



# Statement of Consultation

# Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document

Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework  
[www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/amencorner](http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/amencorner)

March 2010

**ANNEX 3**  
**Statement of Consultation**  
**Regulation 18(4)(b)**  
**Amen Corner**  
**Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft**  
**(November 2009)**

## **1. Background**

Bracknell Forest Council produced a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) called the Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Draft (December 2009). It was published for public consultation between 30 November 2009 and 14 January 2010. Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 requires that prior to adoption of the a statement be published summarising who has been consulted during the preparation of an SPD, how consultation has taken place, and how any issues raised have been addressed.

## **2. Consultation**

In the preparation of the Amen Corner SPD Bracknell Forest Council has comprehensively consulted with a range of key and statutory organisations to help assess the scope of the SPD, the consultation included:

- Land owners.
- Prospective Developers.
- Statutory bodies and organisations.
- The general public.
- Others with an interest in the site.

There have been a number of consultations on the Amen Corner Area Action Plan which have been carried forward into the preparation of the Amen Corner SPD. The Amen Corner SPD, has therefore been informed by the following consultations:

1. Area Action Plan Newsletter (July 2007);
2. Area Action Plan Issues and Options (December 2007);
3. Area Action Preferred Options (June 2008);
4. Area Action Plan Draft Submission Report (February 2009); and,
5. The Consultation Draft SPD (December 2009).

Details of all previous consultation on the Area Action Plan and to the Amen Corner SPD Consultation Draft are available online at [www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/aclibrary](http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/aclibrary) under specific ACL reference, with each detailed in:

- Doc Ref ACL16 – Amen Corner Area Action Plan Report of consultation at Regulation 25 (May 2008) which details response to stages 1 and 2 above. .
- Doc Ref ACL27 –Amen Corner Area Action Plan Regulation 30 1 d Statement of Consultation (January 2009) which details responses to stage 3 above.
- Doc Ref ACL53 – Amen Corner SPD Consultation Draft Regulation 17 (1)(b) Statement of Consultation (November 2009) which details responses to stage 4 above.

In accordance with regulation 18(4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 in respect to the Amen Corner SPD Consultation Draft (stage 5 above):

- Details of who has been consulted on the SPD Consultation Draft and how they were consulted can be viewed in the ACSPD Consultation Proforma (Doc Ref ACL56).
- Details of the responses made to the consultation and how they have been taken account of in the Adopted SPD are detail in Appendix 1 of this statement.

## Amen Corner

### Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft (December 2009) Consultation representations and responses

*Amen Corner SPD Consultation Draft (November 2009)* was the subject of a public consultation in December and January 2009/2010. This paper details feedback from the consultation process and highlights amendments that have been made to the document in light of comments received.

Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft (November 2009)

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
<b>1. Surrey County Council</b>	We had no concerns when consulted over the previous versions for the Amen Corner area. Similarly, in respect of the draft SPD now to hand, due to the location of the Amen Corner site in relation to Surrey, we have no concerns.	<b>Comment:</b> No concerns raised <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary
<b>2. The Coal Authority</b>	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	<b>Comment:</b> No concerns raised <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary
<b>3. Wokingham Borough Council</b>	Paragraph 8.4 (4). Should refer to development principle AC5 and not AC4;	<b>Comment:</b> Comment partly agreed as Point 4 should cross reference with both Development Principles AC4 and AC5 to make the SPD correct. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend Point 4 of Paragraph 8.4 to read as: "The enhancement of the public rights of way alongside the strip of land described in Point 3 above

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
		which is located in Bracknell Forest Borough and in the Amen Corner site (to be delivered through Development Principles <u>AC4 and AC5</u> above in this <del>SPD Consultation Draft</del> )." )"
	Paragraph 10.3. Second sentence should refer to "Supplementary Planning Document" and not "Area Action Plan".	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the term Area Action Plan should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to paragraph 10.3 to read as "It is the Council's preference to provide a solution prior to the adoption of the <del>Area Action Plan</del> <b>Supplementary Planning Document</b> ."
	Paragraph 13.1. Penultimate sentence should refer to "Development Principles AC3 and AC8" and not "Policies AC3 and AC8".	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed and this should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date. <b>SPD Response: Amend the penultimate sentence in Paragraph 13.1 to read as:</b> "Until North View and South View are redeveloped the area should be enhanced so that the quality of life for the existing residents is improved in line with <del>Policies</del> <b>Development Principles AC3 and AC8</b> ."
	Paragraph 13.2. Second sentence should refer to "Supplementary Planning Document" and not "Area Action Plan".	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the term Area Action Plan should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the second sentence in paragraph 13.2 to read as: "However, at this time it is not certain if or when this land will come forward for redevelopment and therefore there is a need for flexibility in the <del>Area Action Plan</del> <b>Supplementary Planning Document</b> ."
	Paragraph 14.7, eighth bullet - The Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) has been replaced by the South East Plan. Make a similar correction to the next bullet.	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed and this should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the 8 <sup>th</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup> bullet points to read as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment is consistent with the economic</li> </ul>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
		<p>approach in <del>Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9)</del> <b>the South East Plan</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment complements the suite of employment related policies including those at a sub-regional level in the <del>emerging</del> South East Plan.</li> </ul>
	<p>Paragraph 16.4. Last sentence should refer to Development Principle AC13 and not AC12.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed and this should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the last sentence of paragraph 16.4 to read as: “ These have informed Development Principle AC12- <b>AC13</b> below.”</p>
	<p>There is no appendix 2 included in the document.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is an appendix 2 in the appendices document.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><b>Paragraph 5.15 (1)(B) indicates that a new primary school could be delivered in the vicinity of the site. To minimise risk that people may travel to Wokingham Borough’s primary schools, the maximum distance of an alternative site should be specified. This distance should not exceed the maximum appropriate for primary school aged children to walk to from the site.</b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The new primary school will need to serve the development and therefore the intention is that it is within walking distance. Therefore for clarification purposes, a sentence will be added to ensure this intention is stated in the SPD.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new sentence to paragraph 5.5 Option B which reads as: “This distance should not exceed the maximum appropriate for primary school aged children to walk to and from the site.”</p>
	<p><b>Paragraph 14.4. The Council would support high quality employment at Amen Corner to ensure that the mix of uses proposed is appropriate to a site bordering residential uses.</b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comment  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p>
	<p><b>Paragraph 14.9. The Council considers that additional employment on the Hewlett Packard Recreation Ground where its impacts upon the transport network (including Wokingham</b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comment  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>Borough) have been appropriately addressed. This could include further highway improvements on an enhanced travel plan.</p>	
	<p>Concept masterplan. This should be amended to indicate that the areas for residential development do not coincide with the borough boundary thereby indicating areas to maintain settlement separation within Bracknell Forest Borough as required by their Core Strategy (policies CS4 and CS9).</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The Concept Plan demonstrates that the development can be achieved and does not prescribe the extent of the layout of development as prescribed by the development principles AC4 and 5. However it is agreed that clarification could be added to the Plan.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the Concept Plan to show the residential elements will not coincide with the Borough Boundary.</p>
	<p>Comments on the appendix 1 Green Infrastructure (Development Principle AC4). Additional line should be inserted to commit developer to submit a planning application to Wokingham Borough Council to deliver Passive open space on the Wokingham Countryside strip (in line with paragraph 7.7 of the draft SPD). This should be timed so that it can be delivered in tandem with proposals covered by the SPD. However, the inclusion of this statement within the SPD should not fetter any decision that Wokingham Borough Council may take upon such an application. The Council supports the statements in Development Principle AC2 (1) and (4) regarding the need to timely deliver adequate primary and secondary school capacity within Bracknell Forest to support the development.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Agreed and additional text should be added for clarification purposes.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend Appendix 1 to read as: "It should be noted that in respect to the Wokingham Countryside Strip a planning application shall be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council to deliver Passive open space (in line with paragraph 7.7 of the SPD)."</p>
	<p>Additionally, the Council supports the following:  1) Development Principle AC5, together with</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>other statements in the draft Supplementary Planning Document highlighting the importance of maintaining and enhancing the strategic gap between Bracknell/Binfield and Wokingham thereby ensuring there separate identities.</p> <p>2) The expectations of Bracknell Forest Borough Council that appropriate primary and secondary education provision will be delivered within Bracknell Forest Borough in accordance with Development Principle AC2 (1) and (4);</p> <p>3) The contributions towards the delivery of transport improvements in Wokingham Borough necessitated by the development. These are likely to include to public transport together with works to Coppid Beech roundabout (Development Principles AC12 and AC13(4) respectively).</p>	
4. English Heritage	I write to inform you that English Heritage has no comments to make on the consultation drafts.	<p><b>Comment:</b> No concerns raised</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p>
5. Natural England	<p>7. Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character</p> <p>Natural England are pleased to see this chapter within the document. There is a need to consider how these developments could contribute to enhancing existing open spaces in terms of quality, accessibility and biodiversity value, contribute to ongoing management, and also how such spaces may be better linked to provide corridors for the</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is supporting. The Council will endeavour to meet other standards of provision, including the ANGST standards. Provision of natural greenspaces in urban areas is provided through the Council's standards for Open Space of Public Value which will be a requirement of this development.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>



Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>movement of people and wildlife.</p> <p>We would also like to draw your attention to ANGST Standards set out in English Nature Research Report No. 153: 'Accessible natural greenspace in towns and cities: A review of appropriate size and distance criteria, Guidance for the preparation of strategies for local sustainability' (1995), which define accessibility standards for access to semi-natural wildlife rich spaces in towns and cities. It is important that similar standards are applied in Bracknell.</p> <p>Other forms of green infrastructure such as green roofs could also be considered. Natural England believes that the provision of green infrastructure should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities throughout England. Networks of multi-functional greenspace providing a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits should be identified in regional and local plans and designed into all major new development and regeneration schemes from their outset. Green roofs offer a number of environmental benefits including improving air quality and reducing the risk of flooding by absorbing the worst of the weather. In ecological terms, a green roof is one that supports a community of plants and their associated wildlife. Under most circumstances roofs will colonise naturally, of course, and it is not unusual to see lichens and mosses taking a foothold on many houses or sheds. However, the slow-growing nature</p>	<p></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is supporting and the intention of Development Principle AC4 is to achieve exactly the aim of Natural England in this respect. Paragraphs 7.26 and 9.7 specify that the urban contribution to biodiversity will be made through a range of measures such as green roofs.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>of many of these species means that they rarely get the opportunity to become well-established before the man-made material of the roof requires replacing. Low maintenance roof top gardens can make a significant contribution to the survival of Britain's native plants.</p>	
	<p>Street trees can form an attractive and functional element of urban streets, helping to define their character. Planting should be of native species with a continuous canopy if possible. This will maximise the habitat potential for birds and insects. Street trees should be planted as semi mature standards at around 10 years old, as at this age they are less easily vandalised. Natural England note that they are discussed in paragraph 9.7 from the Biodiversity section of the document.</p> <p>We draw your attention to the South East Green Infrastructure Framework which was finalised at the beginning of July 2009. This will offer you regional advice and guidance on the matter</p> <p>We also draw your attention to the document below regarding climate change. Green Infrastructure can have a positive impact on many aspects of climate change, and Natural England recommend you consider this document with regard this particular section of the SPD.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is supporting and the intention of Development Principle AC4 is to achieve exactly the aim of Natural England in this respect. Paragraphs 7.26 and 9.7 specify that the urban contribution to biodiversity will be made through a range of measures such as native tree planting</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><b>10. Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area</b></p> <p>Natural England are pleased to see the progress being made in terms of mitigating for likely significant</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is a supporting comment.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>effects upon the integrity of the SPA generated by this proposal. We are happy for this document to continue to remain flexible in terms of what approach is taken. We do wish to remain fully engaged with this proposal and are happy to offer advice and visit the mitigation sites when necessary.</p>	
	<p>10.8 – Natural England are pleased to see the inclusion of the emerging Strategic Access Management and Monitoring measures mitigation technique. We understand this will hopefully go live around April 2010.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is a supporting comment. <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><b>Appendix 2 – Appropriate Assessment</b></p> <p>Natural England acknowledge for this document that the Habitats Regulations Assessment has not currently been updated. Once a mitigation proposal has been decided upon, this will need to be updated to reflect this. Again Natural England are happy to remain fully engaged in this process.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> A revised Appropriate Assessment is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report which gives more details on the solution. Further work on development the SANG will also be required such as a management Plan etc. <b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new text at the end of paragraph 10.3 which reads as: "<b><u>The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report provides a revised Appropriate Assessment for Development Principle AC7 and it is recognised that further Appropriate Assessment is necessary to provided more detail to the SANG solution advocated in Development Principle AC7 to inform for example, the production of a Management Plan. This work will be continued to support the production of an Amen Corner Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.</u></b>"</p>
<p><b>6. Ascot and Bracknell District CPRE</b></p>	<p>Section 14 Employment Provision - The committee is concerned that no reference is made specifically to the need to provide small units especially small</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Development Principle AC11 does not preclude the provision of smaller employment provision revised Appropriate Assessment is included</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	workshop units. There is reference to small commercial units in the Local Centre but this may not be the appropriate location for units of the workshop type. This committee would like to see this recognised in Development Principle AC11 - Employment Provision.	in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report which gives more details on the solution. Further work on development the SANG will also be required such as a management plan etc. <b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new text at the end of paragraph 10.3 which reads as
<b>7. Resident (Linda Cooper- Dellow, Beehive Road, Binfield)</b>	<u>Consultation Draft document</u> 3.3 – the possibility of using the land at Farley Wood for the provision of a railway halt - this land is too far from the railway to be practical for this use.  - this land is too close to existing residential development for change of use to a railway halt.  - the existing Farley Wood site and the land around it is required for the use of the community. Other parts of the plan indicate the need to grow these facilities. The use of some land for a railway halt will take away valuable space for growth of community facilities.  - the land for HP recreation is much more suitable as railway station as it is next to the railway and further from residential development.  - I therefore object to the proposed use of the Farley Wood land for a railway halt	<b>Comment:</b> Comment agreed the text relating to a railway halt is a typo and paragraph 3.3 is corrected accordingly. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the second paragraph of Paragraph 3.3 to read as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Farley Wood Recreation Land</i></b>              The 3.63 hectares of land at Farley Wood (as shown in light blue on Map 2). <del>This land will be investigated through the Site Allocations Development plan Document and/or Local Transport Plan 3 for the provision of a railway halt. Should a robust business case be demonstrated in favour of a railway halt then the land could be redeveloped for additional employment and a railway halt.</del> <b><u>Contributions from the development will enhance the recreational facilities and community centre which currently exist for the benefit of the new and existing community (see Development Principles AC2 and AC4). There is also an option to share the pitch for use by the new Primary School to be provided (see Development Principle AC2)</u></b> </li> </ul>
	<u>Map 2 and Concept Masterplan</u>	<b>Comment:</b> The bus gates are not part of this

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>- it is not clear if the bus gates on Beehive Road/Cain Road junction will remain.</p> <p>- there is no consideration given in the plan for the protection of the privacy and road use of the existing old residences on Beehive Road. My house is over 200 years old and cannot deal with heavy traffic use on Beehive Road - it literally shakes the foundations.</p> <p>- please provide clarity on the retention of bus gates on Beehive Road.</p> <p>- please provide clarity on protection and consideration to existing residential development.</p> <p><u>Bus route 190</u></p> <p>- the bus route has previously been rerouted away from London road down John Nike Way. There is indication that it will be rerouted again.</p> <p>- it is important that the bus route not only serves the new Amen Corner community but also services the existing residential communities of Beehive Road and London Road.</p>	<p>development and will remain. The transport solution for the site takes account of their retention. Beehive Road will not be opened up for general vehicle use as part of the Amen Corner development</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new sentence at the end of paragraph 15.4 to read as: <b><u>“The existing bus gate between Cain Road and Beehive Road will not be removed as a result of this development.”</u></b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The development will contribute towards delivering bus services which could include the 190 service. The bus operator normally decides on the appropriate route for a particular bus service (taking account of factors such as journey time and commercial viability). The Council can have some influence on routing if it provides commercial subsidy or support. This is a matter for the detailed planning of bus routes in the vicinity of the area at the planning application stage of the process.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
<p><b>8. Binfield Badger Group</b></p>	<p>"A badger survey which should be undertaken over winter when signs of any activity are most obvious"</p> <p>This is incorrect as badger activity is lower in the winter as their sources of food (earthworms, grubs, cereals etc) are less available. We understand why</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the appropriate text should be amended to correct the SPD.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet in paragraph 9.5 to read as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “A badger survey <del>which should be undertaken over winter when signs of activity are most</del></li> </ul>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>you have been provided with this statement as it is easier to find setts in undergrowth when the nettles and brambles have died back.</p> <p>However we would suggest that in future publications you state:</p> <p>"A badger survey by a qualified consultant, which should be undertaken at the earliest planning stage to mitigate impact by redesign. Also prior to any groundwork starting to confirm no new wildlife activity has occurred"</p> <p>Obviously we are very keen to be able to continue to support the Council with this major development as we know of a number of significant badger activities very close to the plan area.</p>	<p><del>obvious-</del><u>by a qualified consultant, this should be undertaken at the earliest planning stage to mitigate impact by redesign and prior to any groundwork starting to confirm no new wildlife activity has occurred</u> .</p>
<p><b>9. GOSE</b></p>	<p>GOSE does not have any fundamental objections to the SPD. However there are two minor issues that need addressing:</p> <p>Para 2.4 The use of the word 'adopted' doe the South East Plan mentioned in the second and third sentences should be replaced by 'published'. It would also be helpful to include the date of publication – May 2009.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the appropriate text should be amended to correct the SPD.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the last sentence in paragraph 2.4 to read as: "The adopted <u>published</u> South East Plan (<u>May 2009</u>) contains the Borough's housing allocation for the period 2006 to 2026."</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>Para 2.6 PPG4 was superseded by Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth on 29 December 2009. The section should be updated to reflect the latest national policy.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the appropriate text should be amended to update the SPD.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the third bullet point of paragraph 2.6 to read as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>PPG4 Commercial and Industrial Development: encourages new development in locations which minimise the length and number of trips, especially by motor vehicles; encourage new development in locations that can be served by more energy efficient modes of transport; discourages new development where it would be likely to add unacceptably to congestion; and, locate development requiring access mainly to local roads away from trunk roads, to avoid unnecessary congestion on roads designed for longer distance movement.</del> <b><u>PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2010) sets out a positive approach for planning economic growth with the Government's objectives:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><u>A good range of sites identified for economic development and mixed-use development;</u></b></li> <li>- <b><u>A good supply of land and buildings which offers a range of opportunities for creating new jobs in large and small businesses as well as start-up firms and which is responsive to changing needs and demands;</u></b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>High quality development and inclusive design for all forms of economic development;</u></li> <li>- <u>Avoiding adverse impacts on the environment, but where these are unavoidable, providing mitigation; and</u></li> <li>- <u>Shaping travel demand by promoting sustainable travel choices wherever possible.</u></li> <li>- <u>A sequential test, which requires shops to be developed on the most central sites first, retained alongside a new impact test. Schemes that could harm town centres will be assessed against factors including impact on the high street, consumer choice and consumer spending.</u></li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Warfield Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>All references to ACL18</b>  <u>Summary:</u>            ACL18 is unsound. It merely refers to a 2003 study of potential for a railway station associated with the Jennet's Park development. However, according to ACL18, the 2003 study itself did not provide any costing of a railway station and ACL18 does not address this deficiency. The 2003 study does not take into account the development now proposed at Amen Corner, or that intended for Warfield.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes:</u>            Work in partnership with Network Rail and South</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The purpose of the SPD is not as an allocation document (which is the function of a DPD). There is uncertainty over a railway station at present because of a number of factors including the lack of a business case (including the impact of deflection from Bracknell Railway Station) and that an additional station on a railway line which already takes over an hour to get to London. Network rail are in favour of the principle of a station and the SPD reflects this by allowing for a potential station to be provided. It would therefore be entirely wrong to place an emphasis on the development at Amen Corner to provide a station. However, the Council is producing two other</p>



Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>West Trains to provide specifications for a new railway station comparable to Martins Heron station, to be used as an addendum to ACL18. Recognise that railway infrastructure is strategic and an essential component of sustainable transport, on the same basis as highways infrastructure, not as a standalone business case.</p> <p>For illustrative purposes, the similar new Mitcham Eastfields modular station cost £6M which includes lift access to both platforms.</p> <p><b>Paragraphs 3.3, 4.3, 5.4, 5.15, 14.6, 14.9, 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.6, 15.8</b></p> <p><u>Summary:</u> It is welcome to see that potential for a railway station at Amen Corner has been added to the SPD, since this was omitted in the AAP. However, the proposal is passive and fails to secure funding for this essential infrastructure.</p> <p>Martins Heron station was provided in 1988 through partnership between Berkshire County Council and British Rail. Three decades later, the requirement for sustainable transport is paramount, yet the SPD fails in this respect.</p> <p>Railway station car parking is already oversubscribed at Bracknell, Martins Heron, Ascot and Wokingham stations, causing potential rail users to be displaced to road use. This situation will be further exacerbated by the BFC housing development plans to 2026. Furthermore, the immediate proximity of Amen Corner Business Park to the proposed station location can provide a</p>	<p>strategies in which the potential railway station could be further explored: The Site Allocations DPD and Local Transport Plan 3. The Council has consulted with both Network Rail and South West Trains yet both have remained fairly silent over the issue. The Council will continue to engage with these organisations further.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The provision of a railway station is still aspirational rather than a robust, feasible and viable project. Therefore, it is not agreed that the proposed changes are included in the SPS. However the proposed text and comments will be taken forward for consideration under both the Local Transport Plan 3 and the Site Allocations DPD. It is agreed that s106 or CIL could be sources of funding.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>sustainable alternative for inbound commuters from outside Bracknell Forest, as well as viable rail access to the leisure facilities at the site that attract visitors from far afield. The private road “John Nike Way” is already a cause of significant congestion at peak hours that in turn causes congestion at Coppid Beech Roundabout. This situation will worsen with the development proposed in this SPD which will increasingly constrain access to/from the Northern Distributor Road (Harvest Ride / Temple Way) from the west.</p> <p>In view of these existing constraints it is ludicrous to suggest that a business case is required for the railway station any more than it is required for a road improvement scheme, such as the recent traffic signals installed at John Nike Way/London Road junction.</p> <p>There is thus a clear call to action for Bracknell Forest Council to engage actively with Network Rail and South West Trains to deliver this key transport infrastructure as an integral part of this development, by securing funding through Community Infrastructure Levy or failing that by Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>This SPD represents the final stage of development at Amen Corner. Failure to secure a new station now would probably result in the permanent loss of the opportunity. Network Rail relies heavily on local authority partners to deliver local infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Recommended Changes:</u></p>	

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>3.3 Change <del>The Hewlett Packard Recreation Area</del>....<del>due course</del> to  <b><i>The Hewlett Packard Recreation Area</i></b>  This comprises 2.39 hectares shown in green in map 2 that is used as a private sports ground containing a football pitch, pavilion and balancing pond. This land is designated for the provision of a new railway station, associated car park and secondary transport hub with additional employment space. A consideration will be the re-provision of the recreational facility off-site, retention of the balancing pond and some of the space currently designated as Open Space of Public Value.</p> <p>4.3 Change <del>Planning applications</del>....<del>service provider</del> to  <b>The Council will work actively with Network Rail and South West Trains to deliver a new railway station and ancillary car parking at Amen Corner to provide sustainable transport to the SPD area, Amen Corner Business Park, Jennet’s Park and wider area of Binfield and Warfield.</b></p> <p>Renumber <b>5.4</b> and subsequent sections, inserting new section</p> <p><b>5.4 The development will include the on-site provision of a railway station and ancillary car parking on the land owned by Hewlett Packard shown in green in map 2. This will be delivered in partnership with Network Rail and South West Trains and secured by Community Infrastructure Levy or by section 106 agreements and potential contribution from any successor to the Network</b></p>	

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p><b>Rail Discretionary Fund.</b></p> <p>5.15 Renumber 1 and subsequent paragraphs, inserting new paragraph</p> <p><b>1. A new railway station will be constructed on land owned by Hewlett Packard, secured by Community Infrastructure Levy or other planning obligations, in partnership with Network Rail and the train operator.</b></p> <p>14.6 Change <del>There may also be....come forward to</del>  <b>There will also be additional office space together with a railway station and ancillary car park sited on land owned by Hewlett Packard.</b></p> <p>14.9 Change <del>Additional employment....CS8</del> to  <b>Additional employment space on the Hewlett Packard Recreation Ground subject to the provision of alternative recreational facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS8.</b></p> <p>15.1 Change <del>improvements to bus</del> to  <b>improvements to train and bus</b></p> <p>15.2 Insert <b>Network Rail</b>, before <del>the Highways Agency</del>.</p> <p>15.4 Change <del>Public Transport Hub – Buses</del> to  <b>Public Transport Hub – Trains and Buses</b>  Insert <b>Key to this is the provision of a new railway station on the London Waterloo to Reading line</b> before <del>The Amen Corner Transport Assessment</del>  Delete <del>The later addition of a railway station....paragraph 3.3</del></p> <p>15.6 Change <del>may cover railway services</del> to <b>will include railway services</b></p> <p>Delete <del>(including the uses of railways should a</del></p>	

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p><del>station be provided)</del>            15.8 Change <del>4. Buses</del> to <b>1. Trains and buses</b>            After <b>public transport hub</b> insert <b>centred on a new railway station</b></p>	
	<p><b>Paragraphs 5.16, 7.32, 14.11, 15.1, 15.12, 16.10</b></p> <p><u>Summary:</u></p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) comes into full effect on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010. It has been possible for local authorities to determine CIL since 6<sup>th</sup> April 2009. CIL is intended to overcome the frequent shortfalls and/or misallocation of Section 106 funds that have often made S106 ineffective for delivering infrastructure for larger scale development projects. Whereas S106 is expected to remain in use for small scale developments, strategic developments such as Amen Corner are expected to have infrastructure financed through CIL.</p> <p>The SPD mentions CIL in passing via a foot note however it should be cited as the primary delivery vehicle for infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Recommended changes:</u></p> <p>5.16 Insert <b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>, before <b>Conditions</b> and delete foot note.</p> <p>7.32 Insert <b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>, before <b>Conditions</b></p> <p>14.11 Insert <b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>, before <b>Conditions</b></p> <p>15.1 change <del>will be agreed</del> to <b>will be funded</b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The Council is uncertain at present regarding to the implementation of CIL. The Council does have to have its CIL arrangements in place for 2014 at the latest. However this may be late for the implementation of development at Amen Corner associated with this SPD. The second bullet point is paragraphs 5.16, 7.32, 9.11, 10.11, 11.9, 12.12, 14.11 and 15.12. which read as “ Conditions, Section 106 Agreement or other agreements <b>unless other legal measures to secure contributions or works are put in place</b>” allows the flexibility to use CIL if appropriate arrangements are put in place.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>through the Community Infrastructure Levy or else agreed  15.12 Insert <b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>, before <b>Conditions</b>  16.10 Insert <b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>, before <b>Conditions</b></p>	
	<p><b>Paragraph 4.2</b>  <u>Summary:</u>  Existing residential developments are to the north and south, existing commercial developments are to the east</p> <p><u>Recommended changes:</u>  Change <b>east</b> to <b><u>north and south</u></b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that this is an error and changes should be made for clarification.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.2 to read as: “Whilst the level of development is not necessarily sufficient to create a fully self-contained community in its own right, opportunities must be taken to ensure the new development integrates well with the existing development including the residential development to the east <b><u>north (off Beehive Road and Turnpike Road) and south (Jennett’s Park).</u></b>”</p>
	<p><b>Paragraphs 10.3</b>  <u>Summary:</u>  Errata</p> <p><u>Recommended changes:</u>  Change <b>Area Action Plan</b> to <b><u>Supplementary Planning Document</u></b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the term Area Action Plan should be updated. A revised Appropriate Assessment is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence to paragraph 10.3 to read as “It is the Council’s preference to provide a solution prior to the adoption of the <del>Area Action Plan</del> <b><u>Supplementary Planning Document.</u></b>”</p>
	<p><b>Paragraphs 13.2</b>  <u>Summary:</u>  Errata</p> <p><u>Recommended changes:</u></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the term Area Action Plan should be amended to bring the SPD up-to-date.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the second sentence in paragraph 13.2 to read as: “However, at this time it is not certain if or when this land will come forward for</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	Change <del>Area Action Plan</del> to <b><u>Supplementary Planning Document</u></b>	redevelopment and therefore there is a need for flexibility in the <del>Area Action Plan</del> <b><u>Supplementary Planning Document.</u></b> ”
<b>11. Environment Agency</b>	<p><u>Paragraph 4.5</u> We support the inclusion of a guiding principle for development of green infrastructure in this section. However, we note that there is no guiding principle in this section on sustainability and would recommend that an additional guiding principle is added to this section on sustainable development as this relates to mitigating climate change, water resource availability, SUDS, waste management etc.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that sustainability is important, however, the Council has already published the Sustainable Resource Management Supplementary Planning Document of which planning applications at Amen Corner will be expected to take account. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Development Principle AC2</u> We support the inclusion of parts 3 and 5 in this development principle as they promote the sustainable management of water at the site.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Paragraph 6.11</u> We note from this that <i>‘the development will need to demonstrate that it has been designed and laid out to adapt to the predicted effects of climate change’</i>. However, the examples cited in paragraph 6.11 all relate to energy usage only; they do not consider the impacts of and adaptation requirements for climate change on water usage, flood risk etc. We recommend that paragraph 6.11 is expanded to incorporate other ways of adapting to climate change.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Comment agreed Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new bullet point at the end of paragraph 6.11 which reads as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>“New development will have to consider key impacts of climate change such as flooding, structural damage and subsidence, biodiversity losses, intense rainfall and drought leading to soil damage, erosion and damage to road/rail infrastructure. The development may have to include adaptation measures such as installing external shading above south-facing facades or setting aside land for water attenuation systems to cope with intense rainfall.”</u></b></li> </ul>
	<p><u>Section 7 and Development Principle AC4</u></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>We support the inclusion of section 7 and development principle AC4 on Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character from both a biodiversity and flood risk perspective.</p> <p>We are pleased that you have included the use of SUDS as part of this section on green infrastructure and have stated that the system must '<i>provide a net ecological benefit</i>' as this recognises the multi-functionality of SUDS schemes.</p> <p>There is not a significant risk of flooding at Amen Corner as it is within flood zone 1 and is largely greenfield. However, the redevelopment could result in a significant increase in flood risk from pluvial sources if not managed appropriately. The requirement in AC4 for a sustainable urban drainage scheme (SUDS) will help to prevent any increase in surface water runoff as a result of the proposed development.</p>	<p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Section 9 Biodiversity and Development Principle AC6</u></p> <p>From both a biodiversity and flood risk perspective we support the inclusion of paragraph 9.7 which recommends the inclusion of green roofs. We support this as they not only control surface water run off at source but can replace losses of habitat and can also be used to provided ecological enhancements at a site in accordance with PPS9.</p> <p>They can also help to limit the impact of climate change by conserving energy as they make buildings</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>



Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>more thermally efficient. Green roofs can also prolong the life of a roof, manage the extremes of temperature and humidity, moderate surface water run-off, provide greenspace for people and wildlife and help to reduce air pollution and noise.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 11.1</u> Due to the previous potentially contaminating uses on the site we are pleased to see the inclusion of this paragraph and development principle AC8 as these accord with the requirements of PPS23.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
<p><b>12. RSPB</b></p>	<p>Amen Corner is situated within 3km of Broadmoor to Bagshot Woods and Heaths SSSI, which forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Without appropriate mitigation, additional residential development in this location is therefore likely to have a significant effect on the SPA both on its own and in combination with other housing applications in the area.</p> <p>In this respect, we greatly welcome the commitment to avoid and mitigate impacts on the SPA through a bespoke combination of on and off-site SANGS, access management and monitoring measures. We also welcome the proposal sets out in paragraph 10.2 of the SPD to improve footpath connections to the proposed on-site SANGS and to introduce parking facilities in association with that SANGS. These measures should help to improve the attractiveness of the SANGS and therefore its effectiveness as an alternative to the SPA for recreational users.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supportive comments <b>SPD Response:</b> The SPD provides for SPA mitigation in Development Principle AC7</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>We understand that the Council has purchased land known as Bigwood, which may be provided as offsite SANGS. As no details have been provided on the location or size of the area, it is not currently possible to comment on its adequacy or appropriateness. Nevertheless we acknowledge that work is ongoing to investigate the options for off-site SANGS and we recognise that Development Principle AC7 incorporates a degree of flexibility to ensure that any future developers could bring forward an alternative site for off-site SANGS.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> A revised Appropriate Assessment is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report which gives more details on the solution. Further work on development the SANG will also be required such as a management Plan etc.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new text at the end of paragraph 10.3 which reads as :<b><u>"The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report provides a revised Appropriate Assessment for Development Principle AC7 and it is recognised that further Appropriate Assessment is necessary to provided more detail to the SANG solution advocated in Development Principle AC7 to inform for example, the production of a Management Plan. This work will be continued to support the production of an Amen Corner Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy."</u></b></p>
	<p>We greatly welcome the statement at paragraph 10.3 of the SPD that "it is the Council's preference to provide a solution prior to the adoption of the Area Action Plan. This approach is considered to represent best practice and provide certainty that an adverse impact will be avoided, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations" and we would support the Council in its efforts to achieve this objective. Paragraph 10.3 should, however, be updated to replace the term Area Action Plan with Supplementary Planning Document, to reflect the current approach of the Council.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supportive comments and it is agreed that the term Area Action Plan should be updated. A revised Appropriate Assessment is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence to paragraph 10.3 to read as "It is the Council's preference to provide a solution prior to the adoption of the Area Action Plan <b><u>Supplementary Planning Document.</u></b>"</p>
	<p>We recognise that the Appropriate Assessment that accompanies the Consultation Draft SPD and is</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> A revised Appropriate Assessment is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>provided at Appendix 2 of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal, was undertaken for the submission version of the Amen Corner AAP. We understand that a revised Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken in respect of the SPD and we recommend that this be undertaken as early as possible.</p>	<p>which gives more details on the solution. Further work on development the SANG will also be required such as a management Plan etc.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new text at the end of paragraph 10.3 which reads as: <b><u>"The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report provides a revised Appropriate Assessment for Development Principle AC7 and it is recognised that further Appropriate Assessment is necessary to provided more detail to the SANG solution advocated in Development Principle AC7 to inform for example, the production of a Management plan. This work will be continued to support the production of an Amen Corner Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy."</u></b></p>
<b>13. The Theatres Trust</b>	No comments to make	<b>Comments:</b> No comments <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary
<b>14. Thames Water</b>	<p>5 Infrastructure, Services and Facilities.            In commenting on previous versions of the Amen Corner Area Action Plan TWUL identified concerns as to the capacity of the existing sewerage network to support additional demand arising from future development at Amen Corner. It was therefore considered that any future version of the Area Action Plan should make it clear that the capacity of the sewerage network to provide for wastewater demand should not be adversely affected by development at Amen Corner. The same considerations are appropriate to the SPD Document.            TWUL therefore welcomes the inclusion of section 5 Infrastructure, Services and Facilities within the SPD. In particular the requirement for "all new</p>	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	development to provide suitable infrastructure and services to support it and mitigate any impacts that it may create" (Paragraph 5.1) is supported.	
	Development Principle AC2 - Community Facilities and Other Services and Infrastructure. It is likely that strategic sewer reinforcement work will be required to accommodate development at Amen Corner. TWUL therefore supports the requirement for all necessary utilities (including surface water and foul sewer management) to be secured by private agreement between the developer and the provider. The requirement for a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the site is also supported.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	TWUL considers that the wording of bullet point 5 could be strengthened by making it clear that that planning permission will only be granted where there will be adequate provision for and / or improvement of necessary infrastructure.	<b>Comment:</b> The purpose of the document is guidance rather than prescriptive policies in a DPD and therefore the suggested change is disagreed. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	There should also be a requirement for phasing of development, where appropriate to ensure that the required infrastructure is provided ahead of development.	<b>Comment:</b> The provision of infrastructure will be subject of agreements/conditions associated with planning applications affecting the site. At this stage the timing of provision will be considered in detail in line with current policies and guidance (such as that set out in the Limiting the Impact of Development SPD). <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	Thames Water supports the use of sustainable urban drainage systems in appropriate circumstances. However it should be stated within bullet point 5 or the supporting text to Development Principle AC2 that sustainable drainage systems are not	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that a caveat relating to drainage in the event SUDs cannot be fully provided is included. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the first bullet point of paragraph 5.12 to read as:

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>appropriate for use in all areas, for example areas with high ground water levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage. A well maintained and managed sustainable drainage system is also required to prevent it becoming ineffective, potentially increasing overland flows and consequently having an impact on the sewerage network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“ water management including surface water and sewer management (<b><u>all sustainable drainage systems should be well maintained and managed to ensure they do not impact for example, on the sewerage system).</u></b>”</li> </ul>
	<p>In respect of any future development at Amen Corner it is anticipated that sufficient capacity to provide for additional wastewater demand will be available at existing Sewage Treatment Works (STWs), however sewerage network upgrades are likely to be required and may need developer funding. Water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act to prevent connection to distribution networks ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of development either through phasing or the use of planning conditions.</p> <p>TWUL would expect to be consulted on most major planning applications.</p> <p>Paragraph 84 of PPS12, states that lifedequacy of infrastructure can be a aterial consideration in deciding whether permission should be granted." Paragraph 22 of PPS23, 2004, states at Appendix A that the ollowing should be considered in the preparation of development plans and can be material in the consideration of individual planning</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> As acknowledged in the response from Thames Water this comment relates to planning applications affecting the site.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	<p>applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of sewerage and sewage treatment and the availability of the existing sewerage infrastructure.</li> <li>• The need to make suitable provision for the drainage of surface water.</li> <li>• Compliance with water quality objectives.</li> </ul> <p>TWUL published and circulated in Summer 2007 to all LPAs in our area a "Guide for LPAs on Planning Application &amp; Development Plan Consultation with Thames Water Utilities as Statutory Water and Sewerage Undertaker". This will be of assistance to you when determining which planning applications to consult TWUL on and in the preparation of LDF documents.</p> <p>The earlier TWUL is able to be involved in the planning application process the greater the opportunity we have to make known our concerns regarding the ability of the local infrastructure to support development, and to ensure any proposed development has no detrimental impact on our assets or the service we provide to existing customers. Furthermore, early consultation allows TWUL to work with developers and other agencies to enable the issues caused by a development to be mitigated, or a compromise to be reached.</p>	
	<p>Additional Comments.</p> <p>There is a surface water pond that is under TWUL ownership in the south east corner of the Amen Corner Area. TWUL would seek assurance that any subsequent development will not be placed at risk of</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that that the current surface water pond should not be placed at risk. However it should be noted that Hewlett Packard maintain that they own this pond.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary</p>

Organisation or Name	Comment Summary	Response or amendments incorporated in SPD
	flooding should this pond be unable to cope with extreme weather.	
<b>15. Binfield Village Protection Society</b>	My first reading of the Consultation Draft was that every issue had been addressed and covered with appropriate development principles. It is not as “sparse,” thankfully, as the BFC LDF Core Strategy because the Introduction and the History of the site are more detailed than in previous Amen Corner documents and the “development principles” are broader and more detailed as a result of the numerous and important comments and objections raised during the various consultations held since the first Newsletter in Jul-Aug 2007.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	Some issues appear easy to rectify such as the timing of the Badger survey.	<b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the appropriate text should be amended to correct the SPD. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet in paragraph 9.5 to read as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“A badger survey <del>which should be undertaken over winter when signs of activity are most obvious</del> <b><u>by a qualified consultant, which should be undertaken at the earliest planning stage to mitigate impact by redesign. Also prior to any groundwork starting to confirm no new wildlife activity has occurred</u></b>”.</li> </ul>
	Some development principles appear to allow for alternatives (In my mind the school situation) which must be a good thing in the present financial climate. I think the planners efforts at protecting the gap between settlements against central government decrees and neighbouring borough's LDF is	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.

	<p>admirable.</p> <p>I welcome the Design Principles (DV Principle AC3) and all the “green” principles – AC4, AC5, AC6 and of course AC7, which may have some returns for the community in SANGS. It seems to me that the last five development principles should have a notable effect on Development Principle AC9 Housing Provision.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>After years of thinking and talking, discussion and argument, disappointment and acceptance it would seem to me that Development Principle AC10 – North View and South View is the ultimate in pragmatism. I hope that the opportunity to comment or object at the planning application stage still remains in planning legislation and has not been removed in recent changes because the interest and concern of the Society in these little houses remains.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Comments noted. It is confirmed that the opportunity to comment on planning applications remain.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>It is still hoped by bvps members and non-members alike that the Development Principle AC11 will provide for small, contemporary business units which has been a requirement in the Borough for many, many years.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Comments noted. The intention of the SPD is to allow the provision of small business units at Amen Corner.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
<p><b>16. Highways Agency</b></p>	<p><u>Development Principle AC1 – Vision (The Delivery of Comprehensive Development)</u>  It would seem that the start date for the delivery of the Amen Corner Development is stated to be 2010. As this document is only in draft form, it would be questionable whether this is achievable considering the time involved in finalising the document and the time required for the site to gain full planning permission. This could have implications on the certainty of the development and therefore could compromise the deliverability of the site itself.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that at current that the delivery programme for the site is optimistic and therefore the programme for delivery should be put back for a year.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Appendix 2 is revised to delay the development phasing by a year. Consequential changes to timings in the document and Appendix 1 are also made.</p>



	<p>Further clarification on the start date is required.</p>	
	<p>Furthermore, it is unclear within the SPD whether the delivery of the entire development will be reliant on a single planning application, or if the site will consist of a number of planning applications. Further detail should be provided in order to ensure that the delivery of the site is fully understood; this should be outlined within the Development Principle AC1.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SPD provide clarity in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 that comprehensive development is sought on the site and that individual applications would only be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that the implementation of a comprehensive scheme will not be prejudice by individual application approvals. <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Evidence Base</u> In response to the Amen Corner Area Action Plan – Draft Submissions Document, the HA concluded that the Amen Corner Transport Model Assessment was fit for purpose for assessing impacts on the SRN. However, it would seem that the document has now been revised to account for a revalidation of the base model, and also to consider comments raised by Bracknell Forest Borough Council. Upon review of the Revised Transport Model Assessment, it is apparent that these revisions have resulted in the evidence base varying from that previously agreed. The HA therefore request verification of these changes as this could have serious implication on the SRN, particularly at Junction 10 of the M4.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> As the Highways Agency is aware, Transport Modelling is based upon assumptions and up-to-date information. In respect to the issue of verification this matter will be dealt with by separate correspondence with the HA. <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Sustainable Growth and Infrastructure Services and Facilities</u> It is noted that the SPD refers to an integrated transport strategy which the HA supports. The strategy will need to be provided before the HA can make further comment. PPG13<sup>1</sup> refers specifically to public transport and also to mixed-use and B1 development which should be considered when</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is noted and the Council will continue to work with the HA regarding the potential impact of development on the SRN and on the Integrated Transport Assessment. <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

<sup>1</sup> PPG13 Planning Policy Guidance 13:Transport

	<p>producing the integrated transport strategy. The HA will be looking for the integrated transport strategy to be phased in line with the development. The HA has no objection in principle to the development of the infrastructure, services and facilities proposed within the SPD, providing that a suitable level of mitigation is implemented to minimise the impact on the SRN. This should be in line with PPG13.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>A robust infrastructure delivery plan will be required which should indicate the phased approach to development and infrastructure. This document will ensure that the impact of the development on the SRN is controlled and would be 'deliverable'. This is in line with PPS12 paragraph 4.44 which states that "Core strategies must be effective: this means they must be deliverable". As such, this SPD is one of the means of that delivery.</p>	
	<p><u>Public Transport and Accessibility</u>  The HA supports that the parking provision will be in line or below the Council's maximum parking standards. This will assist in mitigating the impact of trips on the SRN. However, it may be necessary for the Council to adopt lower standards of parking if traffic levels require further mitigation. Parking provision could prove to be a vital mitigation measure for the development as outlined in PPG13<sup>3</sup>, and as such, the HA would request a wording</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The restriction of car parking provision could have some impact on reducing car borne trips, however we are in an area of high car ownership and restricting private space for parking will only lead to parking on adopted/distributor roads around the site and this will impact on the look of the development. Careful consideration should be given to design of this site and how parking relates to each parcel. Just reducing car parking provision will not in itself secure a reduction of car trips on the SR. The inclusion of</p>

<sup>2</sup> PPG13 paragraph 20, "Local Authorities should .... actively manage the pattern of urban growth and the location of major travel generating development to make the fullest use of public transport. This may require the phasing of sites being released for development, in order to coordinate growth with public transport improvements"

<sup>3</sup> PPG13 paragraph 49, "reducing the amount of parking in new development (and in the expansion and change of use in existing development) is essential, as part of a package of planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable travel choices"

	<p>change which will ensure that traffic on SRN can be reduced through parking restrictions:</p> <p><b>“The site should not however be dominated by parking provision, but designed by taking a reasonable and pragmatic approach which is consistent to the Council’s Parking standards SPD and has regard to the traffic impacts of development on the Strategic Road Network.”</b></p>	<p>frequent public transport services to the site and the potential for a new rail halt are going to more positively reduce car use as they will provide reliable regular services to key local destinations and this should help attract commuters to work within the locality and not further afield where impact on the SRN would be witnessed.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Travel Plan</u> It is noted that Travel Plans will be required for the development, with specific action points and monitoring relating to employment development, residential development and primary school. The HA welcomes this approach.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comment <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p>
	<p>In order to ensure sustainability benefits are maximised, it may be appropriate for the Council to develop an area wide Travel Plan for the whole Amen Corner SPD area. All Travel Plans should take into account the guidance set out in DfT documents ‘The Essential Guide to Travel Planning’ ‘Smarter Choices’ and ‘Making residential Travel Plans work’. This approach would be consistent with DfT Circular 02/2007<sup>4</sup> and PPG13. This in turn should help to ensure that the level of development proposed is deliverable and in line with the requirements of PPS12.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Comments agreed as it is the intention to ensure an area wide travel Plan. The text should be amended for clarification. <b>SPD Response:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of paragraph 15.4 should be amended to read as: “The development will provide a co-ordinated <b>(area wide)</b> Travel Plan (which may <b>also</b> cover railway services) to cover employment development, residential development, the new Primary School and the development of the local centre. “</p>
	<p><u>Site Access and other Highway works</u> Subsequent to our review of the Amen Corner Transport Assessment prepared to support the</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The Council is in dialogue with the Highways Agency and Wokingham Borough Council regarding the impacts on the SRN. This supports, as</p>

<sup>4</sup> Guidance on Transport Assessments, paragraph 4.82 – “The use of area and site specific travel plans is an important mechanism in the underlying aim to manage vehicle trips at the source. Whenever a site specific TP is proposed, the developer should ascertain the existence of an area-wide TP. Where one exists, the site-specific TP should integrate with the area-wide TP.”

	<p>Preferred Options AAP document, it became apparent that Amen Corner will have a detrimental impact on the SRN, specifically the M4 Junction 10, but also on the M3 Junction 3. As highlighted within our previous response to the AAP dated 23 March 2009, the following recommendation was made:</p> <p>“Based on forecast traffic changes at Junction 10, M4 a number of slip roads will need to be improved to preserve safe flow conditions in the future. The impact of Amen Corner at M4 Junction 10 is a component part of general traffic growth across the assessment area. As such it is reasonable to expect a contribution towards improvements measures, such as those already described.”</p> <p>Within Guidance Principle AC13, the HA would request that ‘point 7 – general improvements to the wider network which may include improvements to the Strategic Road Network necessary to accommodate development traffic’ be amended to read:</p> <p><b><u>“general improvements to the wider network and improvements to the Strategic Road Network, in particular the M4 Junction 10 and the M3 Junction 3 necessary to accommodate development traffic”.</u></b></p> <p>The HA are undertaking a study which is looking to assess the viability of a scheme at M4 Junction 10 to</p>	<p>demonstrated by point 7 of paragraph 16.9, the principle of development mitigating their impact on the SRN. The Council is on-going dialogue with the Highways Agency and Wokingham Borough Council on this matter. However, it is clear at present that no proper account has been taken of the impact on Junction 10 of the M4 by traffic from other authority areas (other than Reading, Bracknell Forest and Wokingham). Furthermore, there is no mechanism for securing contributions so the SPD cannot be more specific in this nature. Finally, and of concern is that the HA seemed to have changed their position again and are now demanding contributions to the M3 as well despite not earlier seeking such contributions regarding Amen Corner or not seeking the contributions from a larger development closer to the M3 at a Public Inquiry.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
--	---	--

<sup>5</sup> Circular 02/2007, paragraph 8 – “the presumption should be to give preference, where possible, to solutions other than the provision of new road Capacity”

	<p>accommodate the proposed increases in traffic from the surrounding area. This includes traffic associated with Bracknell Forest, Reading and Wokingham councils. The study seeks to determine an appropriate scheme in order to protect the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. It is also essential that stringent demand management measures are implemented to minimise the traffic impact as outlined within Circular 02/07<sup>5</sup>. The HA will be looking for such measures to reduce the impact at Junction 10. However, it is apparent that a scheme may still be required to mitigate traffic impacts at Junction 10; some of this traffic may be attributed to the proposed development at Amen Corner. However, the deliverability of this scheme remains undetermined and therefore there is the potential that the scheme will not be affordable.</p>	
	<p><u>Mitigation</u>  The SPD does not appear to provide in any detail evidence of potential mitigation measures on the M3 and M4. The proposed development at Amen Corner, in conjunction with other forthcoming developments within the area could adversely affect the capacity and safe and efficient running of the SRN. As such, the HA would seek appropriate mitigation measures. The Amen Corner Transport Model Assessment also gives a good indication of what demand management measures will be required to enable the development to come forward. Any reduction in traffic generation could help to relieve vehicular flows on the SRN, specifically at Junction 10 of the M4. Therefore, greater consideration should be given to these measures</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The Council is in dialogue with the Highways Agency and Wokingham Borough Council regarding the impacts on the SRN. The supports as demonstrated by point 7 of paragraph 16.9 the principle of development mitigating their impact on the SRN. The Council is on-going dialogue with the Highways Agency and Wokingham Borough Council on this matter. However, it is clear at present that no proper account has been taken of the impact on Junction 10 of the M4 by traffic from other authority areas (other than Reading, Bracknell Forest and Wokingham). Furthermore, there is no mechanism for securing contributions so the SPD cannot be more specific in this nature. Finally, and of concern is that the HA seemed to have changed their position again and are now demanding contributions to the M3 as</p>

	<p>within the SPD.</p>	<p>well despite not earlier seeking such contributions or not seeking the contributions from a larger development closer to the M3 at a Public Inquiry.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary/</p>
	<p><u>Implementation and Phasing Plan</u></p> <p>As you are aware, the HA do not plan to improve the M4 Junction 10 as outlined within the HA's forward programme of work. As a result, it is anticipated that any scheme will be funded through developer contributions by way of a Section 106 agreement. It is also important that this is reflected within the SPD. The following additional wording is requested to be added alongside guidance principle AC13:</p> <p><b><u>“It is expected that funding for improvements to the Strategic Road Network would be acquired through S106”.</u></b></p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Page 10 of Appendix 1 already provides text regarding this issue where it says that ...”Funding for improvements to the Strategic Road Network could be acquired through s106.” However further text should be added to included other partners such as Reading and others  <b>SPD Response:</b> Update the text to read as: “Developer(s)/BFC/Highways Agency/Wokingham Borough/<b><u>Reading Borough/Others</u></b> Funding for improvements to the Strategic Road Network could be acquired through S106.”</p>
	<p>As you are aware, the Amen Corner site was previously brought forward as a DPD document. Development at Amen Corner raises the possibility of additional pressure on key junctions on the SRN, including M4 J10 and M3 J3. As such, and given the document's status as a SPD, the HA would hope that serious consideration is given to the advice in this letter. Given the capacity issues on the SRN, should the points raised in this letter not be addressed, the HA may have to consider its position at the planning application stage.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The Council is fully aware of the HA position regarding development and the SRN. The Council is in ongoing dialogue with the HA and Wokingham Borough regarding this issue.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
<p><b>17. Sport England</b></p>	<p>The Amen Core development area (as indicated in yellow as shown on Map 1) does not include any current or former use as playing field, such that the proposals do not propose any loss of playing field</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>

	<p>land. Therefore, Sport England raises no objection to the allocation of the Amen Corner as a development site and the principle of mixed used development.</p>	
	<p><u>Para 3.3 Farley Wood Recreation Land – Comment</u></p> <p>This paragraph provides that this site will be investigated for the provision of a railway halt. In this regard, we take this opportunity to remind the Council that Sport England would resist the loss of any playing field land unless it complies with PPG17 and as such accords with Sport England’s policy. Sport England policy is to oppose development on playing fields in all but exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>These exceptional circumstances are where, in the judgment of Sport England:</p> <p>E1 - A carefully quantified and documented assessment of current and future needs has demonstrated to the satisfaction of Sport England that there is an excess of playing field provision in the catchment, and the site has no special significance to the interests of sport.</p> <p>E2 - The proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as a playing field or playing fields, and does not affect the quantity or quality of pitches or adversely affect their use.</p> <p>E3 - The proposed development affects only land incapable of forming, or forming part of, a playing pitch, and does not result in the loss of, or inability to make use of any playing pitch (including the maintenance of adequate safety margins), a reduction in the size of the playing area of any playing pitch or the loss of any other</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Comment agreed the text relating to a railway halt is a typo and paragraph 3.3 is corrected accordingly.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the second paragraph of Paragraph 3.3 to read as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Farley Wood Recreation Land</i></b>  The 3.63 hectares of land at Farley Wood (as shown in light blue on Map 2). <del>This land will be investigated through the Site Allocations Development plan Document and/or Local Transport Plan 3 for the provision of a railway halt. Should a robust business case be demonstrated in favour of a railway halt then the land could be redeveloped for additional employment and a railway halt.</del> <b><u>Investment from the development will enhance the recreational facilities and community centre which currently exist for the benefit of the new and existing community (see Development Principles AC2 and AC4). There is also an option to share the pitch for use by the new Primary School to be provided (see Development Principle AC2)</u></b></li> </ul>

	<p>sporting/ancillary facility on the site.</p> <p>E4 - The playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development.</p> <p>E5 - The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields.</p>	
	<p><u>Para 3.3 The Hewlett Packard Recreation Area – Comment</u></p> <p>This section of the document provides that the Hewlett Packard Recreation Area may be appropriate for the provision of a railway station in the future with associated employment space. However, the text also makes clear the need for the recreational facility to be re-proved. The approach to re-proved any lost provision accords with Core Strategy Policy CS8 and also Sport England Policy which derives from PPG17.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Para 4.4 - Support</u></p> <p>Sport England supports the provision of a new Commercial and Leisure Zone that will compliment and enhance the existing sports and leisure facilities at the John Nike Leisure sport complex.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Para 4.5 - Support</u></p> <p>Sport England supports the SPD vision for development, which aims to achieve the integration of leisure facilities and the provision of infrastructure,</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>



	services and facilities.	
	<u>Development Principle AC1 - Support</u> Sport England supports Development Principle AC1 and the inclusion of community and recreational facilities and open as part of any development.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	<u>Para 5.6 - Support</u> Sport England supports the proposed enhancement the Farley Wood Recreation Facility as detailed in Para 5.6 of the draft document. In particular, Sport England supports the proposed provision of additional changing facilities and the enhancement of the existing sports pitches	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	<u>Development Principle AC2 &amp; Apra 5.15 - Support</u> Sport England supports the upfront commitment, expressed by the Council within Development Principle AC2, to secure the improvements to the Farley Wood Recreation Facility via planning obligation. Sport England also supports the preparation Farley Wood Enhancement Scheme which will set out the nature of the improvements required.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	<u>Para 7.4 – Support</u> Sport England supports the Councils commitment to provide 3.35 hectares of active open space as part of the Amen Corner development.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
	<u>Development Principle AC11 &amp; Para 14.9 Support</u> Sport England supports the Council's approach that additional employment space on the Hewlett Packard Recreation Ground will be only be acceptable subject to the provision of alternative recreational facilities in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS8.	<b>Comment:</b> Supporting comments. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
<b>18. Binfield Parish</b>	Clause 7.25 on page 23 of the Consultation Draft	<b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the SPD could be more

<b>Council</b>	document states, ".There may be opportunities to provide communal allotments for the benefit of new residents." Can we suggest that the sentence reads, "The layout of the site will also provide communal allotments for the benefit of new residents."	positive about the provision of communal allotments and the wording should be amended. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the last sentence of paragraph 7.25 to read as: " <del>There may be opportunities to</del> <b>The layout of the site will also</b> provide communal allotments for the benefit of new residents."
	Under Development Principle AC4 - Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character, Clause 7.3 states, "The development will provide. which includes" and is followed by a list including "7. Provision of gardens, communal allotments and amenity soft landscaping." Presumably this principle may not include all of the items in the list of eight points.	<b>Comment:</b> The intention of the SPD is to express the requirements of the development which includes all the elements in Development Principle AC4. <b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.
<b>19. South East England Partnership Board</b>	No comment to make	<b>Comment:</b> No concerns raised <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary
<b>20. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</b>	I can confirm that we do not have any comments to make regarding this document at this time.	<b>Comment:</b> No concerns raised <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary
<b>21. Tony Collins (Hewlett Packard LTD)</b>	Introduction and Context Para 1.4  Proposed Change: It is necessary for the Amen Corner Area covered by the SPD to be clearly defined on a plan.  Reason: Include new plan to define area and include HP's recreation land within the designated area. This should accord with Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy.	<b>Comment:</b> The SPD does clarify the area to which the SPD applies. However for clarity further annotations to Map 1 and 2 will be provided. <b>SPD Response:</b> Amendments are made to Map 1 and 2

	<p>National and regional Policy Para 2.6</p> <p>Proposed Change: The recently published PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth needs to be incorporated into the SPD. In particular Policy EC2.</p> <p>Reason: This supports the allocation of HP's recreation land for office use together with a balancing pond and railway station.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that the policy context needs to be amended to update it in respect to the publication of PPS4.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the third bullet point of paragraph 2.6 to read as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>PPG4 Commercial and Industrial Development: encourages new development in locations which minimise the length and number of trips, especially by motor vehicles; encourage new development in locations that can be served by more energy efficient modes of transport; discourages new development where it would be likely to add unacceptably to congestion; and, locate development requiring access mainly to local roads away from trunk roads, to avoid unnecessary congestion on roads designed for longer distance movement.</del> <b><u>PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2010) sets out a positive approach for planning economic growth with the Government's objectives:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><u>A good range of sites identified for economic development and mixed-use development;</u></b></li> <li>- <b><u>A good supply of land and buildings which offers a range of opportunities for creating new jobs in large and small businesses as well as start-up firms and which is responsive to changing needs and demands;</u></b></li> <li>- <b><u>High quality development and inclusive design for all forms of economic development;</u></b></li> <li>- <b><u>Avoiding adverse impacts on the</u></b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---	--

		<p><u>environment, but where these are unavoidable, providing mitigation; and</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Shaping travel demand by promoting sustainable travel choices wherever possible.</u></li> <li>- <u>A sequential test, which requires shops to be developed on the most central sites first, retained alongside a new impact test. Schemes that could harm town centres will be assessed against factors including impact on the high street, consumer choice and consumer spending.”</u></li> </ul>
	<p>Area for SPD Map 2</p> <p>Proposed Change: The map does not include any reference to the coloured areas.</p> <p>Reason: Clarify map notation by reference to a key.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The references to the colours on Map 2 are all included in Paragraph 3.3 of the document. However labels will be added to Map 2 for clarification.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amendments are made to Map 2.</p>
	<p>The Development Area Para 3.2</p> <p>Proposed Change: The yellow area should include HP’s recreation land</p> <p>Reason: Change Map 2 to reflect the development potential of HP’s land.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is not agreed as there is no certainty over the provision of a railway station and therefore the remaining element of development associated with the SPD should be considered on its own merits. Because of the uncertainty over the delivery of a railway station the status of the Hewlett Packard Land it should be treated separately as it is in paragraphs 3.3, 4.3 and 14.6</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>The Development Area Para 3.3</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SPD cannot allocate specific uses. A DPD is the only tool for this process. The Council is</p>

	<p>Proposed Change: HP's land is part of a single planning unit for Class B business purposes. The land has been used for recreation purposes (football pitch) which is disused and for a balancing pond for HP's main office development.</p> <p>The Council has indicated that the football pitch is suitable for office development (10,000 sq m) together with a railway halt.</p> <p>The balancing pond would be retained for HP's future development.</p> <p>Network Rail and South West Trains do not consider any business case prior to the issue of a planning permission or land use allocation in principle.</p> <p>The SPD area needs to be positively planned for recreation facilities without need for like-for-like replacement facilities. The land comprises a disused football pitch for HP's employees.</p> <p>The land needs to be allocated now. If land is to be developed later rather than sooner this should be phased now.</p> <p>Reason: The land is part of a Class B1 permission and is used for ancillary purposes to the main office use. The Council has accepted the principle under the AAP process.</p>	<p>now producing the Site Allocations DPD, the relevant comments on made on the Draft SPD such as this will be considered through the SADPD. On confirmation from HP these comments will be considered as a response to the forthcoming SADPD Participation on Issues consultation. The Golf Driving Range has a temporary planning permission and does not benefit from an established recreational use as the does the Hewlett Packard Recreation Area.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Add an additional wording to the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in paragraph 3.3 to read as: This comprises 2.39 hectares and is a privately owned sports ground containing a football pitch, a pavilion and a balancing pond. This land (shown in green on Map 2) is designated as Open Space of Public Value (OSPV) on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. <b><u>This land forms part of a single planning unit for Class B business purposes. The land has been used for recreation purposes (football pitch and pavilion) which is disused and for a balancing pond serving the main Hewlett Packard office development. Hewlett Packard have indicated that this land could accommodate up to 10,000 sqm. of new employment space whilst retaining the drainage function of the balancing pond. In the circumstance that this development goes ahead the recreational land would be developed.</u></b> This land may be appropriate for the provision of a railway station in the future with associated employment space. In order for a railway station to be delivered on this land is will be necessary for evidence and a business case to be provided. A further consideration will be the re-provision of the recreational facility <b><u>and guaranteeing</u></b> the drainage function of the balancing pond <b>will be</b></p>
--	--	--

	<p>There is no intention of removing the balancing pond.</p> <p>As advised by Network Rail.</p> <p>The public golf driving range immediately north of HP's land has not been required to be re-provided and the Council's approach is inconsistent in this matter.</p> <p>Clarity is required in the SPD as to the release of land over the plan period.</p>	<p><b><u>appropriate to serve the existing and new development.</u></b> The development proposed in this Draft SPD will not prejudice an appropriate scheme coming forward in due course. <b><u>The formal allocation of land for employment and a railway station will be considered through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (see <a href="http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sadpd">www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sadpd</a>).</u></b></p>
	<p>Development principle AC1 Para 4.7</p> <p>Proposed change: The list should include the provision of a railway halt.</p> <p>The employment floorspace should be increased to 45,000sq m to accommodate the office development of HP's recreation land if not already included in the 35,000 sq m allocation.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure the SPD area is developed with sustainable transport modes. To enable the proper planning for the SPD area.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is not agreed as there is no certainty over the provision of a railway station and therefore the remaining element of development associated with the SPD should be considered on its own merits. Because of the uncertainty over the delivery of a railway station the status of the Hewlett Packard Land it should be treated separately as it is in paragraphs 3.3, 4.3 and 14.6</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Development Principle AC2 Para 5.15</p> <p>Proposed change: The list should include the provision of a railway halt to be funded through section 106 planning obligations as the station will support the whole of</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is not agreed as there is no certainty over the provision of a railway station and therefore the remaining element of development associated with the SPD should be considered on its own merits. Because of the uncertainty over the delivery of a railway station the status of the Hewlett Packard Land it should be</p>

	<p>Amen Corner.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure the SPD area is developed with sustainable transport modes.</p>	<p>treated separately as it is in paragraphs 3.3, 4.3 and 14.6</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Development principle AC3 Para 6.13</p> <p>Proposed changes: The requirement for an approved masterplan and design code prior to the issue of a planning permission is contrary to Government guidance and statute. This will act as a moratorium on development and could preclude individual land owners progressing planning applications on their respective land parcels even though the proposed uses would be in compliance with the SPD. Other matters of design can be controlled by planning condition.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that Amen Corner can be developed without unnecessary requirements of the LPA.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and amendments should be made to the text to ensure the SPD is consistent to allow individual applications that demonstrate a comprehensive delivery of the site.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend paragraph 6.13 to read as: <b><u>“A detailed Masterplan and Design Code for the development are required to be submitted and approved prior to any detailed planning submissions being considered and permissions granted. either as part of a full application or prior to the submission of Reserved Matters.”</u></b></p>
	<p>Passive Open Space Para 7.7</p> <p>Proposed change: Plan 2 should be Map 2.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the appropriate text should be amended to correct the SPD.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend the second sentence in paragraph 7.7 to read as: “Such provision could include land in Wokingham Borough as identified (on <del>Plan</del> <b>Map 2</b> shown in orange).”</p>

	<p>HP's land should be removed from the current Open Space of Public Value (OSPV).</p> <p>Reason: Correct error in text. To ensure proper designation of land in SPD.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SPD cannot allocate specific uses. A DPD is the only tool for this process. The Council is now producing the Site Allocations DPD, the relevant comments on made on the Draft SPD such as this will be considered through the SADPD. On confirmation from HP these comments will be considered as a response to the forthcoming SADPD Participation on Issues consultation.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> no changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Business Zone Para 14.4</p> <p>Proposed changes: HP's potential to deliver 10,000 sq m should be included. HP's site is adjacent to HP's main office development and provides ancillary support at present.</p> <p>Reason: The circumstances pertaining to the public golf driving range are the same as that for HP's private recreation land. Both parcels are suitable for office development and should be allocated accordingly</p>	<p><b>Comment:.</b> This is disagreed because the Golf Driving range is subject of a temporary permission and not an Open Space of Public Value designation unlike the HP Recreational Land. For this reason they are treated differently. The Site Allocations DPD provides the opportunity to remove the OSPV designation otherwise it is for HP do demonstrate how alternative provision could be made in line with Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy DPD. The employment space associated with the HP recreational land is tied to the provision of a railway station and should not be provided for regardless of a railway station.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p>Commercial and Leisure Zone Para 14.6</p> <p>Proposed change: It is not clear why HP is mentioned under this head rather than the Business Zone. The land contains a disused football pitch and balancing pond. The latter is to be retained whilst the football pitch is planned to be redeveloped for offices adjacent to the station halt.</p> <p>Reason: HP's land needs to be allocated and confirmed under paragraph 14.4 with the correct information.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is agreed that this paragraph should be moved under the Business Zone paragraph (14.4). Further, the SPD cannot allocate specific uses. A DPD is the only tool for this process. The Council is now producing the Site Allocations DPD, the relevant comments on made on the Draft SPD such as this will be considered through the SADPD. On confirmation from HP these comments will be considered as a response to the forthcoming SADPD Participation on Issues consultation.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> swap paragraph 14.5 and 14.6 around.</p>



	<p>Development Principle AC11 Para 14.8  Proposed change:  The employment floorspace should be increased to 45,000sq m to accommodate the office development of HP's recreation land if not already included in the 35,000 sq m allocation.  Reason:  To enable the proper planning for the SPD area.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SPD cannot allocate specific uses. A DPD is the only tool for this process. The Council is now producing the Site Allocations DPD, the relevant comments on made on the Draft SPD such as this will be considered through the SADPD. On confirmation from HP these comments will be considered as a response to the forthcoming SADPD Participation on Issues consultation.  <b>SPD Response:</b> no changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Development Principle AC11 Para 14.9  Proposed change:  HP's land should be allocated in the SPD for employment use. Any recreation facilities should form part of the planned facilities for the whole of the SPD area. Remove reference to Policy CS8  Reason:  To enable the proper planning for the SPD area.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The SPD cannot allocate specific uses. A DPD is the only tool for this process. The Council is now producing the Site Allocations DPD, the relevant comments on made on the Draft SPD such as this will be considered through the SADPD. On confirmation from HP these comments will be considered as a response to the forthcoming SADPD Participation on Issues consultation.  <b>SPD Response:</b> no changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Development Principle AC12 Para 15.8  Proposed change:  Include requirement for provision of a railway halt.  Reason:  To enable the proper planning for the SPD area.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> There is uncertainty over a railway station at present because of a number of factors including the lack of a business case (including the impact of deflection from Bracknell Railway Station) and that an additional station on a railway line which already takes over an hour to get to London. Network Rail are in favour of the principle of a station and the SPD reflects this by allowing for a potential station to be provided. It would therefore be entirely wrong to place an emphasis on the development at Amen Corner to provide a station. However, the Council is producing two other strategies in which the potential railway station could be further explored: The Site Allocations DPD and Local Transport Plan 3. The Council has consulted with both Network Rail and South West Trains yet both have remained fairly silent over the issue. The Council will</p>

		continue to engage with these organisations further. <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.
	<p>Concept masterplan Para 17.</p> <p>Proposed: The plan should include HP's recreation land coloured yellow for business purposes.</p> <p>The station location needs to be moved to the southern end of Beehive Lane.</p> <p>Reason: To enable the proper planning for the SPD area.</p> <p>This is the optimum location for the station.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is not agreed as there is no certainty over the provision of a railway station and therefore the remaining element of development associated with the SPD should be considered separately. The Hewlett Packard Recreational Land has been coloured differently to reflect its context as set in paragraphs 3.3, 4.3 and 14.6. It is agreed that the potential location of the railway station should be moved to the southern end of Beehive Lane.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amen the Concept Plan to show the potential railways Station in a different location.</p>
<b>22. Nike Group</b>	<p><b>Development Principle AC 5 - Landscape Sensitivity</b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> No objection to the policy as worded, however other parts of Footpath 14, Binfield could well be superseded by the footpath/cycleway to be introduced in connection with the new link road.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is noted and agreed with</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p><b>Development Principle AC 9 – Housing Provision</b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Item 2 of the principle refers to the character zones being <u>fully detailed</u> in an agreed masterplan. It is not considered realistic to try to fully detail the character zones at masterplan</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is agreed and the text should be amended for clarification purposes.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Amend point 2 of paragraph 12.11 to read as: <b>“the housing will be provided in distinct Character Zones which will be <u>fully detailed specified</u> in an agreed Masterplan;”</b></p>

	<p>stage, at a time when the eventual developers will not be known, as they will input into the final detail. The wording should be amended so that the distinct character zones are <u>specified</u> in an agreed masterplan.</p>	
	<p><b>Development Principle AC 10 – North View and South View</b>  <b>Comments: 1.</b> The supporting text acknowledges that there is no certainty that this land will come forward for redevelopment. The principle should therefore be amended to read North View and South View will be developed as part of the early phases in the development <u>if practicable</u>.</p> <p>It is not considered that this location is suitable for small business enterprises. If there is a requirement for small business enterprises at Amen Corner, The Nike Group consider a better location would be on Scott land adjacent to the railway. However this would reduce the amount of land available for housing and go against the consensus of opinion at the Employment Land Study Workshop, which concluded that Amen Corner was not the location for small business enterprises</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The purpose of the SPD is ensure that an appropriate development goes ahead including the redevelopment of North and South View. There has been flexibility in this to provide development that would enable this to go ahead. It is apparent from consultation responses that North View and South View need to be redeveloped as part of the development. Clarification is needed to ensure that any employment at this location is compatible with the other business and residential uses to be located nearby.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Add a new 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence in paragraph 13.1 which reads as: “<b><u>Any employment uses must be compatible with nearby other uses such as offices, school and residential areas. Industrial, noisy and polluting uses will not be acceptable.</u></b>”</p>
	<p><b>Paragraph 15.4</b>  <b>Comment:</b> It is considered that a 10-minute service for the shuttle bus service is excessive.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> It is considered that the text may be detailed at this stage however, the Transport Assessment work carried out so far has indicated the need for such a service. To allow more flexibility and detailed work additional text should be included.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> Add new text to the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence to paragraph 15.4 which reads as: “This is intended to provide a 10 minute service (15 minutes off-</p>

	<p><b>Guidance Principle AC 13 – Site Access and Other Highways works</b>  <b>Comment:</b> 16.9 Item 5 is now unnecessary. The junction of John Nike Way and London Road has already been improved. The junction of John Nike Way with Cain Road is covered in 16.8 item 2.</p>	<p>peak) <b><u>although the actual extent of the service will be matter for further detail and negotiation.</u></b>  <b>Comment:</b>. It agreed and this text should be deleted to reflect an update on the ground.  <b>SPD Response:</b> Delete point 5 of paragraph 16.9 and renumber points 6 and 7 as “<b><u>5 and 6</u></b>”</p>
<p><b>23. Thames Valley Police</b></p>	<p>You will be aware that the District falls within the operational area of Thames Valley Police Authority (TVP) who is responsible for delivering services to address community safety, tackle the fear of crime and seek to achieve a reduction in crime. The delivery of growth and new development within the District imposes additional pressure on TVP's infrastructure base, which is critical to delivery of effective policing and securing safe and sustainable communities. The Police Service no longer receives central grant funding for infrastructure projects; while revenue funding is provided by the Home Office and the Council Tax precept, capital projects are financed through borrowing. Borrowing to provide infrastructure has an impact on delivery of safe and sustainable communities because loans have to be repaid from revenue budgets, the corollary of which is a reduction in the money available to deliver operational policing. PPS1 makes clear that the promotion of communities that are inclusive, healthy, safe and crime-free is a key tenet of Government planning policy, and is therefore a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. As part of achieving sustainable communities, PPS1</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is context to the comments TVP make on the Draft SPD.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

requires Local Authorities to take account of the provision of essential infrastructure in bringing forward land for development (paragraph 2.7).

The Police are recognised nationally in PPS12 as key stakeholders in determining the type and quantum of social infrastructure needed to support sustainable development (paragraph 4.29). At a regional level, the South East Plan (May 2009) states via Policy CC7: Infrastructure and Implementation, that infrastructure will need to be expanded and improved to support development, where existing capacity is insufficient. The Policy advises that contributions from development towards infrastructure will be needed to ensure its delivery in a sustainable manner. A table within the supporting text defines infrastructure as including the emergency services, which encompasses the Police.

Consequently, there is clear acceptance within Government that the Police is a key stakeholder when it comes to determining what infrastructure is necessary in order to ensure development can be delivered in a sustainable way.

The delivery of Community Safety is an obligation on the part of the Council under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended), which extends to place shaping and spatial planning, and consequently the delivery of housing and employment development. It is therefore critical to ensure the appropriate Police infrastructure is provided in a timely fashion and in the right location to deliver community safety. This is particularly crucial at Amen Corner given the scale and

	<p>implications of the development of the site.</p>	
	<p><b>Draft SPD</b>  TVP supports the proposal to seek contributions towards social infrastructure from the development of Amen Corner in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS6 of the Core Strategy DPD. TVP strongly supports recognition of the Police as third party infrastructure providers (paragraph 5.2 of the Amen Corner SPD) and one of the number of infrastructure services likely to be affected by the development proposed at Amen Corner.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is a supporting comment.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p>TVP also strongly supports the acknowledgement developer contributions towards Police infrastructure would be necessary if the Police identifies a requirement which accords with the provisions of Circular 05/05.</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This is a supporting comment.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
	<p>TVP objects to the omission of reference to the specific contributions required by the Police to fund additional capital infrastructure costs to mitigate the impact of the development on the Police Service. Included with this representation is an assessment against Circular 05/2005 of the principle of claiming developer contributions towards Police infrastructure.</p> <p>Development Principle AC1 of the Amen Corner SPD sets the "Vision" for the development of the site, including the anticipated number of dwellings and employment space to be provided. Accordingly, the level and type of the infrastructure to be provided as part of the development should also be outlined to clarify the scale and extent of</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> This comment is not agreed as the SPD provides guidance rather than prescribes the infrastructure provision required. In respect to 3<sup>rd</sup> party infrastructure provision it is uncertain over an effective mechanism to secure provision in respect to Local Government law. e.g. for financial contributions in lieu of provision. The SPD is not an allocations document and therefore will not exactly prescribe all the infrastructure provision as a DPD would. The Site Allocations DPD will provision an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and 3<sup>rd</sup> party infrastructure needs will be considered as part of this process. The Council does have an SPD in place (Limiting the Impact of Development) which makes provision for infrastructure requirements in association with planning applications. This tool will be used alongside the Amen Corner SPD</p>

	<p>development.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that the SPD identifies in broad terms the required infrastructure, services and facilities to be provided at Amen Corner, including how this will be provided, where, when and by whom. The SPD as drafted specifies the infrastructure requirements arising from the development in the case of all other service providers. However, in the case of the Police (and Health and the Fire Service), the SPD places onus on TVP to justify the extent of the claim sought at the application stage and demonstrate compliance with Circular 05/05. This approach is disappointing given the extent of discussions held with Officers during the preparation of the Amen Corner Area Action Plan and the belief that Police requirements would be incorporated in the final document. Moreover, it fails to offer the clarity and certainty that the developers will be seeking at the pre-application stage on the level of contributions which would be sought from the development.</p> <p>Policy CS6 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Council Core Strategy, Limiting the Impact of Development acknowledges that new development places additional pressures on existing infrastructure and local facilities. The Policy establishes that new development should address the resulting local impacts either through mitigation measures which form part of the proposals or through contributions towards measures which will address the cumulative impacts. The Policy is supported by the SPD Limiting the Impact of Development which</p>	<p>should an application be received prior to the consideration of the Site Allocations DPD. It is considered that the need for a new facility at Amen Corner cannot be met by the existing facility in Binfield (next to the Parish Office). The TVP should discuss separately with the Council any opportunity to use the existing community centre at Farley Wood for such purposes.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>
--	---	--

provides general guidance on developer contributions in the Borough. As this is non-specific guidance, detail is limited although participation in CCTV schemes is given as an example of the type of Police infrastructure that may be required through a planning obligation.

In response to the TVP representations submitted to the draft Amen Corner Area Action Plan in March 2009, Bracknell Forest Council stated that the Limiting the Impact of Development SPD could be relied on to seek contributions towards Police infrastructure, if justified, from the development. However, the Core Strategy and Limiting the Impact of Development SPD precede the 2008 version of PPS12, the adoption of the South East Plan and the amendments to the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations of 2008. They therefore fail to include specific reference to the Police as infrastructure providers. The inclusion of the suggested amendments to the Amen Corner SPD would serve to provide explicit requirements.

**Suggested Amendments**

PPS12 encourages negotiation with infrastructure providers at the earliest possible stage in order to ensure its delivery and provide certainty to the developer and to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure in the right location. The SPD should include details of the items of Police infrastructure required, the contribution triggers, the method of delivery, and the quantum and source of infrastructure funding for the Police.



This information in relation to Police infrastructure was submitted to the consultation on the Amen Corner Area Action Plan in March 2009. This is essential to ensure the delivery of community safety at Amen Corner and it is not satisfactory to leave the detail or principle of the provision of infrastructure to the application stage.

Further clarification should be provided in Development Principle AC2 regarding the Police infrastructure that would be required as part of the proposed development of Amen Corner. TVP has identified an on-site requirement for a neighbourhood Police facility of maximum 60sqm gross internal area plus a dedicated car space and shared use of other parking spaces, sufficient to accommodate three staff with ancillary facilities eg toilets, kitchen etc. This would be sought at no cost to TVP. It would be possible for the facility to be collocated within the Community Centre, which would result in a reduced space requirement if elements such as a meeting room or ancillary facilities were shared.

The development at Amen Corner is also identified as one of the seven sites around the Borough at which an Automatic Number Plate Recognition camera is required. Contributions should be sought from development towards provision of this facility.

In addition, financial contributions would be sought towards capacity building at Basic Command Unit and Force-level and the need for additional staff

	<p>and accommodation to mitigate the impact of the development on policing in full.</p> <p>These changes would provide certainty on the type of infrastructure required as part of the development at Amen Corner. Unless these changes are incorporated within the final SPD, TVP objects to the document.</p>	
	<p><b>Developer Obligations towards Police Infrastructure</b></p> <p>We set out below how the need for an appropriate Planning Obligation to include provision to mitigate the impact of the development on the Police Service meets the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p> <p><b>Relevant to Planning</b></p> <p>In the context of the prevailing planning policies outlined above and on the basis that an increase in population arising from the development proposals would impact on the ability of the police to deliver an effective and efficient service, the request for contributions towards police infrastructure provision to mitigate the impact of the proposed development is relevant to planning in the context of Circular 05/2005.</p> <p><b>Necessary to Make the Proposed Development Acceptable in Planning Terms</b></p> <p>The delivery of safe, healthy and attractive places to live is fundamental to planning for sustainable development. Contributions to essential Police infrastructure are required to ensure that an adequate level of police service is available to achieve sustainable communities. Contributions</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> The problem at present is that there is no effective mechanism to secure financial contributions. The Council, under Local Government Law has to maintain the discretion over COS106 contributions it receives. For example, the Council is currently exploring a mechanism for securing a strategic contribution in respect to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which may include the need for a Joint Committee which only Councils can be part of. Therefore an SPD is an inappropriate tool for securing contributions for third party infrastructure requirements. The CIL may provide an opportunity and the Council will explore all relevant infrastructure needs as part of this process. The Site Allocations DPD is another mechanism that provides the opportunity for consideration.</p> <p><b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>

are necessary because there is no central Government grant funding to cover the capital costs of increasing staffing and associated accommodation/vehicle costs in line with the additional impact on the police service arising from the development proposals. Consequently, TVP will be unable to maintain current levels of policing, with existing resources stretched to serve an enlarged resident and working population, resulting in heightened incidents of crime and disorder within the local area. Contributions are therefore necessary to bring the development in line with the objectives of sustainable development as articulated through local, regional and national planning policies set out above.

***Directly Related to the Proposed Development***

There is a functional link between the new development and the contributions and/or onsite Police infrastructure being sought.

The scale of Police Force resources sought is commensurate with the scale of the population to be served, in order to maintain an adequate level of service and enable the police to deliver on its duty to address crime and disorder issues. There is evidence that an increase in population arising from new developments would result in an increase in the incidents of crime, which would apply greater pressure to the existing Police Service.

In addition, new development inevitably creates targets for crime which requires a Police presence to reduce the perception of crime and respond effectively to incidents of crime. The impact of

increased incidents of crime and targets for crime arising from development must be addressed through Planning Obligations in order to fund the expansion of the police service to maintain a commensurate level of policing.

Put in simple terms, if there was no development there would be no need for additional Police resources and a resultant contribution. Where a development proposal gives rise to an increase in population it will be necessary to increase the number of Police Officers and support staff policing that population to ensure the level of service is maintained. Additional accommodation, vehicles and other ancillary facilities would be required to be delivered to meet the needs of the expanded staffing. As previously explained, there is no existing funding source to support this from central or local taxation.

It is therefore appropriate to seek contributions towards community safety from new housing and employment development because such development will have a direct impact on the capacity of the Police Force to provide an efficient and effective service in the area.

***Fairly and Reasonably Related in Scale and Kind to the Proposed Development***

TVP has formulated a methodology for seeking contributions. It is constructed to ensure that payments are directly related in scale to impact arising from proposed development in terms of new resident/working population accommodated by the scheme. The formula-based approach anticipates

	<p>that there would not necessarily be a direct relationship between population growth and housing growth based on current household size. Accordingly it includes a discount factor to ensure that there is proportionality between new population and new dwellings. The contributions sought are therefore appropriate to the net impact of new development in terms of population growth.</p> <p><b><i>Reasonable in All Other Respects</i></b>  The financial contribution and/or on-site infrastructure provision sought is not to resolve existing deficiencies in police infrastructure provision, nor is it seeking to provide a higher level of service. The impact of the development on the capacity of the Police Force to provide an efficient and effective service in the context of the Government's agenda for the delivery of safe communities is a material planning consideration, and the contributions/infrastructure sought are proportionate to that impact. The requirement for a Planning Obligation to deliver a financial contribution to Police infrastructure and secure the provision of an on-site facility is therefore reasonable in all respects.</p>	
<p><b>24. Crowthorne Parish Council</b></p>	<p>CPC has reviewed the Amen Corner SPD and supports the proposals contained therein.</p> <p>Because of the closeness of the site to Wokingham BC "South Wokingham Development Area", CPC urges BFC to continue consultation with WBC to optimise transport inter-linkage, use of green infrastructure and rights-of-way, and development of SANG</p>	<p><b>Comment:</b> Supporting comment  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The Council will continue to discuss the delivery of Amen Corner and the Wokingham Strategic Development Locations with Wokingham BC.  <b>SPD Response:</b> No amendments necessary.</p>



Copies of this booklet may be obtained in large print, Braille, on audio cassette or in other languages. To obtain a copy in an alternative format please telephone 01344 352000.

### **Nepali**

यस प्रचारको सक्षेपं वा सार निचोड चाहिं दिइने छ ठूलो अक्षरमा, ब्रेल वा क्यासेट सूनको लागी । अरु भाषाको नक्कल पनि हासिल गर्न सकिने छ । कृपया सम्पर्क गनुहोला ०१३४४ ३५२००० ।

### **Tagalog**

Mga buod/ mga hango ng dokumentong ito ay makukuha sa malaking letra, limbag ng mga bulag o audio kasette. Mga kopya sa ibat-ibang wika ay inyo ring makakamtan. Makipag-alam sa 01344 352000

### **Urdu**

اس دستاویز کے خلاصے یا مختصر متن جلی حروف، بریل لکھائی یا پھر آڈیو کیسٹ پر ریکارڈ شدہ صورت میں فراہم کئے جا سکتے ہیں۔ دیگر زبانوں میں اس کی کاپی بھی حاصل کی جا سکتی ہے۔ اس کے لیے براہ مہربانی ٹیلیفون نمبر 01344 352000 پر رابطہ کریں۔

### **Polish**

Streszczenia lub fragmenty tego dokumentu mogą być dostępne w wersji napisanej dużym drukiem, pismem Brajla lub na kasecie audio. Można również otrzymać kopie w innych językach. Proszę skontaktować się z numerem 01344 352000.

### **Portuguese**

Podemos disponibilizar resumos ou extractos deste documento em impressão grande, em Braille ou em audiocassete. Podem também ser obtidas cópias em outros idiomas. Por favor ligue para o 01344 352000.

Spatial Policy  
Environment, Culture and Communities  
Bracknell Forest Council  
Time Square  
Market Street  
Bracknell  
RG12 1JD