UK lockdown, during the final revision of this document prior to Referendum, now delayed until 06 May 2021, the Bracknell New Town heritage of extensive landscaping</u></b></p>	Does not relate to the main content of the Plan, therefore no implications.

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<p><u>is definitely proving its worth to its residents. Whilst the UK New Town movement which inspired it did not want to return to the worst aspects of the design of some cities and their living conditions due to the C19th Industrial Revolution, none of its proponents could have foreseen quite how vital the public open space layouts they fought for would be for this country's increased population during this epidemic, an event outside the statistical norm, which, according to Mark Harrison's Disease and the Modern World, is one of the principal threats to the order and prosperity of modern states as it involves person to person transmission.</u></p> <p><u>When the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group started work, it asked our town's residents why they valued its green spaces and, while some of the answers clearly conveyed that they were very agreeable added extras, no one then thought that, later on, in 2020 &amp; in 2021, our green spaces would be there for us, essential for everyone's wellbeing, ready to be cycled through and walked in during the daily hour of exercise allowed under emergency legislation.</u></p> <p><u>What changes will now follow the biggest economic annual decline in 300 years to where people will work, how often they will travel to work and what form retail will take, for instance, are yet to be seen and it will be for those who undertake the implementation and monitoring of this 2016-2036 BTNP to face the challenge of adapting to them in the future of Bracknell Town</u></p> <p><u>According to Bill Gates' book How to Avoid a Climate Disaster, failing to remove the 51bn tonnes of greenhouse gases from the atmosphere every year would cost more than the 1.5 million lives already lost to Covid 19...Gates calculates that using more renewables and fewer</u></p>	

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification  (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<p><b><u>fossil fuels would account for 27% of the reduction needed in carbon emissions, changing how we would manufacture our goods (31%), growing our food (18%), travel (16%) &amp; keeping our buildings warm or cool (6%) so this an even bigger challenge for those who revise our plan and adapt its policies accordingly.</u></b></p>	
Supporting text to EV1	<p>Information note added to explain the position in relation to Jubilee Gardens (to be added after policy justification section, and before Policy):</p> <p><b><u>Information Note</u></b>  <b><u>: Play, Open Space and Sports Study for Bracknell Forest (2016-2036) August 2017, p51 Summary of Policy Recommendations 3 refs. &amp; also p140 Recommendations for new planning policies and guidance. The definition of Open Space of Public value in sections i &amp; ii to the word 'life' is referred to in para 64 of Examiner J Slater's BTNP Report 23 April 2020.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Para 70 refers to Jubilee Gardens &amp; to Station Green &amp; in para 72 refers to Bracknell Forest Local Plan p 146 Proposal PEii Land at the South of Bracknell Town Centre and its paras 9.15 to 9.21 (especially 9.21) referring in particular to the words "to provide a suitable amount of replacement open space. Jubilee Gardens is registered as BK285414: land on the North West Side of the Ring Bracknell &amp; as BK288580: Jubilee Gardens, The Ring, Bracknell and Station Green is registered as :BK471941: land At, Replacement Park Station Road, Bracknell. Jubilee Gardens: POSS site 72, has been deleted from the BTNP Referendum version Appendices 5.2, 5.21, 5.22 &amp; 5.23 where Station Green: POSS site 355 is already listed. The EV1 Policy Map has also been amended</u></b></p>	Consequential change to the Plan to be consistent with Examiner's recommendation in relation to removing open space on this site, and to provide information.

<b>BTNDP Policy/ Para.</b>	<b>Council's modification</b> <b>(bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)</b>	<b>Justification/reason</b>
EV1 Map (open space)	Policy Map within the Plan.  Remove open space areas relating to:  South Hill Park (open space numbers on plan: 369, 126a, 126b, 17, 125 and 206) Lily Hill Park (open space number on plan: 83)	Consequential change to the Plan to be consistent with Examiner's recommendation in relation to removing open space designation from Lily Hill Park and South Hill Park, which are also covered by a Local Green Space designation.
EV1 appendices in 5.2	Appendices updated to remove reference to Jubilee Gardens and open spaces associated with South Hill Park and Lily Hill Park.	Consequential change to the Plan to be consistent with Examiner's recommendations.
Policy justification for EV3  Page 9 of 34	Remove text at bottom of page:  <del>Appendices 4,3,2 &amp; 1 were created in the chronology described in Appendix 11 Bracknell Neighbourhood Plan: meetings &amp; consultations list which contains the data used for the Consultation Statement &amp; Appendix 12 Dear Resident BTC Website/Social media NP Content is self-explanatory.</del>	Consequential change to the Plan as result of deleting Appendix 11 and 12.
EV4 (avenue of trees)  Page 12 of 34	Additional text added to describe the pictures of the three trees:  <b><u>The three trees illustrated above, that is the Cedar, the Lucombe Oak and the ancient Yew tree, are clear examples of the crucial importance of the retention of ancient trees of arboricultural and amenity value.</u></b>	Factual modification – provides explanation of what the photos are – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
EV5 (tree protection)	Additional text added:  <b><u>However, it is relevant at this point to include a caveat in this plan and to say that, since many of the trees we continue to fell are older</u></b>	Consequential modification as a result of the previous three policies being split, and merged into two new policies - does not affect the nature of the Plan.



BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
Page 17 of 34	<p><u>specimens, we must also understand what proper compensation looks like, according to author and biologist Amy-Jane Beer who goes on to say that replacing a 150yr old beech or even a youthful 50 yr old pine with a single sapling, with slim chances of growing to a similar age and stature, is an almost meaningless gesture. We should be planting, or encouraging the natural regeneration of dozens of replacements for every mature tree felled to achieve some kind of balance.</u></p>	
EV5	<p>Deletion of word 'of' within first sentence</p> <p>Wording below reflects the Examiner's recommendations as set out in Table 1, further changes to the Examiner's working are shown as strikethrough text:</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Protection of Trees</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to retain all trees <del>of</del> in good condition and which possess amenity value, especially ancient trees, which either individually, or collectively, contribute to the sylvan character of the immediate area and the town in general.</p>	<p>Editorial modification to improve the readability of the Policy – does not affect the nature of the Plan.</p>
EV6	<p>Added in reference to 'suitable longevity' to policy wording, and correct use of word 'planning' and change to 'planting'.</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording (to also reflect Examiner's recommendations, as set out in Table 1):</b></p> <p>New Tree Planting</p>	<p>Consequential modification as a result of changes to the tree policies overall. This does not fundamentally change the aim of the policy or policy requirements, but provides further clarity in the application of the policy - does not affect the nature of the Plan.</p>

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	Wherever possible and where appropriate, all new development, particularly at gateway locations, will be expected to incorporate tree <del>planting</del> <b>planting</b> within their landscaping proposals, including trees of an appropriate size and species <u>of suitable longevity</u> , that can make a significant contribution to enhancing the sylvan character of the town, as well as add to the visual amenity of the immediate area.	
EV11 map (air quality)	Added on air quality monitoring points to this map and Policy (Parish) overview map.	Factual modification to provide clarity where monitoring points are locations – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Section 4 - Heritage	This section has been reworked in order to improve the flow of the chapter – text largely relates to Interim Report text, which has been re-ordered.	Consequential modification as a result of changes to the heritage policies - does not affect the nature of the Plan.
HE1	<p>Pluralise word 'setting' in second paragraph, and pluralise word 'proposal' in third paragraph.</p> <p>Wording below reflects the Examiner's recommendations as set out in Table 1, further changes to the Examiner's working are shown as bold/underline:</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording:</b></p> <p>Protection of Parks and of Parkland Features of Historic Parks and Gardens</p> <p>Proposals that contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of Bracknell Town's historic parks, Lily Hill Park, Easthampstead Park and South Hill Park, as shown on Map HE1 will be supported.</p>	Editorial modification to improve the readability of the Policy – does not affect the nature of the Plan.

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<p>Where development proposals will affect the parks or their settings<del>s</del>, they will be required to provide analysis of the potential impact of proposals on the significance of these parks as heritage assets, including effects on the value of access by the community.</p> <p>Proposals in these areas will be expected to demonstrate that they have sought to avoid or minimise conflict between the conservation of these heritage assets and any aspect of the proposals<del>s</del>.</p> <p>Great weight will be given to the conservation of South Hill Park, Lily Hill Park and Easthampstead Park to be considered alongside other potential benefits of development.</p> <p>Proposals that would harm the significance of any of these heritage assets will only be permitted where it can be robustly justified, on the basis of the need to provide public benefits that outweigh the harm and cannot otherwise be delivered in a less harmful way.</p>	
HE2	<p>Pluralise word 'setting' in policy title.</p> <p>Wording below reflects the Examiner's recommendations as set out in Table 1, further changes to the Examiner's working are shown as bold/underline:</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording title:</b></p> <p>Protection of the settings<del>s</del> of Heritage Assets</p>	Editorial modification to improve the readability of the Policy – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Supporting text for	Additional text added:	Factual modification/consequential modification to reflect matters which were

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
Policy HE2 and HE3  (Page 10 of 12 )	<p><b><u>With regard to other heritage assets in Bracknell Town, on 22 October 2019, Bracknell Forest Council's Executive approved item 8, the Local List of Buildings and Structures of Local Architectural or Historic Interest, which designated the following buildings within the plan area as locally listed buildings:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Larges Lane Cemetery, Bracknell, RG12 9AL</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Downshire Arms, Downshire Way, Bracknell, RG12 7AA</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Lily Hill House, Lily Hill Road, Bracknell, RG12 25J</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Market Inn, Station Road, Bracknell, RG12 1HY</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Ranelagh School, Ranelagh Drive, Bracknell, RG12 9DA</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>Spring Lanes House, 10 Holly Spring Lane, Bracknell, RG12 2JL</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>The Boot, Park Road, Bracknell, RG12 2LU</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>The Royal Oak, London Road, Bracknell, RG12 2NN</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>The Green Man, Crowthorne Road, Bracknell, RG12 7DL</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>taken into account by the Examiner (see para. 103 of the Examiner's report).</p> <p>Also provides clarification in relation to the application of the reworded policies, following the Examiner's recommendations (which now refer to non-designated assets and locally listed buildings).</p> <p>This information was unable to be included in the 'Interim report' version of the Plan, as at that point BFC had not published the Local List – does not affect the nature of the Plan.</p>
HO1	<p>Add the word 'will' between 'the amenity of neighbours' and 'reflect the scale'...</p> <p><b>Amended Policy wording (to also reflect Examiner's recommendations set out in Table 1):</b></p> <p>Infill and Backland Development</p> <p>All infill and backland development, <del>including extensions and outbuildings,</del> and redevelopment will <del>protect</del> <b>not unacceptably adversely impact on</b> the amenity of neighbours and <b>will</b> reflect the scale, mass, height and form of neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Editorial modification to improve the readability of the Policy – does not affect the nature of the Plan.</p>

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification <b>(bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)</b>	Justification/reason
	It will have a similar form of development to properties in the immediate surrounding area. This is particularly important for applications for two or more dwellings on a site currently or previously occupied by a single property.	
Supporting text for Policy HO2  (page 3 of 20)	<b>Additional text added:</b>  Using an Article 4 Direction would be a proactive measure supported by the BTNP. <b><u>BFC has not designated an Article 4 Direction which removes the permitted development rights for the change of use from Use Class C3 to Use Class C4.</u></b>	Consequential modification to reflect matters which were taken into account by the Examiner (see para. 114 of the Examiner's report). This is a matter of fact – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
HO2	Remove the word 'and' from last bullet point of Examiner's modified Policy.  <b>Amended Policy wording (to also reflect Examiner's recommendations set out in Table 1):</b>  Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)  Applications submitted for changes of use to houses in multiple occupation (HMO) will <del>not be permitted unless</del> <b><u>be supported if:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the building, adjacent buildings or local landscape context and</del></li> <li>• the design, layout and intensity of use of the building would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenities and</li> <li>• internal and external amenity space, refuse storage and car and bicycle parking would be provided at an appropriate quantity and would be of a high standard so as not to harm visual amenity. <del>and</del></li> <li><del>• the proposal would not cause unacceptable highway problems and</del></li> </ul>	Consequential modification to reflect that the preceding bullet points have been deleted from the Policy in line with Examiner's recommendations – does not affect the nature of the Plan.

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>the proposal would not result in an over concentration of HMOs in any one area of the town, to the extent that it would change the character of the area or undermine the maintenance of a balanced and mixed local community</del></li> </ul>	
Supporting text for HO8 (buildings of local character) (page 19 of 20)	<p>Changes to the list of definitions referred to in the supporting text (and also rearranged into alphabetical order):</p> <p>Definitions: included here where relevant especially for the residents reading this community plan :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulk: the composition &amp; shape of a building's massing.</li> <li>• Character : term relating to the appearance of any place in terms of its landscape or the layout of streets and open spaces, giving it a distinct identity</li> <li><del>• Density: dwelling density: the no. of dwellings per hectare.</del></li> <li>• Design: the plan of a building.</li> <li>• Footprint : the area on a project site that is used by the building structure and is defined by the perimeter of the building plan. Parking lots, landscapes and other non building facilities are not included in the building footprint.</li> <li>• Landscape Character Assessment: a process of identifying and describing variations in the character of the landscape. It seeks to identify &amp; explain why an area is distinctive.</li> <li>• Scale: the relative dimensions of a building.</li> <li>• Separation: the space between buildings</li> <li>• Townscape : the planning and building of structures in a town or city.</li> <li>• <b><u>To define “grain of development, see This hierarchy of definitions:</u></b></li> </ul>	Consequential modifications to provide a definition of the terms included in the reworded policy (which has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations – see Table 1).

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Layout = urban structure, urban grain, urban density and mix</u></li> <li>• <u>Scale : density &amp; mix, height &amp; massing, building type, façade &amp;</u></li> <li>• <u>Interface</u></li> <li>• <u>Appearance : building type, façade &amp; interface</u></li> <li>• <u>Public Realm : façade &amp; interface, details &amp; materials, streetscape &amp; landscape</u> <a href="https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/councillorsguide-to-urban-design.pdf">https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/councillorsguide-to-urban-design.pdf</a> refers and see</li> <li>• <u>Urban grain : The nature and extent of the subdivision of the area into smaller development parcels showing: • The pattern and scale of streets, blocks and plots • The rhythm of building frontages along the street as a reflection of the plot subdivision</u></li> </ul>	
Introduction to Economy section 7  Page 2 of 16)	Additional text included:  <b><u>The Ministry of Housing, Communities &amp; Local Government Council Tax data for local precepting authorities 2020-21 shows Bracknell as no 16 after Weymouth, Chippenham, Salisbury City Council, Weston Super Mare, Dunstable, Central Swindon South, Leighton Linlade, Falmouth, Trowbridge, Banbury, Truro, Sutton Coldfield, Lowestoft, St Neots &amp; Newquay.</u></b>	Explanatory modification – provides some context on Bracknell in relation to other towns - does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Supporting text to EC3  (page 7 of 16)	Amendments to text:  Jennett's Park has been added to the New Town with a school and community centre <del>but negotiations are still on-going to provide 1 shop</del> <b>and,</b>	Factual modification to reflect the current position – does not affect the nature of the Plan.

BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<b><u>after prolonged negotiations, now have a food shop and an estate agent's office opposite the school.</u></b>	
Supporting text to EC4 (page 9 of 16)	Amendments to text:  The Brakenhale School formally became an academy with the Greenshaw Learning Trust on 1st April 2016. <b><u>The school has now been rebuilt.</u></b>	Factual modification to reflect the current position – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Supporting text to EC5	Amendments to text:  This policy is suggesting that adding more sites of mixed, complementary uses into the town centre will improve the type of environment the new residents of high density dwellings will be living in - all day - every day. <b><u>Countryside Properties plc has 392 Bracknell plots in its landbank, according to its latest set of accounts p36.</u></b>	Factual modification – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Supporting text to TR5	Amendments to text:  <b><u>There have been several attempts to have “walking buses” to help pupils to walk to school together under supervision.</u></b>	Factual modification – does not affect the nature of the Plan.
Appendix 3 & 4	Note to be added to Appendix contents relating to Appendix 3 and 4 that that information will be available electronically:  3. Appendix 3 EV2 Protection & Maintenance of Local Green Space: Justification A to K Ownership Spreadsheet: see Policy Justification PRINTING NOTE too large for A4 printing so do on BFC 2 x 4 ft format printer see <a href="mailto:simon.cridland@bracknell-forest.gov.uk">simon.cridland@bracknell-forest.gov.uk</a> <b><u>so kept for electronic reference only when needed. (Available by request from Bracknell Town Council).</u></b>	Explanatory modification, as copies of the information will not form part of the printed/electronic version of the Plan, and are available upon request from Bracknell Town Council.



BTNDP Policy/ Para.	Council's modification (bold/underline is amended text, strike through relates to deleted text)	Justification/reason
	<p>4. Appendix 4 Policy EV2 Protection &amp; Maintenance of Local Green Space: Justification A to K List of BK Title registers, plans &amp; screenshots: see Policy Justification PRINTING NOTE : <del>this was done by assembling the titles of all files in the folder not the contents</del></p> <p><b><u>The large folder called Appendix 4 Policy EV2 P &amp; M of LGS Justification A to K List of BK Title registers, plans &amp; screenshots contains all the Appendix 4 individual electronic files of either BK title register entries, plans or screenshots of large plans but is kept for electronic reference only, when needed. (Available by request from Bracknell Town Council). It is indexed as the file called Appendix 4.1 in screenshots ready for printing 20 Feb 2021 used here for printing as A4 landscape &amp; for inclusion in Document 2.</u></b></p>	
Appendix 10 & 11	Appendices relating to previous consultation material have been deleted from the referendum version of the Plan, and consequential update to rename former Appendix 13 and Appendix 11	Factual modification: these appendices relate to an earlier version of the Plan to demonstrate that appropriate public engagement had taken place, which is not necessary to include in the referendum version of the Plan.