

Consultation Statement
Regulation 12
Bracknell Town Centre Masterplans Supplementary Planning
Document
Consultation Draft
(February 2024)

September 2024

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Town & County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires in Regulation 12 that before a Local Planning Authority adopt a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) it must prepare a statement (Consultation Statement) setting out:
 - i. the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the SPD;
 - ii. a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - iii. how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.2 This document is the Consultation Statement for the Bracknell Town Centre Masterplans SPD, which sets out the persons the Council consulted in preparing the SPD and how their comments have been addressed.
- 1.3 A list of all those consulted, including statutory consultees, on the SPD are set out in Appendix A.
- 1.4 The Council held a public consultation on the draft SPD between Monday 8 April and Monday 20 May 2024 (6 weeks). This included public exhibitions at The Lexicon on Thursday 25 April and Saturday 27 April 2024, where Council officers and the consultant team were available to answer questions and register comments. Following the exhibitions, exhibition boards were exhibited at Bracknell libraries.
- 1.6 A summary of representations received and how they have been addressed in the adopted SPD can be found in Appendix B.

Appendix A – Persons consulted on the draft SPD

In the preparation of the Bracknell Town Centre Masterplans SPD, officers throughout the Council were consulted in the development of this document.

Following this, the draft Bracknell Town Centre Masterplans SPD was published for consultation for a 6 week period between Monday 8 April and Monday 20 May 2024.

320 individuals and organisations (including statutory consultees) on the Planning consultation database were consulted. Additionally, letters were posted to all properties in and around each of the three masterplan areas, providing notification of the consultation.

Relevant 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies, as defined in The Local Plan Regulations 2012 (Parts 1 & 2), were notified of the consultation. These included:

- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Integrated Care Systems
- Homes England
- National Highways
- Utility providers
- Relevant authorities whose area is within or adjoins Bracknell Forest
- Voluntary bodies
- Economic bodies

Additionally:

- Public exhibitions were held at The Lexicon in Bracknell town centre on Thursday 25 April and Saturday 27 April 2024, where Council officers and the consultant team were available to answer questions and register comments. Following the exhibitions, exhibition boards were exhibited at Bracknell libraries.
- Consultation information was issued in a press release.
- Hard copies of consultation documents were made available at principal Council offices, Town and Parish Council offices and public libraries.
- All documents were published on the Council's Bracknell Town Centre Masterplans SPD website: <https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/bracknell-town-centre-masterplans-supplementary-planning-document>

Appendix B – Summary of representations to the draft SPD and the Council’s response

Around 110 representations were received, and are summarised as follows:

[Please note that all document references relate to the consultation draft SPD and might differ from the adopted version.]

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
General comments		
Concept	Decision to create an SPD and underpinning concept for masterplan areas to create resilient urban form through a utilisation of mixed-use and densification is supported.	Noted.
	Certain aspects are however too prescriptive. Whilst the desire to provide as much certainty as possible is laudable, it is important that the masterplan retains sufficient flexibility to respond to market conditions.	Development proposals would be required to be in general conformity with the SPD, and where there is deviation, this should be justified and generally provide a betterment to the original concept.
Community uses	Community businesses under the High Street Car Park (HSCP), which are beneficial to Bracknell, should be helped to relocate.	This falls outside the scope of this SPD, which is planning design guidance. It is understood however that BFC is assisting tenants in finding suitable premises to relocate.
	Easthampstead Works (at Easthampstead House) acts as a community hub for locals and small businesses. Could this use remain or be facilitated elsewhere.	Since being vacated by the Council, Easthampstead House has provided business space for small businesses as an ‘incubation’ space. This has always been intended as a temporary use prior to the redevelopment of the site. Where appropriate the Council could assist in relocation. Redevelopment would also deliver significant commercial space, which could include incubation space as part of the offering. The purpose of the SPD is to provide design guidance only, with this detail being a matter for the planning application process and subsequent marketing.
	Lack of community facilities proposed.	Planning policy for both the Eastern and Southern Gateway sites require the provision of on or off-site community facilities. In terms of the Southern Gateway, Development Principle (DP):SG4 – Land Use makes reference to the potential location of community and leisure uses, and figure 5.18 will be amended to show the potential location around Market Square/Central Spine. Further, under the key public space ‘Market Square’, p38, reference is made to it serving a community space/event function.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		<p>For the HSCP site, DP:HSCP4 – Land Use states that the development should provide commercial / community uses on the ground floor, and will be shown in an amended figure 6.18. The requirement for Community and Leisure uses within the Eastern Gateway is referenced in DP:EG4 – Land Use, and figure 7.22 will be amended to show the potential location by the Town Square. Further, the Town Square public realm is shown to serve a community space/event function (p66).</p>
	<p>The Council should provide a creative community space for the Acoustic Couch.</p>	<p>Where appropriate the Council would assist in finding alternative premises for businesses and services within the HSCP prior to the complete closure. It is understood that this is ongoing.</p> <p>There will be additional opportunities for community/cultural/leisure space within each of the redeveloped areas.</p>
	<p>The redevelopment of the High Street car park should be used to facilitate community and entertainment uses</p>	<p>A wider Council objective is to redress the historic imbalance and provide more residential accommodation in the town centre. This site provides an opportunity for this.</p> <p>The ground floor of the redeveloped site will however provide opportunity to provide community and leisure uses suited to a town centre location – ref. DP:HSCP4.</p>
	<p>Support the retention of Easthampstead House, which could house the relocated library.</p>	<p>Noted. Proposals allow for the retention of Easthampstead House, and the Council would encourage its retention as a carbon-saving opportunity, and to preserve the architecture of the New Town era. Retention however should not be at the expense of better placemaking. Whilst relocation of Bracknell Library would be a requirement of redevelopment, the focal point location of Easthampstead House would likely be used to deliver planning policy LP9 requirements for residential, office or hotel space. Such detail would be a matter to be explored at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Seating</p>	<p>Needs outdoor seating as somewhere to eat own food in town centre.</p>	<p>Each of the development areas; the Southern Gateway (SG) and Eastern Gateway (EG) in particular, will have attractive areas of public realm with seating for people to enjoy and spend time.</p>
<p>Retail</p>	<p>Need more retail, including charity shops.</p>	<p>An element of retail will be provided across the three masterplanned areas. The planning system only has control related to the use of buildings, e.g. Use Class E which includes retail; whereas the owner would determine whether a charity was to occupy a retail unit.</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	A need for more independent business within the town centre, including a site where local produce can be sold.	The planning system only has control related to the use of buildings, e.g. Use Class E which includes retail; whereas the owner would determine whether a charity was to occupy a retail unit.
Cultural	Shops and restaurants are plentiful, but a medium-sized theatre is needed to bring people into the town of an evening every week.	Bracknell Town Centre is the Borough's main centre for retail, leisure, civic and cultural activities. The NPPF identifies theatres as a main town centre use that should be focused on town centres. The Bracknell Town Centre Vision 2032 identified a deficit of cultural uses compared to other towns within the Thames Valley and identified the provision of a theatre as part of a range of potential options. Whilst local plan policy does not specifically require a theatre to be provided, the masterplans have been amended to provide for community/cultural space within the Southern and Eastern Gateways and HSCP site (refer to amended Proposed Land Use plans – figures 5.18, 6.18 & 7.22. It will be a matter for the Council as landowner or a prospective developer/owner to deliver a theatre within his space.
Recreation	<p data-bbox="394 791 1272 884">Could an ice rink be placed in the town centre?</p> <p data-bbox="394 887 1272 1018">Needs to accommodate the needs of teenagers by creating a safe space.</p> <p data-bbox="394 1021 1272 1318">The demolition of High Street car park would provide space for leisure opportunities.</p>	<p data-bbox="1299 791 2103 884">An ice rink is not proposed in this SPD, however could be a 'pop-up' use within the Eastern or Southern Gateway areas of public realm, earmarked for community event space.</p> <p data-bbox="1299 887 2103 1018">Noted. Space for teenagers will form a part of the Children and Youth play shown to be provided within the Southern and Eastern Gateways and HSCP site, shown respectively in figures 5.18, 7.22 and 6.18.</p> <p data-bbox="1299 1021 2103 1318">There would be scope on the ground floor for a leisure use. The Deck is anticipated to provide a leisure offering within the town centre, and likely be facilitated in terms of car parking by the HSCP site. The HSCP will contribute towards key objectives in meeting the borough's housing need and bring residential accommodation into the town centre, thereby increasing footfall and vibrancy, and improving the viability of other town centre uses. Further to this, the Southern and Eastern Gateways provide potential for a leisure offering.</p>
Greenspace	New town centre residents will not have sufficient pleasant recreational greenspace and children's play space within easy walking distance for families with small children or the elderly. This calm space is essential for health and wellbeing.	Council recognises that not all open space requirements will be achieved in such a central town centre location. Borough-wide, Bracknell Forest residents are fortunate to have access to extensive publicly accessible greenspace, including woodland and playing fields. The Council does recognise the importance

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		of recreational greenspace within an urban setting and will be maximising opportunities within available space. Jubilee Gardens and areas of public realm with play space will help serve this function within the town centre, and routes to existing more extensive areas of greenspace will be improved wherever possible.
	Green space should be protected from development; it's what makes Bracknell special.	Principle of development of the Eastern and Southern Gateways is established by the Local Plan, and the HSCP is previously developed land. Refer to Section 1.1 for details. Jubilee Gardens will be retained and opportunities to create attractive landscaped areas of public realm and other pockets of greenspace will be maximised.
	In overall support with the plan due to the projected increase in green space.	Noted.
	In support of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan policy for tree planting being incorporated into the proposal.	Noted.
	There is a lack of green space provision which will result in a net loss for biodiversity.	Development will be required to provide mandatory at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), either on and/or off-site.
	The provision of green space should be tested for accessibility as these spaces are important for health and wellbeing.	Noted. Need for good access to public open space is recognised. Jubilee Gardens will be enhanced to ensure that it more effectively serves this purpose, and areas of public realm and private space will be provided throughout the SPD areas. r
	In support of the retention and enhancement of Jubilee Gardens to create a play space. However, the buildings at Braccan Walk and the eastern part of the garden may isolate the space.	Noted. Being an important area of public open space, building design will need to ensure good legibility from the Central Spine public space. This is provided for in a slightly amended 6 th bullet of DP:SG7: “...with the Market Square and Central Spine town centre route.”
	The five storey building to the south of Jubilee Gardens restricts nature daylight so a careful design is required.	Noted. Section 4.2 states that at planning application stage, proposed height strategies would need to be tested through overshadowing studies. Further to this, DP:SG7 identifies the need for building design to avoid too much overshadowing of Jubilee Gardens. The Ring would need to be realigned southwards to create a development footprint that would need to allow for sufficient set back of built form to allow this.
Libraries	It should be explained what is planned for the relocation of Bracknell library. Residents, in particular children, need access to libraries.	Reprovision of the library either on site or elsewhere in the Town Centre is a Local Plan Policy LP9 requirement. As the landowner and provider of library facilities, the Council would need to agree the strategy for re-providing the library with the future developer of the site. It is not the purpose of the SPD to

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	The location of the library should not be changed.	provide this level of detail. Re-provision would likely be secured by planning obligation. Principle of redevelopment of the library site within the Eastern Gateway area, and it's reprovision, is established by the Local Plan.
Funding	How is a Council that is short of money going to fund what is proposed.	Whilst the Council is the landowner, it might not necessarily develop the sites. Land might instead be sold to a developer.
Infrastructure	Insufficient infrastructure, e.g. health, education and transport, is planned to support proposals.	Infrastructure needed to support future development was assessed as part of the new Local Plan making process. As a result, Local Plan policies LP9 and LP10 contain infrastructure required as part of the redevelopment.
	Bus services are deteriorating.	The Council values the importance of an efficient public transport network which meets the needs of its residents. Whilst it is recognised that there has been a reduction in the number of miles operated by local buses in the last dozen or so years, prior to the pandemic the number of bus journeys made had only fallen by 10% over the same period. This demonstrates that with increasing pressure on Local Authority budgets in recent years, the bus network has been rationalised in a way that continues to secure maximum value for money while still delivering a service for many residents. Bus travel is a key part of a green and sustainable future for the borough, and encouraging more passengers is a key target in the Council Plan. This is reflected in the SPD's plans for supporting the reprovision of bus station facilities and bus movement in the town centre – ref. section 4.3 Movement.
	A greater provision of electric car charging points is needed.	Noted. Electric car charging points will be provided at or beyond the mandatory level.
	Concerns regarding the increase in traffic flow from Bracknell to the M3 via the A322. The proposed development should include a comprehensive traffic impact assessment and mitigation measures to address potential congestion issues.	A transport assessment would be required to be submitted as part of any planning application for the SPD's development proposals. This would be scrutinised to ensure that development would not lead to an unacceptable impact on the highway network.
	Concerned with the impact on the existing transport infrastructure, in particular the M3 and M4.	A transport assessment would be required to be submitted as part of any planning application for the SPD's development proposals. This would be scrutinised to ensure that development would not lead to an unacceptable impact on the highway network.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	In support of the promotion of active travel and sustainable modes of transport to ensure the sustainability of the development.	Noted.
	Suggested that the roads within the Southern Gateway and High Street Car Park areas should be restricted for buses and access only for other vehicles prohibiting through-traffic coming from the dual carriageway. Buses should be directed down The Ring rather than Market Street.	Bus and vehicle movement around the town centre shown in the SPD is indicative and will be considered and subject to change as development plans progress over the next ten years, and through the period of next Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP should be adopted in early 2025 and focuses more on the use of sustainable modes and more environmentally friendly accessibility.
	Concerned with the accessibility and connectivity of adjacent areas	The need to improve access and connectivity to the town centre is recognised. Opportunities to improve access for pedestrians and cyclists to the town centre will be delivered as part of development proposals for the three masterplan areas, where possible. This is set out under 'Walking and Cycling, p23, and under the sites' 'Movement and public realm strategy' on pp30-32, 46-49 & 60-61.
Identity	The town centre lacks identity and excitement. Non-chain restaurants would help with character and attract custom.	The purpose of the SPD is to ensure that development is of good quality design and that will contribute towards a vibrant and viable town centre. Whilst the Council, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) can influence the Use Class of buildings, it has no say over whether chain or independent brands occupy the space. This would be a matter for the landowner.
	New developments should be designed to reflect the existing building style to promote character.	The purpose of the SPD is to ensure that development is of good quality design and tailored to the setting and needs of the Borough.
Costs & timescales	No information of costs and timescales is provided.	Section 9 provides an indication of timescales, and it is not the purpose of a design SPD to provide cost information.
	Concern about the cost of the development.	Noted.
The Deck	With The Deck remaining undeveloped, there is little confidence in the Council's ability to fund SPD proposals.	Land comprising The Deck is privately owned, and there are viability reasons for recently approved proposals not having been implemented. The Council is however the landowner of the three SPD sites. This does not necessary mean however that the Council will fund redevelopment of the land. This will be a Council decision.
Health facilities	Improve Skimped Hill health centre and improve transport links to it.	There are current proposals to increase the capacity of Skimped Hill health facility (planning ref. 24/00249/FUL). Bus services will operate within a convenient walking distance of

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		the facility. This will be demonstrated in an amended Figure 4.8: Proposed bus movement.
	Increase the number of GP appointments by making improvements to pre-existing clinics.	This would be an NHS matter. There are current proposals to increase the capacity of Skimped Hill health facility that would serve town centre residents.
	Allocated smoker space should be provided in the town centre, due to concerns surrounding health and wellbeing.	This is a matter outside the design scope of this SPD. Much of the town centre is privately-owned, and would be a matter for the landowner's consideration. Public Health, within the Council, does run stop smoking campaigns to tackle the issue across the board.
Safe drop off and pick up points	Safe drop off and pick up points are needed.	Noted. 'Movement and public realm strategy' sections, from pp30 & 60 will be amended to flag-up this requirement as part of the access strategy for the main Southern & Eastern Gateway sites.
Safe routes	Safe routes through proposed and existing development to access the town centre are required.	Noted. The Council recognises that the decision to walk or cycle can hinge on the feeling of safety. Safe access within the SPD areas would be a requirement of any planning permission, and where there are any safety issues beyond these areas, the Council would work within the resources available to address any issues.
	Market Street should be made an enforced 20mph road due it the volume of residential and retail units in proximity.	Bus and vehicle movement around the town centre shown in the SPD is indicative and will be considered and subject to change as development plans progress over the next ten years. Road speed limits will be a detailed matter for consideration at the time of any planning application.
Town centre safety	A police station is needed for residents and visitors to feel safe.	Noted. The SPD does not affect the Bracknell police station site.
Parking	Opposition to the development of flats due to the limited provision of parking spaces per unit.	Any development would be required to meet the Council's parking standards.
	Concerned with the limited provision of car parking spaces when visitors come from outside of the town.	Currently there is a surplus of car parking space in the town centre. The precise amount of car parking required will be determined at the detailed planning application stage, both to serve residential and commercial/leisure uses.
	Concerned with the loss of over 900 parking spaces in the High Street car park. The wording of 'generous' (p11) should be removed.	Even without the HSCP, the level of car parking serving the town centre generally exceeds demand. Text to be amended to: "Car parking provision in the town centre is sufficient to meet current demand generous with a number of off-street parking options. These currently operate below their capacity, providing scope for increased demand , and...".

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	The car park adjacent to the train station is not a public car park.	Noted. Figure 3.16 will be amended to show this as a private car park.
	The drum car park south-west of Bond Way is allocated to the residents of Winchester House and is not available for public parking.	The drum car park is already shown in figure 3.16 as a private car park.
Bus station	Oppose the loss of the bus station, as it offers a safe and convenient way to use the bus service.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Local Plan Policy LP10. This SPD provides design guidance only. This context is set out in Section 1.1.
	Bus stop dispersal will impact traffic flow and decrease the accessibility of the service for disabled and elderly members of the community.	Disagree. Negligible disruption to traffic flow is anticipated due to bus stops being in segregated laybys. This is generally already the case for bus journeys, but this will include at the start of the journey. The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to a material impact on accessibility.
	Concerned with what will happen to the facilities provided by the bus station (cafe and toilets) and have the bus companies agreed to change their timings to allow extra time for walk ups.	Cafes and toilet facilities available to be used by bus passengers will be provided as part of proposals. Bus routes and timetabling would need to be amended to factor in the new bus strategy. Catching a bus will remain convenient and there is not expected to be a material difference in accessibility.
	Concerned with how the traffic flow along Market Street will accommodate for multiple buses pulling into each stop.	Carriageway design is a detailed matter for the planning application stage. Figure 8.31 provides an example section through Station Road. The Council, including the Local Highway Authority (LHA), will work with developers to ensure that the local highway network and bus movements will continue to work effectively.
	There should be a separate consultation on the loss of the bus station.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development was established at the Local Plan making stage. This was subject to several rounds of public consultation.
	Shared use of bus shelters will mean that passengers will not be able to use them at peak times.	Configuration and capacity of bus waiting space/shelters will be decided as part of the detailed consideration of any planning application.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Suggests an opportunity to create a layer layby in front of the train station to allow buses to stop.	Precise location of bus stops is a detailed matter to be agreed at the planning application stage. A primary objective is to improve pedestrian and cycle access between the train station and town centre. A bus stop in this location would only be worthwhile if it was to serve all/many bus routes. This would lead to such a number of bus stops and bus movement that would cause a physical obstruction and highway safety issue that would prejudice the ability to deliver this objective. Instead, bus stops will be placed outside of the access corridor and remain easily accessible to the train station.
	Opposition to the redevelopment of the bus station due to its existing convenient location close to the train station.	Relocated bus stops will remain easily accessible from the train station.
	Concerned with the redevelopment of the bus station due to the vagueness of stops proposed in the plan. It should be possible to design a sawtooth style bus station where the bays are much more concentrated allowing passengers a short walk to the stops without any need to cross the lanes. Even with a small parking area this should use less space than the current bus station.	Figure 4.8 – ‘Proposed bus movement’ will be amended to clarify the location and quantum of bus stops proposed. Visual imagery will also be added to section 5.3 Southern Gateway Strategy to provide an illustrative interpretation of future on-street bus stop arrangements. On-street bus stops will avoid the need for a centralised bus station and will make for more attractive and efficient use of space in this highly sustainable location.
	In support of the proposed relocation of the bus station provided that the bus stops will be equally accessible to the town centre, provide adequate shelter and are as easy to use as the current station.	Noted. The new arrangement of on-street bus stops will be easily accessible, providing access to multiple points around the town centre. This will be shown in an amended Figure 4.8 – ‘Proposed bus movement’. Adequate shelter for those waiting at bus stops will be provided and is to be specifically referenced to in an amended ‘Southern Gateway strategy’ section.
	The SPD should recognise that the facilities provided by the current bus station act as a community hub.	The Council recognises the important community function it services, but it would not be appropriate for the SPD to refer to the bus station by this term. The bus station provides bus services with supporting facilities, which will be reprovided in a newly reconfigured and effective way.
	Opposition to the removal of the bus station as it is key to reduce reliance on individual cars and will result in the underutilisation of public transport.	The Council recognises the importance of buses in reducing reliance on the private car and remains committed to making buses an attractive form of transport to maximise patronage.
Bus service	SPD should not be approved until a comprehensive bus study has been completed that provides the evidence base for this, undertaken in partnership with the bus operators and bus users.	This SPD sets out design principles for the redevelopment of the bus station – the principle of which has already been established. Details of the bus strategy will be agreed with the Council in consultation with relevant stakeholders as part of the planning application process.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Concern that any associated increase in car traffic, kerbside activity, and changes in circulating arrangements, risks worsening congestion (and so delays to buses). This issue should be included in the above study.	The impact on the local road network and bus services would be a matter to consider at the detailed design stage. A transport assessment would be required as part of any planning application. The Council as LHA would need assurance that road layout, access arrangements and bus facilities have been appropriately considered and operate effectively without an unacceptable impact on bus services.
	There will clearly be a lot of disruption during the various construction phases. Bus operators will need to be involved at an early stage to discuss and agree principles for bus operations during construction, and mitigations for any extended journey times that would increase operating costs (and therefore fares) and reduce the attractiveness of the service. Welcome an opportunity to discuss with officers.	This is noted. Development phasing and means to avoid and mitigate construction impacts on bus services will be agreed as part of the detailed planning application process.
	The overall vision, and the Southern Gateway section, should highlight the opportunity to create a high-quality multi-modal public transport hub (in sections 1.2, 5.2 and 5.3).	The concept of a 'multi-modal' public transport hub was established in the Local Plan. Section 5.2 'Opportunities', p29 will be amended to make reference, and in Section 5.3, 'Movement and public realm strategy' and 'Development Principle: SG1 – Movement' will be amended to describe the multi-modal strategy in more detail.
	SPD should refer to the increasing importance of public transport. The development principles for movement (in each of the three masterplan sections) should include positive statements on buses.	Agreed. The following text will be added under 'Bus Station and movement', p23, to highlight the importance of public transport in contributing towards wider objectives, such as climate change and reducing reliance on the private car: <u>"Buses will continue to play a key role in providing mobility to key services and to meeting climate change objectives. The multi-modal public transport hub will be required to be maintained, with bus services continuing to play an important function, alongside rail and taxi services."</u>
	Eastern Gateway and High Street Car Park areas should reference the opportunities for new and relocated bus stops, integrated with new and improved walking routes, in order to improve public transport access. Section 3.3 (on movement and access) should recognise the important role of buses.	DP:HSCP1 – 'Movement' and figure 6.6 'Proposed bus movement' for the HSCP site, and DP: EG1 – 'Movement' and figure 7.13 'Proposed bus movement' for the Eastern Gateway site will be amended to reference the accommodation of bus services and supporting infrastructure. To emphasise the continued importance of buses, Section 4.3 'Bus station and movement' (p23) will be amended to highlight the key role of buses in providing mobility to key services and to meeting climate change objectives.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	The SPD should reference the importance of passenger and driver facilities.	A 'Bus hub' section will be added under 'Southern Gateway strategy' (from p30) and DP:SG1 – 'Movement' to clarify the need for bus driver/passenger facilities.
Cycling and cycle routes	In support of provision for cycling, however, it should be identified that secure cycling parking must be provided.	Noted. Secure cycle parking will be required in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD. Reference to the requirement for cycle parking is made in the final bullet of DP:GD9.
	Concerned with how the speed of cyclists along the proposed routes will be monitored.	Monitoring the speed of route users is outside the scope of this design document.
	Provision of a cycle route in the town centre through the Lexicon should be considered.	The Lexicon is privately owned, therefore provision of a cycle route would require agreement of the landowner. This SPD relates to land owned by the Council, where opportunities for cycle routes will be maximised.
Retail	Proposed retail space should be small in scale and supported by an impact assessment to ensure it does not compete with existing retail and negatively impact the vitality, viability and resilience of the existing core Town Centre.	<p>Redevelopment of these three masterplan sites is part of the continued regeneration and ongoing viability of Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>National policy and the Local Plan direct main town centre uses (retail and leisure uses among others) to town centres. There would be no need for a sequential test or impact assessment. Policy LP22 and LP43 do however safeguard against proposals that would harm the vitality and viability (including cumulative effect) or role of the town centre. Within the SPD, 'Retail summary' (p17) recognises that "any retail space is proportionate and does not impact upon the existing offer," and Section 4.5 states the need for a good balance of uses to contribute to and not compete with core retail centre.</p> <p>Further to this, the majority of Class E floorspace in the Southern and Eastern Gateways required by planning policy would be restricted to office use, which would increase footfall (together with the residential development planned) in the town centre and help the viability and vitality of The Lexicon.</p>
	<p>A designated market area is needed for independent business to facilitate the market currently located in the 3M building.</p> <p>A greater number of affordable retailers is needed.</p>	<p>Since the redevelopment of the indoor market beneath the former Winchester House building, it has been located near to the entrance to Princess Square, on a main through-route. The Market Square and Central Spine areas of public realm will provide opportunity for markets and events, as referred to under 'Market Square', p38.</p> <p>The planning system only has control related to the use of buildings, e.g. Use Class E which includes retail; whereas the</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		owner would determine whether an 'affordable' retailer occupies the unit.
Restaurants and Leisure	<p>Provision of leisure uses must be carefully considered to ensure that footfall is not attracted away from existing leisure uses in The Lexicon, Princess Square or those proposed as part of The Deck.</p> <p>Concerned that proposals for additional restaurant and leisure uses on the edge of the Town Centre could further impact the viability and deliverability of an alternative scheme for The Deck and the third phase of the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre. Gateway areas should therefore provide limited restaurant and leisure uses as a proportion of the total unrestricted Class E floorspace.</p>	<p>Redevelopment of these three masterplan sites is part of the continued regeneration and ongoing viability of Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>National policy and the Local Plan direct main town centre uses (retail and leisure uses among others) to town centres. There would be no need for sequential test or impact assessment. Policy LP22 and LP43 do however safeguard against proposals that would harm the vitality and viability (including cumulative effect) or role of the town centre.</p> <p>The majority of Class E floorspace in the Southern and Eastern Gateways required by planning policy would be restricted to office use, which would increase footfall (together with the residential development planned) in the town centre and help the viability and vitality of The Lexicon.</p>
Residential and Office	Supportive of new high density and high quality homes and offices, which would increase the number of residents and full or part-time working populations within the Town Centre at different times of the day and night.	Noted.
	Because The Lexicon already sufficiently serves the current population, additional standalone commercial floorspace within Gateways should be restricted unless it is brought forward as part of a wider residential-led development.	<p>Redevelopment of these three masterplan sites is part of the continued regeneration and ongoing viability of Bracknell Town Centre.</p> <p>National policy and the Local Plan direct main town centre uses (retail and leisure uses among others) to town centres. There would be no need for sequential test or impact assessment. Policy LP22 and LP43 do however safeguard against proposals that would harm the vitality and viability (including cumulative effect) or role of the town centre.</p> <p>Within the SPD, 'Retail summary' (p17) recognises that "any retail space is proportionate and does not impact upon the existing offer," and Section 4.5 states the need for a good balance of uses to contribute to and not compete with core retail centre.</p> <p>Further to this, the majority of Class E floorspace in the Southern and Eastern Gateways required by planning policy would be restricted to office use, which would increase footfall (together with the residential development planned) in the town centre and help the viability and vitality of The Lexicon.</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Opposition to height of residential development. Concerned that a 17-storey building will create a 'canyon' effect in the town centre.	This design SPD is tasked with delivering planning policy requirements for housing and other uses. The town centre, because it is the borough's most sustainable location, has been identified as being identified for high density, taller built form. Height rationale is set out in section 3.5 'Heights'. If homes are not delivered here, they would be required in less sustainable locations. Heights proposed are considered acceptable, however the need to avoid a 'canyon' effect is noted and will need to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
	In support of the provision of residential units as long as there is an allowance of affordable housing, not just shared ownership.	Affordable housing provided as part of the development sites would need to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP16. The starting point would be 35% of new homes will be affordable, with the tenure, mix and type informed by the Council's most up to date evidence of identified need.
	In support of the conversion of High Street car park to residential dwellings on the basis that it is well located and connected.	Noted. Bracknell town centre is the most sustainable location for residential development in the borough. Locally it is well connected to jobs, leisure and retail, and regionally / nationally, it is just a short walk from proposed town centre bus stops and the train station.
	The net increase in dwellings would exacerbate the problems the town centre is currently facing.	Disagree. Primarily because of the New Town legacy, Bracknell town centre is playing catch up compared with other towns in terms of bringing residential accommodation into the town centre. This additional footfall adds vibrancy and improves the viability of such uses as retail and leisure, which benefit the borough as a whole. The borough's development strategy is to focus the delivery of homes in the town centre as the borough's most sustainable location.
	Concerned with how many of the market rented units will be available for social rent.	Affordable housing provided as part of the development sites would need to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP16. The starting point would be 35% of new homes will be affordable, with the tenure, mix and type informed by the Council's most up to date evidence of identified need.
	Concerned with the increase in density.	The Local Plan's priority has been to make the best use of land within the borough's existing built-up areas and the most sustainable locations. The development strategy therefore supports the continued regeneration of Bracknell town centre as the most sustainable location in Bracknell Forest. Such height and density would be required to deliver the

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		development required by planning policy. This is considered appropriate in this central and highly sustainable location.
	Opposition to the proposed increase in dwellings as there is insufficient health facilities to accommodate the increase.	Whilst the Council consult healthcare providers as part of the plan making process, the provision of public healthcare facilities to meet demand is a matter for the NHS. A new facility on the Skimped Hill site, that would increase healthcare capacity, is the subject of a current planning application (planning ref. 24/00249/FUL).
	Concerned with the number of shared ownership dwellings being marketed as 'affordable'.	Affordable housing provided as part of the development sites would need to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP16. The starting point would be 35% of new homes will be affordable, with the tenure, mix and type informed by the Council's most up to date evidence of identified need. The pricing of shared ownership is the responsibility of Registered Providers.
	No reference to social housing.	Because the SPD relates specifically to design, the intention is not to regurgitate planning policy, however there is reference to affordable housing under Policy LP9 & 10 context on p3. The provision of affordable housing is a planning policy requirement (Policy LP16) for all three sites.
	Opposed to the provision of flats and offices as it will impact the visual appearance of the town.	The uses within the Southern and Eastern Gateways are established by Local Plan Policies LP 9 & LP10, with further rationale, including for the HSCP site, provided within '3.6 Land use and Ownership' and DPs SG4, HSCP4 & EG4, concerning land use and supporting text.
	Concerned with the increase in density which contrast the low density principle the borough was built on.	The Local Plan's priority has been to make the best use of land within our existing built-up areas and the most sustainable locations. The development strategy therefore supports the continued regeneration of Bracknell town centre as the most sustainable location in Bracknell Forest.
	The document needs to state who the proposed residential dwellings are for.	This is not necessary for this design document. The affordable housing provided as part of the development sites would be informed by the Council's most up to date evidence of identified local need – a requirement of Local Plan Policy LP16.
	Concerned with the height of the proposed development as the scale is uncharacteristic of the town centre and would be out of proportion.	Height rationale is set out in section 3.5 'Heights'. The Local Plan's priority has been to make the best use of land within our existing built-up areas and the most sustainable locations. The development strategy therefore supports the

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Concerned with the significant potential to create wind tunnels.	continued regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre as the most sustainable location in Bracknell Forest. The need to avoid this is recognised. Section 4.2. Heights (p20) refers to the need for wind studies to inform development height strategies.
Wayfinding / Public Realm	Supportive of proposals to enhance the public realm, and legibility and connectivity between town centre and transport nodes and wider communities which will serve to increase footfall.	Noted.
	Supportive of proposals for active and informal play within the public realm and a dedicated external space for youth activities, given the current limited provision within the Town Centre. This would increase dwell time and encourage a broader age demographic into the Town Centre.	Noted.
	Lack of designated open play space of a sufficient size	On-site Open Space of Public Value (OSPV) is a planning policy requirement. However, the Council recognises under 'Play and Green Infrastructure', p36, that "the open space requirements will not be achieved in such a central town centre location". The rationale for open space and landscape is set out in Sections 3.4, 4.4 and in DPs SG5, HSCP5 & EG5 with supporting text, and under 'Green and blue infrastructure', p78.
	The masterplan should consider the provision of family facilities, wayfinding and children's play spaces.	Planning policy does require the provision of on/off site community facilities, which could include family facilities, such as a nursery. Masterplans have been amended to provide for community/cultural space within the Southern and Eastern Gateways (refer to amended Proposed Land Use plans – figs 5.18 & 7.22). The importance of wayfinding is recognised. Building design and signage will both play a part in achieving this and will be secured at planning application stage. The importance of children's play is also recognised, for both visitors and residents. Provision for this is factored into all three masterplan areas, as referenced in DPs SG5, HSCP5 & EG5 and supporting text.
Accessibility and inclusivity	Lack of provision to support disabled groups.	The SPD maximises opportunities for accessibility in the built environment, and the Designing for Accessibility in Bracknell Forest SPD will be a material consideration in any planning application.
Climate change	No mention of net zero carbon targets.	Development would be required to accord with planning policy and Building Regulations in place at the time. Currently, 'net

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		zero' is not a requirement of development, however should this change, it would be applied.
	Sustainability should be a key factor for the proposed development. The council should aim to minimise the carbon footprint beyond national requirements.	Agreed. Any development would need to be in accordance with sustainability-related planning policy or building regulations. A decision to go beyond this would be a matter for the Council as landowner, or for a future developer of the sites.
Formatting	A glossary should be included.	This is not considered necessary, as design-specific terms relevant to the SPD are largely explained within the SPD.
	Paragraphs should be numbered.	Agreed. This will be factored into the final version to ease reference.
Fire compliance	The document considers the constraints on a site-by-site basis. These are focussed on existing conditions. Regulation considerations around fire – particularly for tall buildings where they are proposed - should be noted. Those diagrams suggesting the possibility of roof terraces will need to factor in additional escape measures and therefore the feasibility of a scheme.	Such detail is not required for this high-level design document and would be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage and required by building regulations at the detailed design stage.
Flexibility	The SPD should be sufficiently flexible to cover possible changes in circumstances over the duration of the plan period, as noted in the NPPF, para 86.	The SPD is design guidance that would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It is not considered too prescriptive, to allow for unforeseen circumstances and is based on information known at the time. Future development proposals would be required to be in general accordance, with deviation expected to be justified and provide betterment.
Document-specific comments		
1. Introduction: Vision and Purpose		
1.1 Purpose	The phrase 'high level approaches' should be clarified	Further clarity to that already provided in the section is not considered necessary.
1.2 Vision	Opposition to the removal of the bus station as part of the Southern Gateway vision. Concerned that the removal of the underpass will create barrier for the general public to access the town centre. The proposal to spread bus stops around the town centre is not user friendly.	This section refers to the vision set out within the Bracknell Town Centre Vision 2032 and is an established document. Amendments to this are not relevant to this SPD consultation. Redevelopment of the bus station is established by Local Plan Policy LP10. Removal of underpasses, to be replaced by at grade access, will improve access. The relocation of bus stops to an on-street location will not lead to a material impact on usability of buses.
	Regarding, 'Predominantly residential mix of uses', the Vision document was written before the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan and the adoption of its Policy: EC5: Town Centre Future Development Sites: Mixed Housing & Retail Uses.	Reference to "predominantly a residential mix of uses" in Section 1. Vision is with specific regard to what was proposed for the Southern Gateway Development Area. This is reflected in the newly adopted Local Plan Policy LP10.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	<p>Regarding, 'The inner town centre road structure will be remodelled to establish a better-connected network of sites, encouraging walking and cycling routes, creating a more legible(!) centre'. As the regenerated town centre is pedestrianised with the original service access areas to the rear of most retail sites from what remains of the original ring road, this statement is misleading & unclear especially as it refers to just 3 sites in 3 different places.</p>	<p>This is extracted from the Bracknell Town Centre Vision 2032 document and refers to the role of roads in connectivity and that roads can be reworked to reorientate or open up the edges so that the town centre is more outward facing and easier to visually navigate.</p>
	<p>The use of the phrase 'the ring road' is confusing.</p>	<p>This reference is clarified on p10 as meaning Church Road and Millenium Way.</p>
<h2>2. Planning Policy Context</h2>		
<p>2.1 Emerging / Existing policy</p>	<p>'Page 6 should read: The Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Area is the Bracknell Town Council Area shown on ; https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2022-10/bracknell-town-neighbourhood-plan-referendum-plan-oct-2021_0.pdf on page 9'</p>	<p>This section is to be amended to: "Since the Bracknell Town Council applied successfully for the designation of a neighbourhood area to covering <u>ing</u> the civil parish of Bracknell, in 2014. In October 2021 the neighbourhood plan was 'made' in October 2021. This means that the neighbourhood plan forms was adopted as part of the local development plan for the area."</p>
<p>2.2 Supplementary planning documents (SPD)</p>		
<h2>3. Town Centre Context and Analysis</h2>		
<p>3.1 Introduction</p>		
<p>3.2 Heritage and character</p>	<p>Page 10 paragraph 9: 'Pedestrians do attempt to cross the carriageway which presents significant safety issues'. This should be deleted as it is wrong because pedestrian access, north, south, east & west functions well and is safe using either established crossings across roads or underpasses. Image 3.6 should be deleted from the document.</p>	<p>Disagree. Whilst safe crossings are available, people do cross at other points for a more direct route, as is experienced and evident in figure 3.6, which is a safety concern.</p>
<p>3.3 Movement and access</p>	<p>Figure 3.7 Bus movements are inaccurately shown.</p>	<p>This figure will be amended/updated.</p>
	<p>The proposal must prioritise walking and cycling with limited delays at crossings, otherwise the current underpass would be more convenient.</p> <p>Page 11: 'The bus stopping area which dominates and severs any direct connection between the two stations.' As the writer has clearly not visited Bracknell, they will not have understood how to walk from the railway station to Jubilee Gardens, safely – down well marked underpasses and the main path to the east of the Bus Station.</p>	<p>1st and 2nd bullets of DP:GD9 support this objective.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that there is an alternative means to access the bus station and town centre from the train station, the SPD is correct in stating that the "legibility for pedestrians is currently impacted by the dominance of roads and the bus stopping area which dominates and severs any direct connection between the two stations and</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	<p>The words: 'This may mean only the most experienced cyclists use core routes through the town' is irrelevant speculation.</p> <p>'These (car parks) currently operate below their capacity and have an impact on the vibrancy of the streets around them which lack active frontages...'</p> <p>What is being referred to here and where does the data come from?</p>	<p>beyond".</p> <p>Disagree. This relates to the gaps in the cycle network that require use of roads to get to/from the town centre in a direct and efficient way. Text will be amended to clarify this: "This may mean only the morerest experienced cyclists use core routes through the town to get to the town centre in a direct and efficient way."</p> <p>This refers to public car parks that serve the town centre. 'Active frontages' relate to the use of windows, doors etc on a frontage that provide activity and interest. BFC is the main operator, and information suggests that these car parks do generally operate below their capacity.</p>
3.4 Open space and landscape	<p>Opposition to the description of Jubilee Gardens as a 'softer space'.</p> <p>Suggests the use of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Open Space of Public Value policy map: https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2022-10/bracknell-town-neighbourhood-plan-referendum-plan-oct-2021_0.pdf page 20 Policy EV1</p>	<p>Agreed. This will be amended to: "...a few pockets of softer vegetated open space...".</p> <p>Figure 3.10 is considered sufficient for the purpose.</p>
3.5 Heights	Needs updating. The Bracknell Beeches scheme (21/00701 FUL) has planning permission for 16 storeys. Reference to "subject to section 106 agreement" should be deleted.	Agreed. This reference will be deleted.
3.6 Land use and Ownership	<p>Lack of market analysis of community spaces, in particular medical facilities.</p> <p>Reference to a "lack of larger 3+bedroom properties...and that there may be some scope for...larger 2 bed and/or 3 bed flatted units, duplex apartments or town houses" strays from factual contextual analysis to conjecture. The bustle of a town centre, accessibility to public transport, lower car ownership and affordability means that the most optimum housing mix is always likely to be tailored to studio, one- and two-bedroom homes in the masterplan area.</p> <p>Agree with the market analysis that states "it is not anticipated that office uses will drive the sites forward" and that 'Bracknell has a reasonable hotel offering' already.</p>	<p>The purpose of this analysis is specifically to review residential and commercial market activity in and around Bracknell Town, to inform uses and viability. Non-commercial activity as described would fall outside of this remit.</p> <p>Understood. The development strategy is based on high density development in this most sustainable location. The majority of development proposed is therefore apartment-living; however, in recognition of the differing needs of households, a wider mix of accommodation, to include town houses, is proposed. Deviation from this would require justification. The Council would have regard to individual site circumstances, including the character of the area, and viability.</p> <p>Noted, however this does not obviate the planning policy scope for hotel provision in the Eastern Gateway area.</p>
4. Town Centre - Wide Concept		

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
4.1 Introduction	Pleased to see that the plan anticipates changes in mobility.	Noted.
	Need to clarify: The car will continue to be accommodated, but in ways which anticipate the possibility of significant changes in mobility over the coming generation.	This refers to such changes as the move away from the combustion engine and potential for automated transport.
	Disagree with the statement 'The town centre in its nature is inward looking' - suggest removing this statement.	Disagree. This is a general but accurate description of the town centre, and sets the context for the objective to make the town centre more outward-facing.
	Six key objectives that have shaped the masterplan concept are all supported.	Noted.
	Support reference to framing of key routes and the role of building and views in enhancing the legibility of the town centre.	Noted.
4.2 Heights	Need to clarify: 'to increase permeability'.	The urban design term 'permeability' relates to the ease with which people can move through an area, more specifically supporting pedestrian and cycle connectivity, to improve the vitality of an area and provide people with an attractive alternative to the private car in getting from A to B.
4.3 Movement	Figure 4.8: The position of the bus station pays no consideration to the majority of users, who are elderly or disabled. Concern with the distance in between proposed bus stops.	The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to any material impact on accessibility.
	Figure 4.7: above ground crossing should be provided for pedestrians due to concerns of safety.	All underpasses within the masterplan areas would be replaced by at grade crossing points.
	Opposition to the removal of the bus station as the recent development at the site and the adjacent green spaces has improved the Southern Gateway. Removing the bus station would reverse this.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. This SPD provides design guidance only. This context is set out in Section 1.1.
	Concerned with how the proposed bus stations would cope with the long queues experienced by users.	Configuration and capacity of bus waiting space/shelters will be decided as part of detailed consideration of any planning application.
	Are electric scooters expected, alongside cyclists, to travel (at dangerous speeds) up the High Street – page 23 paragraph 3?	No. This section refers to pedestrians and cyclists specifically.
	Figure 4.8 shows all bus movements along Market Street however, there are movements along The Ring east of the High Street Car Park, which stop outside of Skimped Hill Health Centre.	Figure 4.8 shows proposed routes, however will be updated to correctly show routes along The Ring.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	The statement 'all subways within the masterplan area will be removed' is inconsistent with the 'pedestrian and cycle underpass improvements' at the Met Office roundabout.	The section of underpass beneath the Met Office roundabout falls outside of the masterplan area, and will remain an underpass, with at grade to the west.
	Supportive of movement strategy – use of two-way accesses to help improve permeability and vehicle speeds, relocation of the Bus station and removal of subways that will help create a better pedestrian experience.	Noted.
	Whilst a 'consolidated car parking model' has merits, it should be acknowledged that the current car parks operate below capacity because of a number of factors. Flexibility on parking strategy – to deliver on phase-by-phase basis or within a multistorey purpose-built car park should be explicitly referenced.	'Parking, p23, sets out the parking strategy, that delivers parking to standard whilst minimising the number of vehicles on street and creates a more car-free environment. Any deviation from the model presented would need to be robustly justified and deliver this car-free objective.
	The statement that 'Parking will be unallocated' is too restrictive. It may prove difficult to sell larger homes if a parking space cannot be allocated. Many future homeowners will want security and surety in the ability to park. This can affect viability. Paragraph should be deleted, or caveat inserted.	The text will be amend to: "Parking <u>within the multi-storey car park</u> will be <u>a mix of allocated and</u> unallocated, to enable...".
4.4 Landscape and open space		
4.5 Land use	Figure 4.9 demonstrates a lack of community space.	<p>Planning policy for both the Eastern and Southern Gateway sites require the provision of on or off-site community facilities. In terms of the Southern Gateway, DP:SG4 – Land Use makes reference to the potential location of community and leisure uses, and figure 5.18 will be amended to show the potential location around Market Square. Further, under the key public space 'Market Square', p38, reference is made to it serving a community space/event function.</p> <p>For the HSCP site, DP:HSCP4 – Land Use states that the development should provide commercial / community uses on the ground floor, and Figure 6.18: 'Proposed land uses' will be amended to show this.</p> <p>The requirement for Community/ Leisure uses within the Eastern Gateway is referenced in DP:EG4 – Land Use, and figure 7.22 will be amended to show the potential location by the Town Square. Further the Town Square public realm is shown to serve a community space/event function (p66).</p>
	Land Use diagram (Figure 4.9) is generally supported, although the colour palette used and the use of 12 different classifications can make certain distinctions difficult.	Noted. The colour palette will be reviewed.
5. Southern Gateway		

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
5.1 Illustrative masterplan	Supportive overall.	Noted.
	Diversion of services can be costly and impact viability – this should be noted.	As a design document, it would not be appropriate to make general reference to this.
5.2 Opportunities and constraints summary	Concern regarding the relocation of the Bracknell War Memorial as it has previously been relocated.	Necessary consent, in consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and relevant statutory bodies, would be required prior to any relocation.
	Public art should be featured in Market Square.	Noted. DP:GD13 requires the installation of Public Art.
5.3 Southern Gateway strategy	<p>Relocation of clustered bus stops to being scattered along streets will make bus services inconvenient and discourage bus use.</p> <p>Bus stops will be harder to find and require walking further to get to. Particularly problematic for visitors and those with impaired mobility, and those that need to change buses.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to any material impact on accessibility. Because buses will no longer simply be in one area, effective wayfinding and bus information is of utmost importance. The new layout will provide new, more modern bus stops, which will serve multiple routes and allow for interchange in a similar location to what exists now.</p>
	<p>Proposed bus stops will require seating and shelters, and bus drivers will need an office and toilet facilities. How will this be possible when bus stops/terminus are along stretches of road. This would exacerbate already struggling bus services.</p>	<p>The SPD will be amended to clarify what is proposed. A 'Bus hub' section will be added under 'Southern Gateway strategy' (from p30) and DP:SG1 – 'Movement' to clarify the need for high quality directional signage and bus service information, enabling easy interchange between bus services, and with the train station.</p> <p>Further to this, an artist's impression of new bus stop arrangements on Station Road is included under Section 5.3 'Southern Gateway strategy', to show the extent of stops and how these would be blended into an attractive and vibrant public realm, and how bus laybys would be integrated into the street network.</p>
	<p>The bus station is in a prime town centre location. To strike a better bus user convenience / financial gain balance, consider building retail, office or residential above the station instead of removing it.</p>	<p>The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. Design proposals in the SPD are considered to be the best, most attractive and evidence-based option for delivery.</p>
	<p>Presents a good opportunity to make Jubilee Gardens an attractive area of open space.</p>	<p>Noted. Proposals for Jubilee Gardens are set out in DP:SG7 – Jubilee Gardens and supporting text.</p>
	<p>Suggest the war memorial is moved to Jubilee Gardens, not Market Square; or if the market is moved to Market Square, that it remains</p>	<p>Noted. There are no firm plans to move the memorial. 'Heritage', p28, only identifies opportunities redevelopments</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	where it is, which is centrally located to ensure visibility as a reminder of sacrifices.	present. Proper consideration and necessary consent would be required prior to any movement.
	Underpasses by station provide safer environment for pedestrians, away from cars. Replacing will have a negative impact on pedestrian road safety.	Some deem underpasses to feel unsafe, particularly at night. The underpass would be replaced with a safe at grade crossing point. Refer to DP:SG1 – Movement requirements.
	Market Square will be good opportunity for a “proper” weekly market to return to Bracknell, encouraging footfall to The Lexicon.	Agreed. The use of Market Square as public event and market space is stated under ‘Market Square’, p38.
	Opposition to the development due to the removal of the bus station. Housing located close to the train station will attract outside residents rather than providing housing for existing residents.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. This SPD provides design guidance only. This context is set out in Section 1.1. Close proximity to the train station offers the most sustainable location for homes in the borough. People moving in and out of the borough is to be expected.
	Opposition to the development due to removal of the bus station as it was recently redeveloped. The bus station provides a safe gateway into the town centre.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. This SPD provides design guidance only. This context is set out in Section 1.1.
	The bus flow and the Ring should reverse and go clockwise around the town centre rather than the proposed anti-clockwise.	Bus and vehicle movement around the town centre shown in the SPD is indicative and will be considered and subject to change as development plans progress over the next ten years, and through the period of next Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP should be adopted in early 2025 and focuses more on the use of sustainable modes and more environmentally friendly accessibility.
	Figure 5.6 concerned with the lack of bus stop visibility for travellers exiting the train station.	Because buses will no longer simply be in one area, effective wayfinding and bus information is of utmost importance and will be provided. The new layout will provide a much greater sense of arrival when leaving the train station which will lead residents and commuters through the development to a series of new more modern bus stops which will serve multiple routes and allow for interchange in a similar location to what exists now.
	Opposition to the position of the proposed bus stops. Concerned that the space needed to facilitate one lane for cars, one lane for passing buses, one lane for bus stops and a footpath for pedestrians would obstruct traffic flow and reduce the area of green space.	Bus stops/routes are indicatively shown in figure 4.8. This will be amended to clarify proposed stops/routes/facilities. Figure 8.31 shows an example street section, illustrating how the road could function. Detailed design to follow will ensure that the streets would function safely and effectively.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	In support of the proposed Station Road bus stops as the position is closer to the town centre.	Noted.
	In support of the proposed children's playground in Jubilee Gardens.	Noted.
	It is difficult to see clearly what is being proposed due to a number of small illustrations.	Images/plans will be enlarged where appropriate. The document will however mostly be accessed as an electronic PDF file, where it is possible to zoom into any part of the document to enlarge.
	This section of the document appears to be contradictory. The Southern Gateway is described as having an area of open dining and entertainment but diagram 5.18 shows that the only provision of this is Market Inn.	Agreed. Proposed land use plans will be amended to provide a finer-grained illustration of what will be on the ground floor. Like other key spaces, Market Square will be a vibrant community space, with ground floor uses spilling out, as referenced under 'Market Square', p38.
	The current use of the bus station does not provide the most effective use of land but the proposal lacks clarity in what this site will be replaced with.	Section 5. Southern Gateway provides a level of detail appropriate to a masterplans SPD document.
	The proposal is unclear of what is meant by "Station Way will be humanised to reduce the severance this currently causes and will accommodate two-way movement in addition to northbound (anticlockwise) bus operations" and "Delivering an attractive and inviting bus stop waiting environment will be key – maximising placemaking opportunities along the street".	This first sentence referenced will be amended to: "Station Way will <u>be improved to reduce highway dominance and be made more pedestrian and cycle-friendly by reducing</u> be humanised to reduce the severance this currently causes, <u>and will accommodate</u> T two-way movement <u>will be accommodated</u> in addition to northbound (anticlockwise) bus operations." The second sentence referenced refers to the need to make bus stop arrangements attractive, both because of the extent to which they contribute to the street environment, and to promote catching a bus as an attractive means to travel.
	P36 states "and proximity to existing open spaces within 10 min walk from the site (refer to Figure 3.10)." Figure 3.10 shows very little green space within 10 minutes walking distance.	This is to highlight the objective to improve links to areas of greenspace within a short, convenient, walking distance away. The SPD sites themselves will provide elements of greenspace, but there is a recognition of the need to access larger areas of open space, such as The Elms. Whilst this objective remains, specific reference to 10 mins will be amended to: "This will be achieved through the creation of new green routes linking into the existing green infrastructure network within a 10 <u>min-20 minute</u> walk <u>from the site and/or a 5 minute cycle ride</u> (refer to Figure 3.10)." Figure 3.10 has been amended accordingly.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	All proposed walking and cycling routes need to be the most direct to ensure they are used.	Understood. Opportunities to achieve this across and between the three sites will be maximised. Reference 'Walking and Cycling', p23.
	Opposition to the proposed development being located on the green space next to the bus station.	The principle of development on this area of greenspace is already established through Local Plan Policy LP10.
	In support of DPs SG1, SG5 and SG6 as the proposal seeks to pedestrianise the route towards Market Street.	Noted.
	In support of the bus station relocation.	Noted.
	Page 30 paragraph 3 should state the document sources.	For the sake of keeping the document succinct, this is not necessary. References can be found on the internet.
	Page 30 paragraph 3 - 'Station Way will be humanised' – how?	This will be clarified to read: "Station Way will <u>be improved to reduce highway dominance and make more pedestrian and cycle-friendly</u> , be humanised to reduce the severance this currently causes. <u>and will accommodate</u> It two-way movement <u>will be accommodated</u> in addition to northbound (anticlockwise) bus operations."
	Page 31: asks for further clarification in how safe cycling will be enforced.	Enforcement is not a matter for this design document. Cycle routes will be designed to facilitate safe cycling, e.g. with sufficient visibility splays.
	Page 32: Opposes <i>Delivering an attractive and inviting bus stop waiting environment</i> as this exists at the current bus station.	Principle of redevelopment of the bus station is already established by Local Plan Policy LP10. Objective to deliver new, attractive and inviting bus stop environment remains.
	Page 33: Clarification required on how the council will enforce proposed development being of architectural merit.	This will be secured through the determination of planning applications and subsequent monitoring.
	Page 34: Opposed to the height of the proposed development.	Height rationale is set out in section 3.5 'Heights'. The Local Plan's priority has been to make the best use of land within our existing built-up areas and the most sustainable locations. The development strategy therefore supports the continued regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre as the most sustainable location in Bracknell Forest.
	Page 36: The phrase 'new green routes' is unsubstantiated.	This refers to the creation of walking / cycling routes that are landscaped or integrated into greenspaces.
	The former Royal British Legion building should be included in the development area, this is inconsistently shown across the different drawings at present, as despite being granted permission to become a children's nursery the permission hasn't been implemented and it remains dormant and semi-derelict.	All masterplan areas are under the Council's ownership, which the former RBL building is not, therefore is excluded. Plan references will be amended where appropriate.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Predicted bus numbers, sizes, swept paths and layover requirements will be needed to inform the re-provision of bus stops.	This is recognised and will be a matter for detailed design at planning application stage.
	A new vehicular access to the Jubilee Gardens area from The Ring is likely to be needed to avoid vehicles having to use the one-way service yard route or height-restricted route past Braccan Walk car park to access the site, neither of which are adopted highway. This will be as important for construction vehicles as post-construction (such as for waste collection) and should be a first-phase item of work.	Noted. The need for road enhancements here would be explored as part of detailed design work.
	The Illustrative Masterplan at 5.1 has many colours but no key, making it difficult to interpret.	Each Illustrative masterplan will be amended to include annotations to assist interpretation.
	On page 32 the text “Enhanced Street” is given for The Ring, Station Way and Market Street, but there is no definition of what an “Enhanced Street” is anywhere in the document.	This is shown in DP:GD7 and supporting text.
	The ‘landmark’ frontages shown in Figure 5.13 do not match where landmark buildings are indicated on other plans within the document.	‘Landmark frontages’ have been replaced with ‘Marker edges’ in ‘Key frontages and Edges’ plans to avoid confusion.
	In support of the proposed Southern Gateway development due to the improvements of pedestrian access and connectivity.	Noted.
	Whilst in support of the encouragement of cycle routes, sufficient and safe parking must be provided.	Sufficient cycle parking would be required as part of the planning application process, in line with the Parking Standards SPD, as a minimum. The need for cycle parking is also set out in DP:GD9 – last bullet.
	The document should focus on providing an open and accessible public realm at the front of the station. This should be included as a ‘key public space’.	As shown in figure 5.27 both the Market Square and Central Spine public realms immediately abut the station. Respective DPs SG6 & SG8 recognise the importance of creating a high quality connection to the train station.
	The proposed parking strategy shown on Figure 5.8 is flawed. Reliance is placed on an underground car park under blocks D1 and D2. It is erroneously presumed that the level difference would allow such an accommodation. The dashed line indicating the car parking area extends beyond the building footprint under the square. Basement car parks involve significant technical engineering, notable cost and would represent a severe project risk. Not supportive of this approach.	‘Parking’, p23, sets out the parking strategy, that delivers parking to standard whilst minimising the number of vehicles on street and creates a more car-free environment. Any deviation from the model presented would need to be robustly justified and deliver this more car-free objective.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Support Development Principle SG2, however Figure 5.13 uses the term “Landmark Edges” instead of “Marker Edges”. This is not referred to in the text. For consistency, the text and the diagram terminology should match.	Noted. This inconsistency will be amended.
	Landmark Frontage of Blocks D1 and D2 would be undermined if an access and egress ramp were required for a basement car park. This would create a significant puncture in the frontage at best and could severely impact the length of the frontage at worst.	This would be a matter for the detailed design stage.
	Approach to heights is supported, however reference to precise storeys is overly prescriptive. It should also be noted that the differences in floor-to-ceiling-heights mean that commercial mixed/use buildings may be notably taller than residential buildings of the same storey height.	Noted. This SPD once adopted would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Deviation from design principles would need to be robustly justified.
	Figure 5.18 conflicts with Figure 5.34. The diagram at 5.18 also suggests that the entirety of Block D2 is offices, but in Figure 5.34 it is Block D1 that are offices. Meanwhile the residential landmark and connecting shoulder are all residential in Figure 5.34 but divided between offices and residential in Figure 5.18. Finally, the shadow shading of Figure 5.18 suggests that the office element is taller than the residential element. The diagrams should be amended to ensure consistency with each other.	Agreed. Figures 5.18 & 5.34 will be amended accordingly.
	The Southern Gateway is predicated on a substantial amount of new office space. Yet, as the market analysis acknowledges there is currently an abundance of office space. The identification of such commercial uses should therefore remain flexible to react to changing market conditions. A reference to indicative uses should be made explicit in the supporting text.	The SPD is a high level design document, so by it's nature, implementation will inevitably differ from that proposed. Local Plan Policy LP10 supporting text states that “this policy seeks approximately 22,300m2 of office floorspace (Class E – restricted), and 1,500m2 of floorspace for use within Class E (unrestricted). This will provide flexibility for the market to deliver floorspace in uses which are in highest demand over the plan period and beyond.”
	Ref LP Policy LP10 – Multi-modal hub concept is not, however, referred to in the SPD.	The concept of a ‘multi-modal’ public transport hub was established in the Local Plan. Section 5.2 ‘Opportunities’, p29 will be amended to make reference, and in Section 5.3, ‘Movement and public realm strategy’ and ‘Development Principle: SG1 – Movement’ will be amended to describe the multi-modal strategy in more detail.
	It needs to be articulated how the proposed new bus stop arrangements will work together collectively (along with the railway	The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	<p>station) to provide a focal hub for public transport users. This needs to include physical design issues (such as legibility of walking routes, and sightlines), signage, information (including a well-located staffed facility and real-time information), toilets, and a conveniently located café. The proposed layout distributes stops over a larger distance than today (it's around 250m from Station Way to the Market Street stop), with no direct line of sight. Without any compensating improvements, this weakens the arrangements as a customer hub. The proposed Market Street stop, in particular, is poorly located for access to the town centre as it is the most remote from Braccan Way.</p>	<p>bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to any material impact on accessibility. Because buses will no longer simply be in one area, effective wayfinding and bus information is of utmost importance. The new layout will provide new, more modern bus stops, which will serve multiple routes and allow for interchange in a similar location to what exists now.</p>
	<p>The allocation of stops to services needs to be understood, and it needs to be demonstrated there is enough stop capacity to accommodate them. The allocation needs to include consideration of where routes set down passengers, where they pick up, where they take recovery time, and how they are grouped around shared destinations.</p>	<p>Details of the bus strategy will be agreed with the Council in consultation with relevant stakeholders as part of the planning application process.</p>
	<p>Footways need to be wide enough to accommodate both people moving along the footway, and those waiting for the bus. Shelters should be provided, sized to meet current and future demand requirements. Facilities to support driver sign on/off and changeovers should also be provided in a convenient location for the stops.</p>	<p>Figure 8.31 provides an indication of how bus stops would be served on-street. Precise detail will be agreed through the planning application process.</p>
	<p>The demographic of bus users tends to be somewhat different to those who would use the railway station, with over 26% of our passengers on services in Bracknell using a concessionary pass for their journey. Without wishing to generalise too much, this demographic often has more mobility issues than the wider population, and the impact of having to walk some considerable distance to change buses could well disincline some to travel by bus. The proposed changes would certainly be seen as disadvantaging that group of people.</p>	<p>The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to any material impact on accessibility.</p>
	<p>The combined impact of these need to be understood. An increase in the cost of operating buses would not only increase our own expenditure and bus fares, but also have an impact on the cost of supported routes subsidised by the council or limit the number of journeys that could be supported.</p>	<p>Negligible disruption to traffic flow is anticipated due to bus stops being in segregated laybys. This is generally already the case for bus journeys, but this will include at the start of the journey.</p>
	<p>There are not currently major traffic congestion issues in the area around the bus station, though kerbside activity on Market Street can lead to delays. However, several possible issues are foreseen</p>	<p>This is a matter outside the scope of this design document.</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	with the proposed development on the speed (and so efficiency and cost) of bus operations.	
6. High Street Car Park		
6.1 Illustrative masterplan	Supportive overall.	Noted.
6.2 Opportunities and constraints summary	Constraints section could refer to the current condition of the Car Park and its under-utilisation.	Page 4, first paragraph is considered to provide sufficient context.
	Breakdown of the canyon affect on the Ring is strongly supported.	Noted.
	Landmark gateway buildings along the east west route are supported.	Noted.
	Creation of a key view from the south visually connecting with the Southern Gateway is supported.	Noted.
6.3 High Street Car Park strategy	Opposition to the development due to the loss of parking spaces and the lack of provision elsewhere.	The car park has needed to close permanently for structural reasons. Car parking provision in the town centre is sufficient to meet current demand, and any new development would be required to meeting the Council's parking standards.
	Cyclists should not be given a 'sense of priority'. Priority should be given to what is dictated in the highway code.	This reference refers to the need to create safer cycling routes where space is shared with cars.
	In support of the creation of the east-west route to improve connectivity between The Peel Centre and the Lexicon.	Noted.
	Page 52: Suggests including reference to Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Policy HO 6 Buildings: Energy Efficiency and Generation	It is not intended to repeat all relevant planning policy that would be applied in any event; therefore this is not considered necessary.
	It is key to ensure a pedestrian and cycle link between The Lexicon (across The Ring) and Market Street (and onwards to the Peel Centre) as part of this development. This element of the proposal in the Masterplan document is fully supported by the Highway Authority.	Noted.
	Consideration to retaining or enhancing the footbridge link between Princess Square and the former High Street car park site is advised. Direct linkages around the town centre to the key uses within Princess Square are not as direct and depending on what is provided on this site it may provide flexibility for visitors to the town centre to access this part of the town.	The car park is structurally unsound therefore would need to be demolished, with footbridge. Because of the residential use above ground floor level in the southern block, it would not be feasible to provide a link to Princess Square.
With the loss of a town centre car park, any development on this site must provide sufficient parking on-site to fully meet the Council's Parking Standards SPD requirements. In this regard the wording of the statement on pages 5 and 18 may need to be amended: "The car will continue to be accommodated, but in ways	Any planning application, without robust justification, would need to demonstrate parking to standard, therefore this amendment is not considered necessary.	

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	which anticipate the possibility of significant changes in mobility over the coming generation”.	
	Once this development is complete changes to the road network to re-allocate road space to walking and cycling, particularly on Market Street and The Ring should be explored.	Noted. Improvements to The Ring have been identified, and Market Street could be further explored as part of measures to improve the walking and cycling experience in the town centre. This would assist meeting the Council’s climate change objectives.
	This is suggested in the following bullet point in the document on page 5 “The inner town centre road structure will be remodelled to establish a better-connected network of sites, encouraging walking and cycling routes, creating a more legible centre”.	Noted.
	The High Street Car Park is still shown as (P) parking on the constraints plan (Figure 6.2) even though the car park is closed.	It is not necessary to change this, as it reflects the appearance and most recent use.
	In support of the proposal to provide an enhanced connection along the east-west route.	Noted.
	Opportunities to improve access to the train station should be encouraged.	Noted. Opportunities will be maximised to provide easy access to the train station.
	Parking is mainly in Block C1, with additional parking for blocks A & B accessed from Market Street. This will require careful co-ordination. Consideration should be given to allowing additional flexibility in the car parking strategy.	Deviation would require justification, and generally provide a betterment to that proposed.
	The precise form and curvature of northern most block should be open to greater design innovation, with supporting text clarifying that the diagrams of the layout are an indicative guide rather than fixed parameters that must be followed.	The curvature is intended to flare out the entrance for a better relationship with movement to-from the north (with the High Street), and also provide a visually interesting landmark feature providing legibility from the Southern Gateway area. Deviation from the design proposed would need to be justified, and would still be required to deliver these design objectives.
	Development Principle HSCP2 Figure 5.13 uses the term “Landmark Edges” instead of “Marker Edges”. This is not referred to in the text. For consistency, the text and the diagram terminology should match.	Noted. This inconsistency will be amended.
	Heights are generally supported, however the shadow shading of Figure 6.17 suggests that the 2-3 storey podium is taller than the curved landmark element. The massing and form of Block B is also very prescriptive and would benefit from a supporting reference that	Noted. The shading will be amended. Development proposals would be required to be in general conformity with the SPD, and where there is deviation, this should be justified and generally provide a betterment to the original concept.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	the precise form of the building is flexible and should be tested through a planning application.	
	Land Use is supported. Residential entrances at ground floor will help create active frontages, even if there is an absence of retail/commercial space.	Noted.
	The proposed two-way bus routing on Market Street, combined with the new east-west pedestrian priority street through the site, needs to be complemented by new bus stopping arrangements.	Agreed. Amended Figure 4.8 – Proposed Bus Movement shows new bus stops immediately to the north of the HSCP site.
7. Eastern Gateway		
7.1 Illustrative masterplan	Supportive overall.	Noted.
7.2 Opportunities and constraints summary	Considers Easthampstead House to be outdated and suggests demolition.	Noted. Demolition would be an option if it were to make for better placemaking.
	Figure 7.10: The pale blue line does not appear on the key.	Noted. Key will be amended.
	Cyclist routes are shown between west and south-east on Figure 7.10 across the Met Office Roundabout which does not exist on the ground. The connection is west to north-east, connecting south-east of Warfield Road in front of Avis Budget House.	This figure shows where there are potential opportunities for extended cycle routes.
	Retention of Easthampstead House is listed in the first two bullet points. Whilst this might be desirable, it may not be feasible. The building is not listed and does not form part of a conservation area.	Noted. Retention is listed as an opportunity only, not a requirement.
7.3 Eastern Gateway strategy	Plans for the old library building is unclear.	The Eastern Gateway illustrative masterplan (Figure 7.1) shows the building to be redeveloped.
	Assurance needed that extension to Easthampstead House will be in keeping with the original building architecture.	Whilst Easthampstead House is a good example of New Town architecture, it is not a designated heritage asset. Any development would need to be of high quality design, and any extension would need to be sympathetic and not incongruous to the host building.
	Opposition to the Eastern Gateway Development due to the loss of nature and the removal of the public library.	Development would be required to deliver a mandatory at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. Adopted Local Plan Policy LP9 allows for the “reprovision of the library either on site or elsewhere in the Town Centre”.
	Opposition to the development due to the loss of employment floor space following the demolition of Easthampstead House. The provision of flats should not be favoured in this development.	Since being vacated by the Council, Easthampstead House has provided business space for small businesses as an ‘incubation’ space. This has always been intended as a temporary use prior to the redevelopment of the site. Where

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
		<p>appropriate the Council could assist in relocation. Redevelopment would also deliver significant commercial space, which could include incubation space as part of the offering. This detail would be a matter for the planning application process and subsequent marketing.</p>
	<p>Community leisure uses should be facilitated in the development.</p>	<p>Planning policy for both the Eastern and Southern Gateway sites require the provision of on or off-site community facilities. In terms of the Southern Gateway, Development Principle (DP):SG4 – Land Use makes reference to the potential location of community and leisure uses, and figure 5.18 will be amended to show the potential location around Market Square/Central Spine. Further, under the key public space ‘Market Square’, p38, reference is made to it serving a community space/event function.</p> <p>For the HSCP site, DP:HSCP4 – Land Use states that the development should provide commercial / community uses on the ground floor, and will be shown in an amended figure 6.18. The requirement for Community and Leisure uses within the Eastern Gateway is referenced in DP:EG4 – Land Use, and figure 7.22 will be amended to show the potential location by the Town Square. It will be a matter for the Council as landowner or a prospective developer to deliver community leisure facilities within his space.</p> <p>Further, the Town Square public realm is shown to serve a community space/event function (p66).</p>
	<p>In support of the retention of Easthampstead House and the reuse of Town Square due to the sustainability benefits.</p>	<p>The retention of Easthampstead House is supported by the Council (ref. p59), however this is not a requirement, particularly if its retention stands in the way of better placemaking.</p>
	<p>Page 63: Opposes the height of the proposed development.</p> <p>Page 63: The proposed positive frontages will impact building accessibility, and the proposal should consider the role of the resident caretaker.</p>	<p>Such height would be required to deliver the development required by planning policy LP9. Such density and height is considered appropriate in this central and highly sustainable location.</p>
	<p>The approach to precise storeys is considered overly prescriptive.</p>	<p>Development proposals would be required to be in general conformity with the SPD, and where there is deviation, this should be justified and generally provide a betterment to the original concept.</p>
	<p>There are two “Landmark” buildings in the Eastern Gateway. The building which is positioned is at the confluence of the town square</p>	<p>Creating a landmark is not all about height, but overall design quality. Figure 7.20 will however be amended to make</p>

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	and the central spine (see Figure 7.27) is notably squat in scale given its location. It is also a single linear mass. The heights diagram suggests the building to be 4-5 storeys. Lower than the rest of the buildings on the Eastern Gateway. The building cannot be properly classified as a landmark for legibility purposes based on such an approach.	consistent with the scope to extend Easthampstead House, that is already 5 storeys high, upwards.
	Distribution of uses is generally supported, although the inclusion of a notable office block, and the stated ambition for Easthampstead House to become a hotel may be unrealistic. Office and hotel space should remain flexible to react to changing market conditions. The supporting text should acknowledge this.	Hotel and office space are both requirements of Local Plan policy LP9 – reflective of anticipated need over the plan period. Planning applications would be required to be in accordance with this requirement with deviation from this justified by evidence.
	The principles of the Town Square (EG6) are supported. The introduction of playspace, seating and the use of trees to calm the area are all positive ways of enhancing the use of the square by all.	Noted.
	Two-way traffic along The Ring opens up the possibility of introducing a northbound stop near the eastern end of the High Street, improving access to bus services to the Eastern Gateway and northern areas of the town centre (including Fenwick).	This has been factored into the amended 'Proposed bus movement' figures 4.8 & 7.13.
8. General Design Principles		
8.1 Built form	A reference to the development's surroundings should be included when considering the design of proposed developments.	This is considered in section 3. 'Town Centre Context and Analysis'.
	GD1 is supported, however this section does not adopt the terminology of "Marker Frontages" that is used elsewhere in the document. "Marker" and "Landmark" Frontages are used interchangeably. Need for consistency.	Noted. This inconsistency will be amended.
	GD2, GD3 and GD4 are supported.	Noted.
8.2 Public realm	<p>Proposed new green spaces must have a strategy to ensure they are kept tidy and clean to avoid any unwanted pests.</p> <p>The existing green space could benefit from this.</p>	Noted. Management and maintenance arrangements for areas of landscaping and open space will be a matter to be agreed at the planning application stage.
8.3 Sustainability principles	Suggests the rewording of development principle GD9: Changing the end of the first sentence of principle GD9 to read "streets should meet the needs of pedestrians first, then accommodating cycles, then buses and then private vehicles".	This is not considered necessary.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	Adding a point further down to suggest that "Bus stops replacing the bus station in the Southern Gateway should form a cohesive zone within the development which is clearly signposted, easy to access from the town centre and railway station and easy to navigate to facilitate bus journeys and interchange".	This section is for general design principles, whereas this suggestion is Southern Gateway specific. A 'Bus hub' section will be added under 'Southern Gateway strategy' (from p30) and DP:SG1 – 'Movement' to clarify the need for high quality directional signage and bus service information, enabling easy interchange between bus services, and with the train station.
	Adding another point further down to read "Consideration should be given to provision of shared vehicles for residents, for example through an onsite car sharing club, ideally using electric vehicles."	A further bullet will be added to read: " <u>Consideration should be given to the provision of shared vehicles for residents, for example through an onsite car sharing club, with preference for electric vehicles.</u> "
	Suggests the rewording of development principle GD10: At the end of the 2nd point (which begins with "providing foraging opportunities"), add the following text: ", including consideration of green walls or roofs where appropriate".	Second bullet will be amended to read: "...urbanised areas, <u>including the use of green walls and roofs where appropriate;</u> "
	Suggests the rewording of development principle GD11: Changing the opening text to read "Design all buildings to reduce the demand for energy and the carbon footprint in use by".	Agreed. Text will be amended accordingly.
	Adding text to the first point so that it reads "orientating them to take advantage of natural lighting and winter solar gains".	Agreed. Text will be amended accordingly.
	Adding the following points to the list: "considering the use of renewable energy sources such as PV panels or solar thermal heaters onsite; considering the installation of battery storage units or space for the same to manage electrical demand; considering the use of efficient and low carbon sources of heating, if possible using neighbourhood-scale infrastructure and networks, such as heat pumps or capacity for connection to future district heating schemes; installing the most efficient appliances which are feasible to use; considering the use of electric hobs, as opposed to gas; considering the installation of rain storage facilities to collect rainwater, and the incorporation of grey water recycling where this is feasible and safe; considering the provision of high-quality waste and recycling facilities which reflect the Bracknell Forest waste guidance notes for new developments".	This suggested amendment is not considered necessary. Such matters, where appropriate, would be covered by a developments requirement to meet Local Plan Policy LP55 – 'Sustainable construction', and Building Regulations.
	Adding the following text to the end of the policy after the various points on energy/carbon: "Additionally, buildings should be designed to be resilient to and protect residents from the anticipated effects of climate change in the area, including more severe heatwaves, droughts, storms, winds and rainfall."	This suggested amendment is not considered necessary. Such matters, where appropriate, would be covered by a developments requirement to submit a Climate Change Assessment – a requirement of Local Plan Policy LP27 – 'Climate change'.

Doc. Ref.	Comment summary	Council response
	<p>Suggests the rewording of development principle GD12: Development Principle GD12: Adding the following to the end of the last sentence of the current text: "and with the lowest possible carbon footprint", and adding the following additional point: "Sustainable construction techniques such as lean construction (which manages the construction process to minimise waste) should be preferred where possible. The overall goal should be to minimise the embodied carbon of the development".</p> <p>The document should reference Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan policy HO 6 Buildings; Energy Efficiency & Generation.</p>	<p>The following amendments will be made: "-...New materials should be sourcedspecified from as locally, and with the lowest carbon footprint, as possible. - <u>sustainable construction techniques such as lean construction (which manages the construction process to minimise waste) should be incorporated where possible. The overall goal should be to minimise the embodied carbon of the development.</u></p> <p>Disagree, as there is not a need to duplicate planning policy. Development would be required to accord with relevant planning policy and building regulations at the time of determining any planning application.</p>
8.4 Public art	<p>The public art contributions provided by South Hill Park Arts Centre would improve the visual aspect of the town centre.</p> <p>Public Art is supported.</p> <p>The bus station needs some green walls; and some resilient public art provided by local school children if possible.</p>	<p>The benefits of local partnership working in the creation of more place-appropriate public art is noted. An amendment to Development Principle: GD13 is to reflect this: "Encourage partnership working, <u>such as with local artists or organisations</u>, in delivering public art;..."</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD does not prescribe green walls, however this could form of a part of the development's design and /or green infrastructure. This is shown in Figure 5.21. The merits of local participation in public art is acknowledged. An amendment to Development Principle: GD13 is to reflect this: "Encourage partnership working, <u>such as with local artists or organisations</u>, in delivering public art;..."</p>
9. Phasing and Delivery		
	<p>Suggest caution against the use of such timetabling and question the durations used. All three sites are estimated to have a construction period of 24 months, yet they all have notably different constraints, characteristics and scales of development.</p> <p>The SPD should therefore not prescribe periods but allow developer review. Different construction methods, groundwork can reduce or extend the periods stated. It should also be borne in mind that Infrastructure works would need to be associated with a particular phase as opposed to be delivered up front with the risk of needing to repair later.</p>	<p>The SPD provides only an estimation of phasing and timing – it is not the purpose of the SPD to be prescriptive. Text will be amended to clarify that timescales of the phasing of development are an estimation only, for information. Construction duration will also be revised.</p>

Public exhibition representations to the draft SPD and the Council's response

There were 43 comments made on post-it notes and other verbal comments made by visitors to the exhibitions and are summarised below.

Comment summary	Council response
Development proposals	
Overall, there were positive comments with regards to the development proposals.	
Very exciting proposals – more clarity around the bus station, library and cycle parking was very helpful.	Noted.
Good to see development happening	Noted.
Bus Station	
There were strong views about the existing bus station and concern about the proposals for its reorganisation. A lot of people said that it should stay where it is as it is very legible and close to the town centre. The need for shelter and seating while waiting for buses was strongly voiced.	
The Bus Station should remain as is.	The principle of redeveloping the existing bus station into a mixed-use development has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. This SPD provides design guidance only. This context is set out in Section 1.1.
Please leave the Bus station. Moving it would mean it is less accessible.	The Council is committed to ensuring that use of the borough's bus service remains convenient and attractive to use. Because bus stops are to be dispersed along Market Street, Station Road and The Ring, with potential for each bus service to stop at more than one stop, there is not anticipated to any material impact on accessibility.
There should be an enclosed space/room for people to wait for buses in.	It is recognised that bus travel needs to be as attractive as possible to maintain/increase patronage. 'Bus station and movement' p23, will be amended to clarify that bus stops will be seated and sheltered wherever appropriate.
Bus stations need to be covered, secure, very well-lit and perfect against wind. It is cold, dark, wet and windy in Bracknell 4/12 months a year!	These will be provided.
New bus stands need shelters and benches for the elderly to sit on!	The bus station including café will be redeveloped as part of these proposals. There will be an offering of cafés as part of the new development.
Keep café provision for the bus drivers!	The bus station including café will be redeveloped as part of these proposals. There will be an offering of cafés as part of the new development.
Will the bus stop café remain? Best eggs ever!	The bus station including café will be redeveloped as part of these proposals. There will be an offering of cafés as part of the new development.
Will there be a bus from town to M&S?	The provision of bus services falls outside the scope of his design SPD.
Need for more regular buses to Ascot please!	The provision of bus services falls outside the scope of his design SPD.

Comment summary	Council response
<p>Greenery/Play There were some comments for the retention of the existing green spaces (specifically the Land east of Station Way and north of Church Road), the need for play space being very important which the town centre currently lacks, and residents in the area having to travel quite a bit of distance to the nearest playground.</p>	
<p>Keep existing green spaces (Southern Gateway).</p>	<p>The principle of redeveloping the Southern Gateway area has already been established by Policy LP10 of the new Local Plan. As part of the Local Plan making process, it was decided that it would be more beneficial to retain Jubilee Gardens and redevelop Station Green. Vibrant new landscaped public space will be provided as part of these proposals.</p>
<p>More Green! (Southern Gateway).</p>	<p>Proposed land uses within the Southern Gateway area (ref. figure 5.18) provides a variety of opportunities for public and private green space. DP:SG5 and supporting text provides more detail of play and green infrastructure proposals, in addition to the description of key spaces on pp37-41.</p>
<p>Existing trees should be retained (Eastern Gateway).</p>	<p>As many trees of value will be retained as possible, however there will be a need for some removal to facilitate development. Significant new tree planting will be provided as part of the new development. The requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain will also likely provide for off-site planting opportunities.</p>
<p>Prioritise play space for young children – slides, swings, climbing etc.</p>	<p>Importance of this is recognised, particularly in a high density town centre location to where families will be moving. Within public spaces: Market Square and Jubilee Gardens in particular, opportunities for children’s play activity will be sought, and are set out in the SPD.</p>
<p>Access/Movement/Public spaces Concerns raised about recent and future developments around Market Street, the increase of vehicles making the road unsafe. Concern also raised about the safety of underpasses and that access to Princess Square should be improved (this conflicted opinion from bus station users who thought connection from the station to the town centre was fine). Big concern from shops close to the High Street carpark as footfall has considerably lessened following closure of the carpark with trade suffering as a result.</p>	
<p>Market Street is very busy with traffic & loud cars – move to 20mph with cameras.</p>	<p>Bus and vehicle movement around the town centre shown in the SPD is indicative and will be considered and subject to change as development plans progress over the next ten years. Road speed limits will be a detailed matter for consideration at the time of any planning application.</p>
<p>Underpasses are not safe. Install alternative crossings and walkways above ground.</p>	<p>Replacement of underpasses with safe and direct at grade pedestrian/cycle crossing points is one of the objectives of redevelopment.</p>
<p>Routes to Princess Square need to be improved!</p>	<p>Gangways from HSCP to Princess Square will need to be removed as part of the HSCP demolition works, and it would not be feasible to re-provide as part of redevelopment proposals. Once the Deck (outside the scope of this SPD) is delivered, this will likely create a through-route through Princess Square, which will increase footfall significantly.</p>

Comment summary	Council response
No access to town centre from the west following High Street car park closure.	Gangways from HSCP to Princess Square have needed to be closed with the closure of the car park. Once the Deck (outside the scope of this SPD) is delivered, this will likely create a through-route through Princess Square, which will increase footfall significantly.
Faster train connectivity to London.	This falls outside of the scope of this design SPD.
How will we use these public spaces.	Public spaces are seen to provide flexible community event and market space, and will provide children's play space and space for cafes/restaurants to spill out to make for a vibrant area.
Need a drop off place for those with mobility challenges. Better permeability required!	Noted. Increased permeability is referenced under 'General movement routes and connectivity', p22. 'Movement and public realm strategy' sections, from pp30 & 60 will be amended to flag-up the requirement for safe drop-off points as part of the access strategy for the main Southern & Eastern Gateway sites.
More information required about cycle parking.	Secure cycle parking will be required in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD. Reference to the requirement for cycle parking is made in the final bullet of DP:GD9.
Tall buildings	
Some concern raised about impact of 'wind tunnel' effect around/near tall buildings and consideration of how this can be avoided/mitigated.	
Wind mitigation measures (relating to tall buildings).	Section 4.2. Heights (p20) refers to the need for wind studies to inform development height strategies.
16 storeys on Eastern Gateway – too high.	Height rationale is set out in section 3.5 'Heights'.
Bracknell as a destination	
Some interesting comments were made about what draws people to Bracknell other than shopping/The Lexicon. Across the age range (specifically young people prefer to go to Reading for an evening out). Suggestions made to bring a theatre into the main public square of the Southern Gateway to attract evening visitors which will also support restaurants/bars opening late.	
What is drawing people to Bracknell?	There are many reasons why people chose to live / visit Bracknell, including the attractive newly regenerated town centre, transport links, employment opportunities, quality of life and housing opportunities. The Bracknell Town Centre Vision 2032 document provides added context, but also identifies where there are deficits, and where opportunities exist which this SPD helps to deliver.
Cultural destination – Theatre/gallery?	Bracknell Town Centre is the Borough's main centre for retail, leisure, civic and cultural activities. The NPPF identifies theatres as a main town centre use that should be focused on town centres. The Bracknell Town Centre Vision 2032 identified a deficit of cultural uses compared to other towns within the Thames Valley and identified the provision of a theatre as part of a range of potential options. Whilst local plan policy does not specifically require a theatre/gallery to be provided, the masterplans have been amended to provide for community/cultural space within the

Comment summary	Council response
	Southern and Eastern Gateways (refer to amended Proposed Land Use plans – figs 5.18 & 7.22. It will be a matter for the Council as landowner or a prospective developer to deliver a theatre/gallery within his space.
Other Lots of comments about return of an indoor market, a library (would like to see the present one stay) and the need of a budget supermarket. Concern raised about the lack of amenities (GP surgeries etc. as the population rises in the area).	
Rise in population around the area – leads to demand on social infrastructure, GPs, schools etc...	Infrastructure needed to support future development was assessed as part of the new Local Plan making process. As a result, Local Plan policies LP9 and LP10 contain infrastructure required as part of the redevelopment.
Keep (convert) Library building.	The Eastern Gateway illustrative masterplan (Figure 7.1) shows the building to be redeveloped. The building is too much of a constraint on redevelopment and is not considered of sufficient architectural merit to retain.
The present Library is described as a Heritage building (in draft SPD) – why is it being demolished?	The Eastern Gateway illustrative masterplan (Figure 7.1) shows the building to be redeveloped. The building is too much of a constraint on redevelopment and is not considered of sufficient architectural merit to retain.
Can the library be rehoused in the old British Legion?	The former Royal British Legion (RBL) building is outside of the Council's ownership. The library would need to be reprovided as part of the Eastern Gateway redevelopment, however there is insufficient detail as yet to determine whether this would be onsite, or elsewhere within the town centre.
Indoor market for a different offer to the Lexicon – more sole traders/boutique shops.	Significant Use Class E is planned for in the three SPD areas, which includes shops/retail. Whilst the planning system can control the use of land/building units, it would be for the owner to determine the type of occupant and what is sold. The Market Square area of public realm is however seen as an opportunity for market space.
Miss the covered market <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity in stalls • Local produce • Acts as an attraction. 	Significant Use Class E is planned for in the three SPD areas, which includes shops/retail. The Market Square area of public realm presents an opportunity for market space.
Can the market be in the old British Legion?	The RBL building is privately-owned and lies on land outside the scope of this SPD.
Need supermarket (Sainsbury's gone, high end now only).	Significant areas of retail space already exist within the town centre and is further proposed in the SPD.
Knock down Atrium Court.	This building lies on land outside the scope of this SPD.
Larger Hindu Temple would be great considering the Hindu population in the town.	Community/cultural spaces is to be provided within the Southern and Eastern Gateway areas. It would be a matter for the landowner to determine the tenant.

Comment summary	Council response
Peel Centre best family shops hopefully not lost...?	The Peel Centre (and The Point) is allocated in Policy LP8 of the new Local Plan for redevelopment, for a mixed-use development including 900 homes, replacement supermarket and other commercial space.
Swimming pool.	Noted, however there are no plans in the SPD for a swimming pool. The Bracknell Leisure Centre and Coral Reef are currently the main providers of swimming facilities.
Flats need balconies for ventilation + outdoor space! With solid screens to hide the clutter.	Balconies would likely be required in this town centre location, to provide amenity space for residents. Balcony design would be a matter for detailed design at a later stage.
Acoustic Couch needs to have a new venue! Night club/grassroots music is important.	Noted. This falls outside the scope of this SPD, which is planning design guidance. It is understood however that BFC is assisting HSCP tenants in finding suitable premises to relocate. Community/cultural spaces are however to be provided within the Southern and Eastern Gateway areas, and such music/nightlife venues play an important part in a thriving town centre. It would be for the landowner/developer, or as part of future marketing, to promote such uses in the SPD areas.

Photos of the two public exhibition events in Bracknell town centre, held on 25th and 27th April 2024



