Bracknell Forest Council

Warfield SPD Consultation Statement

Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework
www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/warfield
February 2012

1 Introduction to Consultation Process 4

Section 2: Summary of responses to Warfield SPD Consultation Draft - Dec 2010-Jan 2011

1 Responses to 'Background and Context' 9
2 Responses to ' The Warfield SPD Site area and Context' 76
3 Responses to ' Development Principles' 83
4 Responses to ' Design and Strategy and Urban Design' 89
5 Responses to 'Housing and Employment' 163
6 Responses to 'Infrastructure' 179
7 Responses to 'Green Infrastructure' 191
8 Responses to 'Social and Physical Infrastructure' 223
9 Responses to 'Transport and Accessibility Infrastructure' 244
10 Responses to 'Site Investigation and Pollution Remediation' 273
11 Reponses to 'Delivery' 277
12 Responses to 'Appendices' 281

Section 3: Summary of responses to Detailed Concept Plan consultation Nov 2011

Specific Consultee Responses 298
Developer Responses 317
Residents Responses - General Issues 344
Residents Responses - Site Specific Issues 385

Section 4: Appendices

1 Compatibility with SCI and Community Engagement Strategy 407
2 Details of responders to the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft 413
3 Summary of main issues raised at Detailed Concept Plan exhibitions 420

Bracknell Forest Council

Introduction to Consultation Process

Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework
www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/warfield
February 2012

1 Introduction to Consultation Process

Introduction

1.1 The Council is required to prepare Supplementary Plan Documents in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 ('the Regulations'). This Statement explains how the Council has met the requirements of Regulation 18(4)(b)in the preparation of the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document (Warfield SPD).

1.2 Bracknell Forest Council produced a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) called the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Draft (November 2010). It was published for public consultation between 29 November 2010 and 17 January 2011. Regulations 18(4) (a) and(b) of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004: (a)they have considered any representations; and (b) have prepared a statement setting out (i) a summary of the main issues raised; and (ii) how these main issues have been addressed in the SPD to be adopted.

1.3 This Statement of Consultation summarises the consultations undertaken during the production of the SPD including the statutory consultation on the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft as described above. It sets out in two main sections:

- The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft (Nov 2010) (document reference WL2) - a summary of the issues from each representation made; how the Council has considered each issue and any action taken to amend or otherwise the final Warfield SPD.

- The Detailed Concept Plan (Nov 2011) (document reference WL22) - summary of the issues made; how the Council has considered each issue and any action taken to amend or otherwise the Concept Plan and the final Warfield SPD.

Consultation

1.4 The engagement undertaken in preparing the Warfield SPD has been carried out in line with the following:

- Statutory requirements,
- The adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), July 2006 (available at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/sci) (see Appendix 1 of this Statement); and,
- The Bracknell Forest Partnership Community Engagement Strategy, May 2009 – 2012 (available at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/community-engagement-strategy-2009-to-2012.pdf) (see Appendix 1 of this Statement)

1.5 In the preparation of the Warfield SPD, Bracknell Forest Council has comprehensively consulted with a range of key and statutory organisations to help assess the scope of the SPD, including:

- Local resident groups and organisations.
- Statutory bodies and organisations.
- Land owners and their planning representatives.
- Prospective Developers.

- The general public.
- Others with an interest in the site.

1.6 There have been a number of consultations on the Warfield SPD which have been used to prepare the final Warfield SPD. The Warfield SPD, has therefore been informed by the following consultations.

The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft (Nov 2010)

1.7 The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft was published for public consultation between 29th November 2010 and 17th January 2011 in accordance with the appropriate statutory regulations. This document set out the planning policy framework to guide a comprehensive, mixed use development at Warfield including 2,200 new dwellings and associated infrastructure services, open space and facilities. Additionally, the document set out the principles of design and a draft concept plan. Details of the consultation including who were consulted and how the consultation was undertaken can be viewed in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft Proforma (document reference WL8). The Council also published a Statement of Consultation to meet the requirements of Regulation 17(b) (document reference WL5).

1.8 The Council received 279 separate representations from 235 individuals and organisations. Many of the representations made one or more comments on different parts of the SPD Consultation Draft.

1.9 The consultation ran in parallel with the consultation on the Site Allocation Development Plan Document Preferred Options stage and some representations relating to Warfield did not specify which of the two consultations they related to. The Council used a pragmatic approach in assigning particular responses to either of the two consultations. In any doubtful cases they were assigned to both documents. Where appropriate, part of the representation was assigned to the Warfield SPD and the remainder to the Site Allocations DPD.

1.10 In administering and considering the representations, the following process was undertaken:

1. All Warfield SPD specific representations were acknowledged and assigned a Warfield SPD Representation Number.
2. All Warfield SPD specific representations were printed and filed, together with all the representations made on the Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options stage. They were filed in alphabetical order and made available for public viewing by visiting the Council offices at Time Square.
3. All the responses relating to the Warfield SPD have been read and the comments made were assigned to particular paragraphs of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. They were then copied, verbatim, against the relevant paragraphs in the Council's online system called Objective, which is available at http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/warfield/warfieldcd
4. A summary of each comment was produced in a document called The Summary of Responses to the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft (document reference WL20), in tables which were organised by the type of respondent (e.g. Responses from Statutory Consultees). Each representation within these tables appears under the respondent's

name (or organisation name), then against the relevant paragraph in the Consultation Draft SPD.

5. This Consultation Statement was then produced which in section 2, takes each of these comment summaries by paragraph, and groups them under the relevant chapter in the Consultation Draft SPD under the relevant **Rep No.** There, a specific officer's **Response** has been placed against each comment which demonstrates that all the main issues have been consider by the Council. Underneath each Council response under the **Action** heading it describes either the necessary changes to the final SPD or states that no changes to the SPD are required. Existing text from the Consultation Draft SPD is shown in *italics.* The changes to the Consultation Draft SPD are shown as either deletions (as ~~strikethrough~~) or through new text (in **bold and underlined)**.

The Detailed Concept Plan (Oct 2011)

1.11 The Detailed Concept Plan was a non-statutory consultation which was undertaken as a response to the call for more consultation as requested during the statutory stage described above. The consultation was carried out between Monday 31st October 2011and Monday 28th November 2011. The consultation included a detailed concept plan, streetscenes, examples of character areas, photos and sections through the site to sit alongside some guiding text. The intention was to help members of the public visualise how the development might look in key areas of the site. Details of about the consultation include who were consulted and how the consultation was undertaken can be viewed in the Detailed Concept Plan Consultation Proforma (document reference WL24).

1.12 Responses were received from 215 individuals and organisations. Verbatim copies of all those who responded are available in the Council's online planning portal. A summary of the main issues raised from this consultation can be viewed in section 3 of this statement. Each of these issue have been considered in their corresponding response and action. Here the Council has either detailed necessary changes to the Concept Plan or SPD text or stated that no changes are required. Existing text from the Consultation Draft SPD is shown in *italics.* The changes to the Consultation Draft SPD are shown as either deletions (as ~~strikethrough~~) or through new text (in **bold and underlined)**.

1.13 As part of this consultation, officers held three public exhibitions in which members of the public had the opportunity to questions officers about The Detailed Concept Plan document and other relating issues. Details of the Detailed Concept Plan Consultation Proforma (document reference WL24). All three events were will attended and a summary of the main issues and how they have been considered can be viewed in Appendix 3 of this statement.

Sutstainability Appraisal

1.14 The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (January 2010) set the context for the appraisal of the draft SPD. The Statutory Consultees (Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage) as well as RSPB and BBOWT were consulted for a minimum period of 5 weeks (January/February 2010). The consultation feedback helped confirm and amend where necessary any baseline evidence, identify any key sustainability issues and problems and formed the SA framework that would be used to carry out the draft appraisal. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (November 2010) was consulted on November 2010 - January 2011 alongside the Draft Warfield SPD. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (November 2010) set out the initial appraisal of the Draft Warfield SPD. No comments were received

regarding the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report. Recommendations made in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report alongside specific consultation feedback on the Draft SPD influenced the formation of the Final Warfield SPD and its associated Development Principles.

Other Consultations

1.15 The Council undertook a range of other engagement processes during the production of the SPD including:

- Meetings with developers, landowners and their representatives including workshops.
- Meetings with Warfield Parish Council.
- Meetings with a local residents group.
- Internal dialogue with a range of service providers.
- A design workshop with local groups.

Section 2: Summary of responses to Warfield SPD Consultation Draft - Dec 2010-Jan 2011

1 Responses to 'Background and Context'

Table 1

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 14		**Response:** Support is noted.
1.1	In general NE are please with the progress made. These comments do not affect NE obligation to advise or object to any specific development proposal or later versions of the plan.	
Rep No. 15		
1.1	WPC fully supports the purpose of this document and the majority of the aims and policies. Where no comments are made we imply that we are broadly in agreement. WPC has chosen to cooperate in the planning process to achieve the best possible outcomes for Warfield, mindful that the previous developments were allowed under appeal and failed to secure the appropriate infrastructure.	
Rep No. 18		
1.1	These comments relate to Warfield Garage and West End Farm. Support the general thrust and content of the SPD.	
Rep No. 33		
1.1	General support for land to be included in the SPD	
Rep No. 47a		
1.1	Berkeley Strategic (BS) supports the preparation of the WSPD and is committed to working effectively and collaboratively to deliver a co-ordinated comprehensive and sustainable and mixed use urban extension.	
Rep Nos. 48, 52		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1	The approach to deliver housing in 2012 is supported	
Rep No. 87a		
1.1	Support policy as it recognises the need for community and recreational facilities which will contribute to the sustainability of the community.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** Comments noted. The Council will endeavour to secure funds from other sources to help remedy existing deficiencies in provision where appropriate. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	The aim of building a community consists of a mix of housing, commerce and infrastructure. It is accepted that the existing developments did not receive an equitable amount of infrastructure because they were approved on appeal. It is reasonable to expect the infrastructure to be planned and delivered not only to meet the needs of the new community, but also provide some mitigation for the shortfall that currently exists. It is recognised that developer contributions may not be available to remedy existing problems and wherever possible land should be allocated and funding secured from other sources.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The development will secure much of the eastern side of Cabbage Hill as publicly accessible open space which will be semi-natural and include enhancements such as recreating hedgerows etc. The intention is to retain western side of Cabbage Hill as it cannot be secured as publicly accessible open space. It is considered that development could be located on the eastern slopes west of West End Lane and on southern slopes facing Harvest Ride. This is considered to be acceptable in landscape and visual terms as described In the Landscape Background Paper WL26. However, any development will need to be provided in a sensitive manner. The land is designated as countryside.
1.1	The semi-rural nature of the area can be preserved by retaining as much as possible of Cabbage Hill as publicly accessible open space. The southern aspects of Cabbage Hill are particularly prominent due to their gradients so it is important to them as rural open space. This would increase pressure to develop its Eastern flanks of Cabbage Hill, which would not necessarily respect the existing settlement boundary at West End Lane and be to the detriment of West End residents and the wider visual amenity.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: The Concept Plan has been amended to reflect acceptable potential development in Cabbage Hill and consequential text changes have been made throughout the Warfield SPD
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The evidence shows that the development will generate 3-4 primary school classes per year. A secondary school is not appropriate in Cabbage Hill because the levels are difficult to work with (i.e there will need to be extensive and flat pitches and the the school buildings and pitches would be visually dominant and therefore detract from the intention to retain/create a semi-natural landscape environment in the area. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Development generates 7 primary school classes per year group without a local secondary school which is not sustainable. An alternative site for a secondary school should be considered to the east of Cabbage Hill which would retain a greater proportion of Cabbage Hill as open space	
Rep No. 16a		**Response:** The land around Larks Hill is not Green Belt but it is countryside. The new development will provide new publicly accessible open space for recreational activity as well as retaining existing open spaces including Larks Hill. The open space standard for provision associated with development has increased since Quelm Park was built in the 1990's. The Council recognises that providing for housing needs is a difficult balance between countryside and urban areas. Development in the borough has always been mainly by large urban extensions which can allow a critical mass to be provided which delivers housing, infrastructure, services, facilities and open space which are all necessary in creating sustainable communities. The land was designated as Land Outside Defined Settlement (countryside) in the Bracknell Forest Local Plan. This designation was changed following the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD in 2008. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an
1.1	I moved to Quelm Park because it backs onto Green belt around Larks Hill which I use for jogging, nature, walks do walking etc.	
Rep No. 98a		
1.1	Objection because area is lacking green space for children and nature	
Rep No. 126a		
1.1	I moved to Quelm Park because of its open fields and open countryside	
Rep No. 128a		
1.1	My family enjoy walks in the beautiful countryside with mature trees and wildlife. We were led to believe that this countryside was protected from development as it was green field. Why is this belief incorrect or has something happened that changes the site's grading?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 210a		examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. There will be the loss of green fields, however, existing accessible open spaces will be retained with new areas provided. Many mature trees will be retained and new planting will be required. Biodiversity and wildlife mitigation will also be required. Quelm Park formed part of the large scale urban extension to Bracknell and was built on former countryside land in the 1990s. The new development will retain existing and provide new accessible open space including land at Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. The development will enhance recreational provision The Comprehensive package of Green Infrastructure measures are detailed in Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	The views of the countryside are special and we were told when we moved here that Bracknell Forest believed in conservation and the fields would not be built on. Keep our Green Belt green.	
Rep No. 213a		
1.1	I moved to Quelm Park because of its easy access to the countryside and the Council seemed to be taking steps to keep as much space open such as Larks Hill. Now this will be spoilt.	
Rep No. 17a		**Responses:** It is acknowledged that the character of the area will change. However, the Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection the countryside. The development, for example, will provide a substantial increase in publicly accessible open space; ensure the character of existing development is respected; provide high quality design. The land was identified as a major location for growth in Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy document which was adopted in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public. This was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council
1.1	It will completely alter the character of the area. I moved from Slough to avoid being in a concrete jungle to a more picturesque environment. How has the Council come to this decision?	
Rep No. 144a		
1.1	Warfield will cease to be an ideal place to live but another estate on a green field site.	
Rep No. 164a		
1.1	We look out onto countryside which will be lost because of greedy developers. This will be one large housing estate which will reach to Wokingham	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 172a		has produced the Warfield SPD to provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. Individual landowners will gain financially from the sale of land; developers will gain financially from selling the houses; people choosing to live there will gain by living in a nice community which over time will enhance in value; and, people living near to the site will gain from improved facilities and more accessible open space on their doorsteps. The Council will require that as much of existing biodiversity will be protected as possible. Where some habitats will be lost there will be a need to compensate for that loss. Full survey, and assessment of biodiversity is required to properly ascertain what elements should remain and what mitigation should be provided. Examples are that existing Local Wildlife Sites should be retained and that new hedgerows should be planted in Cabbage Hill. This development will provide new schools and an increase in publicly accessible open space. It will be a sustainable community no likelihood of higher crime rates. Warfield is not taking all the housing burden for the borough as there are substantial sites elsewhere, for example, Bracknell (Jennetts Park, The Parks and the town centre), Crowthorne (Broadmoor and Crowthorne Business Estate) and Binfield, (Amen Corner and Blue Mountain). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Warfield is a sought after area because of its country feel which will be destroyed by building homes on these greenfield sites	
Rep No. 183a		
1.1	Warfield has a nice balance of houses and green fields , why would you want to destroy this character by building on a green field site? Do you have concerns, do you live in Warfield and will you be impacted? Who stands to gain from the sale of the green field sites?	
Rep No. 184a		
1.1	Objection because it will change the nature of Old Warfield	
Rep No. 186a		
1.1	The development will destroy the village feel of Warfield which has a very good balance of houses and green space	
Rep No. 197a		
1.1	I was staggered to see how many green sites were considered for development. Much of the area is devoted to fantastic fields, hedgerows and wildlife including deer. The area is used for leisure activities and it is wonderful to have open countryside bordering Bracknell. The villages around Newell Green, West End and Warfield have been radically eroded over the years and this will push development out to areas that surely must be green field sites.	
Rep No.s 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		
1.1	We value the green field sites which is why we moved here 3/4/5 years ago	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 215		
1.1	We moved to Warfield in 1998 for its schools, open space, quiet and low crime. Object because Warfield should not take the burden of housing for Bracknell Forest.	
Rep No. 18b		**Response:** Noted. This site adjoins the area subject of the Warfield SPD. It will be important that any application affecting this site compliments the larger development subject of the Warfield SPD. This site is included in Policy SA1 of the Draft Submission SADPD (under SHLAA reference 95). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	These comments relate to Land at Battle Bridge House and Garage. By developing the site for mixed use housing and employment gives an opportunity to provide access to some of the development to the south of the site which is currently proposed as low density housing in the Warfield SPD. The development could be delivered in 2012/13.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted. This is a general comment and detailed comments by this group are considered through out this Consultation Statement. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	We do not have any over-riding concerns but some wording changes will help to further enhance the protection of the floodplain and ensure that flooding and biodiversity is not made worse.	
Rep No. 33		**Response:** It is possible that some small sites come forward separately from the main development provided they are in accordance with policy provisions and the Warfield SPD. The Council has produced an assessment of small site parcels giving a rationale over which can or cannot come forward separately from the land within or near to the site. This can be seen under reference WL25. This demonstrates that the site subject of Rep 33 can come forward separately from the main development although its timing should be around the same time the wider development in that area comes forward and it should be consistent with a masterplan for this wider area. The access arrangement of this site will need to be fully assessed including the
1.1	The site (land adjacent to The Splash) is isolated from the main development and could be developed early with access off Harvest Ride or the new north-south link road	

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>proximity the the nearby Quelm Park Roundabout. If access cannot be achieved from Harvest Ride then it may be that this site requires improved access from the rear off Watersplash Lane.

Action: Add bullet points to paragraph 4.27 (now renumbered as paragraph 4.41) which read as:

• <u>Dwellings to front onto The Splash in the south of this area and follow the rhythm of development along this lane.</u>
• <u>Within the parcel alongside The Splash, informal courtyard and mews development will be appropriate.</u>
• <u>To the east of the parcel within The Splash area, development should overlook the existing footpath/cycleway, creating natural surveillance and activity.</u></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 34</td><td rowspan="5">Response: There is a need to provide more flexibility in the SPD in respect to allowing more than one application on the site. This flexibility has been clarified throughout the SPD where a series of applications which contribute towards comprehensiveness will be acceptable. Therefore, additional text should be included in the SPD. Further, a revised trajectory has been compiled and incorporated in Appendix 1 of the final version of the Warfield SPD.

Action: Amend the 3rd sentence of paragraph 1.1 to read as: It is envisaged that the new neighbourhood will start to be delivered on site<s>, once all the appropriate planning permissions have been approved,</s> in <s>2012</s><u>2014/15</u>, providing 2,200 dwellings, with an estimated projection <s>completion</s> date of <s>2020/21</s><u>2025/26 as detailed in Appendix 1.</u> Amend the trajectory in Appendix 1</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.1 and Appendix 1</td><td>Bloor are the prospective developers of the Maple Green site. The SADPD states the site will be delivered from 2014 and The WSPD says from 2012/13. This needs clarification. Bloor support delivery from 2012/13 including Maple Green but only if the WSPD is more flexible.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 34</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.1</td><td>Bloor are concerned that delivery will be delayed if all planning permissions have to be approved before commencement.

In paragraph 1.1 delete “once all the appropriate planning permissions have been approved”.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 53</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1 and Appendix 1	The housing trajectory for the development is inconsistent with the SADPD. It is unlikely that an early start as stated in the consultation draft will be achieved because: • The SPD is unlikely to be adopted before the end of 2011; • No applications (outline or reserved matters) have been submitted or approved yet; • Significant infrastructure needs to be put in place; • Land ownership issues affecting land not controlled by the consortium. The timetable needs to be clarified.	
Rep No. 61		
1.1	The proposed housing completions rates are unrealistic because: • There are a significant number of landowners involved which will take time to get agreements on infrastructure provision. • Significant work on infrastructure needs to be carried out before development can be provided. E.g. the need for secondary school provision. It is recommended that more realistic rates of delivery are included with the implications that the development starts later in the plan period and continues beyond.	
Rep No. 37		**Response**: Comment is noted.
1.1	Please keep us informed of progress as we live within the site	
Rep No. 42a		**Response:** The justification for developing a sustainable community in this location was established in the Core

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1	We moved to Warfield 12 years ago believing it was on the edge of countryside and now we will be in the middle of an urban area. Object because I don't understand why there is a need for this many housing because I believe the housing targets have been scrapped and there are a number of empty offices in Bracknell which would offer suitable brown field sites. Why green field rather than brown field? This development will destroy Warfield. Places like Warfield and Binfield should have a separate identity, space around them and separation is good for people who live in those villages and people in the surrounding area. We like living in the area but if the plans go ahead in there current form we will be forced to move away. I understand more house will be needed over time but can this be done in away that doesn't completely destroy the character of the area. For example, there are small plots of land on the Bracknell side of Harvest Ride that could built on. I also understand that living in the new Quelm Park estate may sound hypocritical, but we didn't move here because of the housing but because of the countryside and separation.	Strategy DPD which was finalised in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council has produced the Warfield SPD to provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. The Council is taking a long term view to development to 2026 to allow for the effective planning of communities and infrastructure. The Council is using robust evidence including market assessments and viability in accordance with government requirements. It is not appropriate to wait until a specific development is completed because the Council provide for housing needs by way of an allocation which is spread over a long time frame Furthermore, housebuilding is also responsive to the market which will contribute towards the pace of development. Housing provides for need. The Council has had to balance the needs for homes, facilities etc. with protecting the countryside. All local authorities outside of heavily urban areas face similar problems. It is clear that the Government sees an increase in the level of housebuilding as an important element in securing long term economic growth. This can be seen in the Plan for Growth document and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. In order for the Council to plan properly for our further development needs and ensure that we get the necessary infrastructure, it is essential we get plans in place for growth. The Council must plan for a balance of growth in housing and employment over the plan period, to allow people to live and work in the Borough should these choose and seek
Rep No. 118a		
1.1	Object because: • The loss of green land; • It will ruin what we have here and why we moved here in the first place. How can the Council let this happen and I hope the decision is rejected.	
Rep No. 122		
1.1	Why will new homes be built in unspoilt natural areas when Bracknell town centre has not been rebuilt. How can the	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Council allow more building when there are homes that do not sell on Jennetts Park?	to reduce levels of in and out commuting in the Borough. The Council's Employment Land Review has concluded that there is a significant over supply of employment space (offices) in Bracknell, and in light of this, the SADPD does not propose any major new employment land allocations. However, there does remain a residual need to allocate land for housing. In preparing the SADPD consideration has been given to the potential reuse of existing office floorspace and some areas of employment are to be allocated for residential development. The Council's preferred strategy for development comprises both brownfield (e.g. Bracknell town centre, Staff College and Crowthorne Business Estate) and greenfield (e.g. Warfield and Jennetts Park). This issue was examined during the production of the Core Strategy DPD where it was concluded that the Council's strategy including development at Warfield was sound in all ways. When allocating new sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. The use of extensions to settlements to provide additional housing follows the development principles set out in Policy CS2. Whilst the Council gives priority to sites in the defined settlement, there is insufficient land to accommodate the overall housing requirement. This was agreed during the examination of the Core Strategy DPD; hence the identification of Warfield as a major location for growth in Policy CS5. The regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre continues to be a priority. There remains a significant number of major employers in the town and the two centre regeneration will create a more positive image and create new employment
Rep No. 124a		
1.1	The Government does not recommend building on green field sites especially when there is an abundance of brown field sites which there appears to be in Bracknell.	
Rep No. 133a		
1.1	The land is countryside and used by many people which is lacking in Bracknell. If this goes ahead all the greenland will go. This proposal will ruin Warfield and the surrounding area. We cannot understand the need when houses at nearby Jennetts Park are struggling to sell. If these proposals go ahead we will have 70% more homes in the area. The Council has not been transparent in this proposal. It is not fair or right that Warfield and Binfield will be saturated with housing on beautiful much needed greenfield sites. If they go ahead then we and other residents will be forced to move out of the area.	
Rep No. 150a		
1.1	Development should not happen until the regeneration of Bracknell and other housing sites are completed to ensure capacity is needed. Consider whether the outstanding building works can cater for the number of people actually wanting to buy new homes and invest in regeneration. Who wants to move to a new housing development of the nearest town did not offer attractive leisure, shopping and work.	
Rep No. 155a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1	I strongly object to any development of Green Field Land as it was promised political protection to safeguard the quality of country life in and around Warfield. The plans are politically and morally wrong and go against the original government and borough agreements.	opportunities. The development is substantial but it does not represent a 70% increase in dwellings in Warfield (there where approximately 4000 built in the area in the 1990's). The development will increase the current housing stock by 2,200 dwellings **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 156a		
1.1	The Borough is out of step with the government in respect to planning policies. Priority should be given to town centre and brown field sites. It is fair to spread development across the Borough using Brownfield sites to reduce the stress on infrastructure. In the spirit of sharing the burden I would not object to some development at Lawrence Hill facing Harvest Ride bounded by Maize Lane and Newell Green. However this should be kept separate form Old Warfield Village by being bounded by the bridle path. Cabbage Hill should not be developed and the level of development should not necessitate major road building such as between Harvest Ride and the Three Legged Cross.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a , 168a		
1.1	Object because you should build on brown field sites first. Binfield and Warfield have taken enough and a 70% increase on existing housing does not seem credible . You should build south, east and west of Warfield first. The is no requirement for additional housing. Object because of the unacceptable effect on rural resident. Object because of the overwhelming objection by local residents	
Rep No. 223		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1	Given that the housing numbers are no longer allocated why does this housing have to be delivered at all?	
Rep No. 230		
1.1	A huge toll has already been taken on the green fields of Warfield which have been decimated by housing in recent years. A substantial amount of green field land will be lost forever which is totally unacceptable when brownfield sites are still available.	
Rep No. 216 part ii		
1.1	Objection to building on green field land when there are plenty of brown field sites in Bracknell	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** Noted. All other comments made by WEG have been included in this report under the respective paragraphs they relate to.
1.1	WEG object to the plans for development in the SPD.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** It is agreed that more detail is needed which reflects the text in the SPD better. A revised and more detailed Concept Plan has been produced following further consultation in November 2011 (responses to this consultation are summarised and addressed in a separate section of this document) which gives a greater reflection of the text in the Warfield SPD and guidance. **Action:** Include amended Concept Plan in the SPD.
1.1	The SPD should act more as a detailed masterplan for the site providing more detail on implementation	
Rep No. 111a		
1.4	The planning documents are vague on details on how the area will be affected and difficult to understand.	
Rep No. 64		**Response:** It is the statutory duty for the water treatment company to ensure that effective provision is made for. This may or may not require improvements as necessary. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	It is important to consider the capacity of water and sewerage infrastructure provision in new development in line with PPS12.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 124a		**Response:** The solicitor acting on behalf of the purchaser did not seek the correct search which relates to Development Plan policies (i.e. Core Strategy DPD). The solicitor enquired about planning permissions and stopping up orders (relating to highways works) of which currently there are none in the vicinity of the objectors' property. The Council has corresponded separately regarding this issue with the objector. The Council has not failed in communication because, for example, there was widespread consultation during the production of the Core Strategy DPD which included exhibitions and adverts which brought about a large number of responses. The previous owner was wrong to inform you that the land could not be built on. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Searches by our solicitor did not show any proposals. In fact they stated no stopping up or planning permission within 250 metres of our property. Clearly there has been a failure to inform the residents of the local, authority plans for a large scale development. Had we been informed we would have not purchased our property.	
Rep No. 124b		
1.1	None of the surveys carried out during the purchase of our property showed the development. The previous owner informed us that there were no plans and the land could not be built on.	
Rep No. 122		**Response:** The definition of sustainable development is to balance growth with the environment. The development is positive in many ways such as: providing more accessible open space; biodiversity measures; it is located next to existing urban areas; and, will provides measures to mitigate climate change and floodrisk. The development has been assessed through a Sustainability Appraisal. As a consequence, measures and mitigation will be required such as mitigating noise and air pollution and providing measures to combat flood risk and climate change. Detailed proposals will need to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	The environment must come first, once it is built on it cannot be reversed.	
Rep No. 131a		
1.1	Object because it will be detrimental and cause irreversible damage to the environment.	
Rep No 143a		
1.1	Objection because the development will have a vast impact on the local environment, countryside and ecosystem	
Rep No. 132a		**Response:** The Council has undertaken assessment work at various stages in the process to support the final version of the SPD. The Council is confident that there is enough land to provide a
1.1	Our Community does not have enough space or amenities for 2,200 houses	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		comprehensive development including 2,200 houses, associated facilities and open space in line with the Development Principles in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 114a		**Response:** The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protecting the countryside. It was established in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008) that the most sustainable way was to provide extensions to existing urban locations including Warfield. However there will be the loss of some green vistas in this area. The development will be expected to buffer existing communities and take account of the Bracknell Forest Character Area Assessments Supplementary Planning Document which considers both settlements which abut the Warfield SPD site. These are Area A Newell Green and Area B1 Warfield Street. The SPD sets out the built and landscape character, boundary treatments and makes recommendations on how new development in and around the site should be considered. Parts of Warfield are already merged with Bracknell Town, e.g. Whitegrove. There is extensive Green Belt between Bracknell and Maidenhead which provides a very high level of planning protection. The houses are needed and this is demonstrated by evidence such as the Housing Market Assessment and therefore it does not contradict UK policy in this respect. Many open space areas will remain with new ones also being provided. Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD details the extensive green infrastructure elements to be provided. As a result of the development there will be a significant increase in the numbers of vehicles. However the Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of
1.1	Object because the new estate will join Warfield Village with the new estate and the longstanding residents will lose their green vistas.	
Rep No. 142a		
1.1	Object because it will cause Warfield to merge with Bracknell and hasten the expansion towards Maidenhead. The houses are not needed and contradicts UK policy on slowing migration from UK towns and villages	
Rep No. 151a		
1.1	The development will result in a change of its semi-rural character and result in Warfield being an extension to Bracknell.	
Rep No. 171a		
1.1	Warfield cannot cope with 5,500 extra people it will become too congested and cramped which will spoil its village feel	
Rep No. 231		
1.1	Warfield is a rural community not another Bracknell, Governments and planners have made a mess of Bracknell please do not do the same to Warfield	
Rep No. 233a		
1.1	The plans for Warfield are heavy handed and will cause a further loss of identity of Warfield Village. The fact that infrastructure is required in a different	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	area (Binfield for schools) illustrates how the development is not sustainable and will further increase the environmental impact of development in terms of road journeys. The technical confusion over the adoption shows how amateurish these development proposals are and smack of desperation to meet Government targets which have been revoked. Common sense says the Council should pause to come up with a more sustainable plan thats spread the burden across the Borough rather than saturating the northern parishes.	road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. A large part of Warfield was developed as an extension to Bracknell in the 1990's and the proposed development will extend on that development as a sustainable urban extension. The development is being coordinated with other development, i.e. it is good planning. The technical confusion is a result of a change in regulations governing the production of policy documents. The Council has already published a statement on this issue (Please see document WL23). The Government has made it clear that growth should be planned and that authorities set their own growth targets which the Council has done in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The process to adopting the Core Strategy DPD considered options for development and the conclusion was to spread development around but mostly in sustainable urban extensions. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 204		
1.15	Object because the areas has been significantly built upon in recent years and it has changed the character and landscape of a once pretty village.	
Rep Nos. 16a, 17, 36a, 41a, 97a, 121a, 133a, 145a, 155a, 159a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 171a, 175a, 180a, 200a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a, 229		**Response:** This was a comment aimed specifically at the local politicians. However the volume and concentration of development can have both positive and negative effects such as providing a critical amount to support infrastructure provision (positive) and the development of green field land (negative). However all issues have been considered throughout the process including weighing up social, environmental and economic matters in an on-going Sustainability Appraisal. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Do you have concerns over the concentration building of 2,200 houses on a greenfield site? If so what are they?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 123		**Response:** The development will retain Larks Hill as stated in paragraphs 2.5, 7.2, 7.11 and Development Principle W5 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1, 1.4, 1.19, 1.23	Larks Hill is much valued and cherished and needs to be protected as a green, recreational park.	
Rep No. 117, 124a, 143a, 144a, 165a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 184a, 190a, 191a, 210a, 215a		**Response:** The provision of new houses adds to the overall market value of housing in this country/market area. There is little or no evidence that says that new housing erodes housing values in an area but there is evidence to the contrary. For example, the construction of housing in Whitegrove did not devalue housing values in the Bracknell new town area. Furthermore, the price of houses is not a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	It could/will affect house values	
Rep No. 144a		**Response:** This is agreed and the development will provide the services, infrastructure and facilities that the development generates demand for. This is expressed through the Development Principles in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required
1.1	Public services will need to be increased across the board	
Rep No. 144a		**Response:** There is a need to provide for growth like all local authorities across the country. The Council are doing this in a plan-led manner by allocating sites for housing, infrastructure and services. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	We moved from South London 16 years ago to live in the countryside in Warfield, this may force us to think about whether we stay or not.	
Rep No. 145a		**Response:** This is disagreed because the process is transparent. The Council identified land at Warfield in the Core Strategy DPD. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore
1.1	The process is not transparent we do not want Warfield saturated with housing development on green fields.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is formally allocating the sites in the Site Allocations DPD which is again subject to consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination. Further detail on the site is being provided in the Warfield SPD which is subject of consultation, evidence and appraisal. Providing for housing and development needs is a difficult process which requires tough choices to be made. Development in the borough has always been mainly by large urban extensions which can allow a critical mass to be provided which delivers housing, infrastructure, services, facilities and open space which are all necessary in creating sustainable communities. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 148a		**Response:** The justification for developing a sustainable community in this location was established in the Core Strategy DPD which was finalised in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council has produced the Warfield SPD to provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Why don't you rip the heart out of the community with no respect to tax paying families. How can you justify 2,200 homes on green field sites? It makes of mockery of our land laws and proves that governments and local officials make it up as they go along.	
Rep No. 149a		**Response:** Housing provides for need. The Council has had to balance the needs for homes, facilities etc. with protecting the countryside. All local authorities outside of heavily urban areas face similar problems. It is unfortunate
1.1	The community has taken the burden of new housing for too long. The countryside has been eroded away little by little.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		that countryside areas have to be developed but social and economic needs are balanced with environmental needs to create sustainable developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 170a		**Response:** The land is already identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council therefore, is committed to ensuring that the development is plan-led. The Council has to deliver a large housing allocation to 2026 and it was decided after consultation, evidence and examination that Warfield should be one of the borough's growth areas. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Objection because of its impact on the surrounding area	
Rep No 179a		**Response:** The land is already identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council therefore, is committed to ensuring that the development is plan-led. The Council does not have the realistic opportunity to go back and reverse this decision without a major risk to being challenged or that a development could come forward by developers via the planning appeal process. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	The Council genuinely try and do a good job and could make it better by not building this development and standing up for residents and community rather than developers.	
Rep No. 182		**Response:** The development will increase the current housing stock by 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Additional housing will increase housing capacity in the area by 70%	
Rep No. 190a		**Response:** The development of new housing on large sites is a normal part of the British housing market.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.1	Market prices for housing would transfer from individual buyers and sellers to the market power of developers	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 192a		**Response:** The Council like all other authorities in this country has to produce plans to provide for growth needs. The Council completed its strategy for growth in the Core Strategy DPD in February 2008. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. This document identified the site at Warfield as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Convince me that it is needed?	
Rep No. 194a		**Response:** Large scale development sites are normally spread over a number of years. The current market conditions have slowed the pace of large developments e.g. Jennetts Park whilst in the past, the development pace has been very fast indeed, e.g. Whitegrove. Ultimately, the market will generally dictate the pace of development. The development will make the best and most efficient use of land which will mean higher densities in some parts. Furthermore the site will provide extensive open space provision. The Council's evidence suggests that the land can accommodate the scale of development required. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	The site will take 10 years to build which suggest nobody is sure if and when the houses will be required. It is difficult to see many houses being built any time soon. Why such a large development in such a small area?	
Rep No. 208a		**Response:** The Council like all other authorities in this country has to produce plans to provide for growth needs. The Council completed its strategy for growth in the Core Strategy DPD in February 2008. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent
1.1	I am appalled at the idea of losing existing green spaces and crowding and congestion.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		inspector. This document identified the site at Warfield as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. It is unfortunate that green spaces will be lost but the development will ensure there is an increase in publicly accessible open space. The development will help to create a sustainable community and the transport impacts will be mitigated. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 210a		**Response:** The decision to develop the area was taken during the Core Strategy DPD process which was eventually adopted in February 2008. All details of the process can be viewed in WL21. The site is not and has never been designated as Green Belt although it is countryside. The development will need to take account of the existing settlements in the area in accordance with the Character Areas Assessments Supplementary Planning Document. As stated the Council demonstrated the need to develop in the borough and in Warfield in the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is also promoting development on brownfield sites e.g. The town centre, Staff College and many other sites. It is disagreed that the development will result in the destruction of Warfield Street although the setting of the settlement will change. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	I am a lifelong resident of Warfield and have been informed that the fields backing Warfield Street are to be developed. They should be protected as they are green belt. If not protected the village of Warfield will merge with Bracknell. Horses riding and riding schools are the lifeblood of the area. Once development Warfield will no longer be a distinct village in rural countryside. There is no reason to develop further in what is already an overdeveloped area. it will upset the sensibilities of the local village people and the independence form Bracknell. It is better to find brown field alternatives. Please contemplate the repercussions of this proposed development which will result in the devastation of this rural village.	
Rep No. 219		**Response:** The character of the area will change due to the amount of housing to be provided. However, the development will provide a substantial amount of open space including retaining existing publicly accessible open space. It will provide new infrastructure and appropriate
1.1	2,200 houses will have a detrimental affect on the area. Traffic will be increased dramatically and the infrastructure will not be able to cope. I don't understand why there is a need for that many new houses. Warfield is a	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	lovely place to live in due to the mix of residential areas and green spaces, please don't ruin it.	transport measures will be provided which will mitigate any impacts form traffic generated from the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 220		**Response:** The development will be built out in phases to be agreed by the Council rather than in one large hit. Paragraph 10.5 and Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft requires that the development minimises it impact in terms of disturbance in the construction phase. The Council will seek to implement this through e.g. agreeing plant storage compounds, hours of operation, agreed routes to transport materials/waste and measures to clean roads/vehicles. These measures will be secured via planning conditions attached to any planning permissions granted. The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	2200 homes is totally insensitive to the local inhabitants' desires. How can anyone call this sustainable development. The interruption by the building, noise and mess etc will be a blight on the community for many years. As for the future traffic chaos and extra pollution… it beggars belief. This plan will erode the quality of life of existing inhabitants..... I cannot understand how a planning department and our councillors carry on wasting our money on such adventures against our wishes.	
Rep No. 221		**Response:** The Council like all other authorities in this country has to produce plans to provide for growth needs. The Council completed its strategy for growth in the Core Strategy DPD in February 2008. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. This document identified the site at Warfield as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The development will consider and assess all existing landscape and
1.1	I object to the allocation of 2200 houses on green field land and the high concentration and density of housing in a semi rural area. Warfield has already been the overextended and these house will exacerbate the issues of extend urban communities around an indistinct town centre. The land has considerable landscape, green lung, biodiversity and river corridor value. The effect on Warfield residents has not been	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	assessed nor have they had proper and full consultation.	biodiversity and protect the most important features. It will provide an extensive range of green infrastructure with open space, wildlife corridors, hedges etc. As detailed in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 222		**Response:** The development will secure much of Cabbage Hill as publicly accessible open space which will be semi-natural and include enhancements such as recreating hedgerow etc. Previously, during the 1990's a large development took place in Warfield which combined both housing and substantial elements of semi-natural green space. The intention this time around is to introduce retain and keep open spaces whilst creating new areas for people and nature to enjoy. The main impact for Binfield will be the provision of a new secondary school which will serve a wide catchment including Binfield, the Warfield development and other areas. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	How can building 2200 houses be at all sympathetic to semi rural environment? Introducing thousands of cars can have one outcome and that is an urbanised environment by 2020/21. There is already a lot of traffic in this area but there is that feeling with plenty of open spaces and the countryside itself is not far away. If Warfield spreads there will be a continues spread north. It will have a huge impact on Warfield yet it's surprising how few people know about this or the impact it will then have on Binfield. So something going on within one planning proposal then has a big impact on another and a different area in Bracknell. It seems as though you can quite happily change one area and in something else say about changing another.	
Rep No. 229		**Response:** This is agreed and the accessible open spaces at Garth Meadows and Larks Hill which were provided as part of the previous development in Warfield contributed to this. The new housing and associated open space such as at Cabbage Hill will be a draw for people making the development a nice place to live. Unfortunately this will also result in the loss of open fields which are not currently accessible. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.1	Previously undeveloped open spaces are an extremely valuable asset and should only be developed as a last resort. These greenfield areas are a huge attraction to people moving into the area	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council recognises there is a need for more flexibility. It does not consider that any site can come forward individually. Therefore, the Council has analysed each site within the Warfield SPD area and considered the planning rationale for grouping them together to build up a comprehensive development. Therefore sites should be considered in the context of a logical planning rationale. Text in the SPD should be revised to clarify how the development should come forward in a comprehensive manner. **Action:** Add additional sentences to paragraph 1.2 (now 1.3) which read as **An alternative approach is that there should be detailed masterplans prepared for blocks of development described in Chapter 11 and shown in Appendix 3. These masterplans should fit together to ensure that they can deliver a comprehensive development across the site in accordance with policy and guidance. Applications should adhere to the agreed masterplans. For each parcel the developer, or consortium of developers would be required to provide:** • **A detailed masterplan for the block of development that accords with the SPD Concept Plan and the SPD Development Principles.** • **Planning applications.** • **An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), showing how the requirements of the overall IDP will be met.** Add a new paragraph 1.4 which reads as:**There may be a some small sites that could come forward in isolation. Where groups of sites and single sites are acceptable, details are included in Chapter 11. Therefore, to achieve a**
1.2	An outline application is desirable but unlikely. Even if only 2 or 3 developers could take 18 months to complete a s106 Agreement.	
Rep No. 34		
1.2	Bloor again have concerns regarding deliverability. Amend paragraph 1.2 to read as: *The Council's preferred approach is for an Outline Planning application……. within the site*. ~~*, an alternative approach is agreed with the Council*~~ **However, the Council recognises that this may severely delay commencement of the development. Whilst continuing to pursue its objective as far as practicable, the Council will therefore consider individual applications on appropriate sites where these are fully in accordance with this SPD [as amended] in respect of layout and contribution to infrastructure and facilities.**	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		
1.2 – 1.4	An outline application is unlikely to work. Each application that comes forward will need to have sufficient conditions or s106 obligations to ensure development comes forward within a comprehensive framework. The Consortium are committed to joint working on a masterplan immediately.	
Rep Nos. 47		
1.2	There are multiple land ownerships and to require only one outline application covering the whole site will frustrate the delivery of housing and associated infrastructure. The objectives to deliver a comprehensive and timely development could be achieved through an alternative delivery mechanism through a number	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	of discrete planning applications consistent to a detailed and measurable concept plan and a fully evidenced and costed Infrastructure Development Plan. The land controlled by BS can deliver significant infrastructure provision (e.g. The north-south link road) so allowing the BS land to come forward first and on a stand alone basis will allow certainty over key infrastructure provision. The requirement of a detailed masterplan in addition to the WSPD is regarded as unnecessary of which a more detailed concept plan would instead provide the necessary framework to ensure a consistent and comprehensive development approach. Paragraph 1.2 should be replaced with the wording : **To achieve a phased, co-ordinated and comprehensive development, planning applications will be required to accord with the Concept Plan and Infrastructure Development Plan contained within this SPD.**	**phased, co-ordinated and comprehensive development, planning applications will be required to accord with the Concept Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan contained within this SPD.**
Rep Nos. 48, 52		
1.2	Amend paragraph 1.2 to include an alternative approach of an outline planning application and master plan for each phase of development	
Rep No. 54		
1.2	A single outline planning application is unlikely and if it is not achievable given the number of landowners, the SPD will need to ensure that the site can be achieved in coordinated way with a consistent approach to separate applications and s106 negotiations	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response**: Support is noted.
1.3	The proposed boundaries of the site are supported.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The designations affecting Cabbage Hill are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. However, these designations will remain until the extent of the built up area has been clarified. The designations whilst remaining a material consideration will have less weight since the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD. However, they will be revised/moved through the DPD process in due course. **Action:** Add sentences to paragraph 1.17 which read as **<u>As a consequence of Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 there will be the need to amend the current Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10 and EN14.These will be revised on the Proposals Map when the extent of the development is fully known following the approval of relevant planning applications and construction on the ground.</u>**
1.3	Figure 1 should be updated to remove/revise older designations especially EN10 to reflect the WSPD concept plan.	
Rep No. 50		
1.3	Opposed to development on the Local Plan EN10 designation because Cabbage Hill is one of the most attractive countryside features in East Berkshire. Its slopes form an attractive and visually prominent rural landscape.	
Rep No. 114a		**Response:** The proposals are considered lawful and the Council is confident it has followed due process in producing the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.3	I believe the proposals are unlawful and that human rights will have been contravened.	
Rep No. 155		**Response:** The public consultation in accordance with statutory regulations which specify a 6 weeks consultation for supplementary planning documents. The Council followed the same procedures as when the Council consulted on the Amen Corner SPD. The Council intends to undertake further consultation also.
1.3	The public consultation has not been given sufficient duration and has not been supported by consultation events/public meetings.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 155		**Response:** The Council understands the emotive feelings and opposition there is to further development. The Council has a duty to balance the need for providing new homes, economic growth and the protection the environment. It is always a difficult task involving difficult choices. A comprehensive development at Warfield was agreed in principle in early 2008 following extensive consultation and an examination of the Core Strategy. Further consultation has been carried out subsequently on the details - SADPD and Draft Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.3	It is unfair that Warfield will be saturated with housing and new development, destroying the unique country side that provides identity and quality of life.	
Rep Nos. 7a part i and part ii		**Response:** The site is adopted into the Core Strategy DPD as a major location for growth in policy CS5. However, regulations governing the production of Core Strategy DPD's at the time the Core Strategy DPD was being produced did not allow for specific allocations to be made. Hence the need to further regularise the site in the SADPD. The decision on whether or not the site was identified was made by an independent inspector in a legally binding report. The grounds on which the inspector made this judgement related to a series of "soundness" tests. The binding report can be read by visiting www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/corestrategy. The SADPD will also be judged during a public examination on its soundness and the decision to adopt the Warfield SPD will be made by the Council Executive. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.4	Why has the land not been adopted into the Core Strategy? Who makes the decision and on what grounds?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 10a, 16a, 36a, 42, 93a, 94a, 96a, 97a, 101a, 104a, 105a, 106a, 108a, 109a, 111a, 113, 117, 121a, 126a, 131a, 133a, 137a, 138a, 143a, 145a, 151a, 154a, 159a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 170a, 175a, 195a, 200a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 208a, 209a, 229		**Response:** The Council has to consider the risk in completing the SPD ahead of the Site Allocations DPD or otherwise. It is not in doubt that the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 will have a significant weight in front of an inspector and therefore, with an effective guidance document (the SPD), it will form a robust strategy for bringing the site forward. In a perfect world, regularising the allocation in the SADPD would happen at the same time as adoption of the SPD. However, given the pressing need for housing and the need to demonstrate a five year supply of housing, the Council would find itself in a weak position should developers put in applications before 2013. Developers are currently working with the Council but fully intend to put forward applications as soon as they can. Therefore, in the desire to continue to be plan-led, the Council considers that adoption of the SPD will help deliver development that the community wants rather than a more compromised development via the appeal process. The Council has already published a statement on this issue (please see document WL23). The Council has already undertaken events similar to that at Binfield and Crowthorne but during the production of the Core Strategy DPD and the original Site Allocations DPD. Please see WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. In response to the request for exhibitions, the Council has held further consultation on a Detailed Concept Plan including 3 meet the planner sessions (see sections 1 and 3 of the Statement for more information). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.4	Object to consultation on detailed use of land Warfield when proposed site has not yet been approved	
Rep Nos. 161a, 230		
1.4	The Council has done nothing to clarify the status of the Warfield consultation compared to other consultations: • Parts of the SADPD will replace sections of the Core Strategy. • Warfield is included in the SADPD so residents should be engaged and given the opportunity to respond. • The Council rejected Warfield Parish Council's invitation to hold the same type of open exhibition sessions as in Binfield and Crowthorne despite being a much larger proposed development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No.47		**Response:** This comment is noted and dealt with elsewhere under comments from this representer. It is not agreed that the bullet point should be deleted but additional flexibility should be added to the text. **Action:** Amend the second bullet point of paragraph 1.4 (now 1.6) to read as: *Provide a starting point for* **preparing** *future detailed masterplanning/***planning applications** ~~*of*~~ **for** *this area.*
1.4	BS support a framework to permit multiple applications to deliver the phased, co-ordinated and comprehensive development. The second bullet point *"Provide a starting point for future detailed masterplanning of this area"* should be deleted.	
Rep No. 54, 54a		**Response**: The adoption of the SPD is intended before the adoption of the SADPD. This means that the Warfield SPD should refer to Policy CS5. It is agreed that consistent text relating to both policies should included in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the first bullet point of paragraph 1.4 (now 1.6) to read as *Guide* ~~*on*~~ *the implementation of Policy CS5 (Land North of Whitegrove and Quelm Park (parish of Warfield)) in the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)* **and/or any relevant policy in the emerging Site Allocations DPD**.
1.4	States that the Warfield SPD guides the implementation of Core Strategy Policy CS5 however the SADPD says that Policy SA9 will replace Policy CS5. Clarification of the status of Policy CS5 should be made in both the Warfield SPD and SADPD.	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** The Council has consulted with people in Warfield as can be seen in the responses in this statement. The existing areas designated as SANGs i.e. Larks Hill and Garth Meadows will be retained. New SANG provision will also be required at a standard of 8 ha per 1000 people as required by Development Principle W6. Therefore, the Council has not breached any planning acts and it is therefore not a clear case of maladminstration. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.4	No only have you not consulted with anyone in Warfield you are consulting about development on protected SANG land which is surely illegal and breaches the planning acts of 1947 and 1990 and which includes green space which were added in 1955. This is a clear case of maladministration.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep. Nos. 123, 123a		**Response:** Taking each objection in turn:
1.4	I object to 2,200 houses on Green Field Land because: i. Loss of amenity countryside ii. Lack of consultation iii. Too high intensity of housing for the land available iv Existing tax paying Quelm Park residents will have to live next to a building site for 10 years.	i. Unfortunately the development will result in the loss of countryside/green fields but there is a need to balance the needs of growth with the need to protect the countryside. The justification for developing a sustainable community in this location was established in the Core Strategy DPD which was finalised in February 2008. ii. The Core Strategy preparation included extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is formally allocating the sites in the Site Allocations DPD which is again subject to consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination. Further detail on the site is being provided in the Warfield SPD which is subject of consultation, evidence and appraisal. iii. The densities across the site will respond to the character of each area to be developed. The development is committed to provided 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. A lower housing density across the site would mean more land taken to meet the housing numbers, hence more loss of countryside or requiring more sites elsewhere. There is a need to balance land take and densities to ensure sustainable communities are built. However, the Council has reviewed the Concept Plan and associated densities across the site in the Warfield SPD. iv There will be an extensive building programme which was the case when Quelm Park was built. The development will be required to minimise disturbance

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		during construction phases as required by Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 155		**Response:** This is agreed and the Council has held further focused consultation events during November 2011 on a Detailed Concept Plan. See section 3 of this statement of how the council has considered all responses. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.4	The Warfield SPD should not proceed until full consultation through local public events have been held.	
Rep No. 226		**Response:** The development is consider to be the right amount for Warfield for reasons such as providing for new facilities and services. Warfield did not lose its identity when a larger development was constructed during the 1990's. This new development will create a character which will in some ways improve the area including providing more publicly accessible open space than that which currently exists. There will be an extensive building programme which was the case when Quelm Park was built. The development will be required to minimise disturbance during construction phases as required by Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.4	This is far too many new houses for Warfield which will lose its identity of fine landscape and open space. The area will be a major building site for years.	
Rep Nos. 2a, 4, 7a part i and part ii, 10a, 16a, 20a, 23a , 30, 36a, 41a, 82a, 83a, 85a, 89a, 92a, 96a, 97a, 99a, 101a, 102a, 103a, 104a, 105a, 106a, 108a, 109a, 111a, 118a, 134a, 146a, 147a, 154a,157a, 159a, 160a, 165a, 180a, 190a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a, 231, 232		**Response:** Consultation on the potential for development began during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. As a result, there has already been extensive consultation on the site and the Council has has completed the consultation in accordance with prescribed regulations and its own consultation strategy called the statement of Community Involvement. The Council
1.6	Concern about consultation such as lack of consultation and events or there has not been any consultation	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 8		has already undertaken events similar to that at Binfield and Crowthorne but during the production of the Core Strategy DPD and the original Site Allocations DPD. Please see WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. The Council has also undertaken further consultation in response to comments such as these on a Detailed Concept Plan in November 2010 to refine the SPD further. Further opportunities will be available as the detail emerges for example, during the planning application stage. **Action:**Further consultation on a Detailed Concept Plan document in November 2011.
1.6	It is difficult to comment without greater detail especially adjacent and to the rear of Old Farmhouse Row (Abbey Place)	
Rep Nos. 10a, 16a, 23a, 36a, 41a, 81a, 92a, 94a, 97a, 101a, 102a, 103a, 106a, 109a, 111a, 113 114a, 118a, 121a, 131a, 137a, 138a, 142a, 145a, 151a, 154a,164a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 169a, 170a, 171a, 175a, 176a, 183a, 185a, 217a		
1.6	No consultation with residents. No opportunity to attend consultation events on SA DPD proposals for Warfield, why?	
Rep No. 117, 132a, 137a, 139a, 159a, 170a, 176a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 208a, 209a		
1.6	Why have we not had the same consultation events as for Binfield and Crowthorne?	
Rep No. 36a		
1.6	Do not object wholesale to new development in the area but simply would like to be consulted on how many and where	
Rep No. 232		
1.6	When will we be consulted and when will an open debate take place?	
Rep No. 8		**Response:** The Core Strategy preparation included extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is formally allocating the sites in the Site Allocations DPD which is again subject to consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination. Further detail on the site is being provided in the Warfield SPD which is subject of consultation, evidence and appraisal.
1.6	The general public should be asked what they would like to see and professionals should be asked to seek solutions to meet how people want to live.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 13		**Response:** The exact location of the junction is not determined yet. The Concept Plan is only indicative and the Council apologises for any inconvenience caused in this instance. Any 3rd party land required to facilitate development will be discussed in ample time, however, it is unlikely that the car park of the pub will be required. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	The proprietors of the 3 Legged Cross pub were not aware they were going to have a road right through their car park! They should be informed of the impact of these plans. It is not clear where the road exits onto 3 Legged Cross junction.	
Rep No. 13		**Response**: Noted.
1.6	This is the clearest document I have read concerning development plans and thankfully lacking in the usual planning jargon,well done on that score and for the obvious thought that has gone into trying to make the best of a bad job to preserve Warfield as best possible.	
Rep No. 31		
1.6	Welcome additional dialogue and input into the proposals	
Rep No. 62		**Response:** The Local Education Authority have been continually involved in the process. Sandy Lane School been added to the consultation database. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	We were not consulted until very late in the process and would like to be consulted much earlier in the process	
Rep No. 112a		**Response:** The Council tries to balance the amount of technical planning terms and trying to communicate easily with the public. The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft has tried to limit the amount of jargon used and its is successful in many areas in this respect. That said, the Council is always looking to improve its planning documents and will strive to improve the Warfield SPD in its final version.
1.6	Where is your transparency? Consultation should be meaningful and not jargon to confuse, just straight answers.	

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Action: The Council has reviewed the final version of SPD to make it easier to read.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 117</td><td rowspan="14">Response: The Council has not granted outline planning permission. The Council has identified the area as a major location for growth in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The 6 weeks length of the consultation is the statutory requirement for consulting on a draft SPD. The Council also consulted extensively during the production of the Core Strategy DPD in this respect. Please see WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. In respect to the Warfield SPD, the Council:

• held regular dialogue with Councillors, groups and others;
• published all documentation on the website;
• made documents available in Council and parish offices and libraries;
• placed an advert in the local free paper;
• liaised with groups and organisations (e.g. The Warfield Parish Council put a narrative in their Wren magazine which goes to most if not all dwellings in Warfield);
• wrote letters to all residents of Warfield Street and Newell Green informing them of consultation;
• e-mailed all people/organisations on our database; and,
• put copies of documents through the doors of all residents living within the site.

All details of the consultation have been published in the Consultation Proforma (Please see document WL8).</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>We have heard nothing about the consultation despite Council claims that they have informed residents.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 117, 204</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>The proposal should have been notified to all residents</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 124a</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>Consultation has been poor. Our neighbours did not receive the consultation like us and according to the planning department outline planning permission was granted in 2008. If we had been informed of this development we would not have purchased our property</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 143a, 187a</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>Warfield has not had adequate consultation</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 147a</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>Communication has been poor and we are left with the impression that residents have been kept in the dark. Not sure if there were opportunities for Warfield residents to attend events</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 148a</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.6</td><td>I am appalled that this process has been allowed to develop without the consultation of those most affected. The leaflet I received summed up your bad practises by asking why the residents have not been consulted. How can the projects have got this far without full</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	approval and without detailed information being made available on how the land is to be used.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 181a		
1.6	Under the new Government we are allowed to have a say and the people of Warfield do not want development. Enough is enough we are not building on this land.	
Rep No. 182		
1.6	The Council has failed to appropriately inform, engage and consult the public and has not been transparent with local tax payers about the implications of proposals. It has posted a consultation without informing local residents about the intention to open a formal consultation process, and engage with local residents through a number of different consultation approaches. It is concerning that the consultation included the busiest two week holiday period of the year and the process fails to effectively include local residents. At best it contravenes Council principles on consultation and at worst raises serious questions about making consultation accessible to all and to ensure residents views are inclusive. The Council have made a strong impression that the decision has already been made within the corridors of local Council offices rather than within the formal decision making meetings open to public scrutiny.	
Rep No. 212a		
1.6	I have not been communicated abut the intention to still build 2,200 dwellings in the area. Are we being kept in the dark? I had read that the new Government will scrap the proposed building.	
Rep No. 217a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.6	How without residents input, can discussions be held transparently on the plans?	
Rep No. 204		
1.6	The majority of residents in Warfield were unaware of the consultation. The Town and Country paper was not received by all residents and most received it after the exhibitions.	
Rep No. 222		
1.6	6 weeks is not enough time for something so substantial. The only way people really know is the paper and the leaflets by action groups. You have done a very poor job at publishing any of this.	
Rep. No. 123a		**Response:** The Council has: published all comments on its online portal facility; published a summary of all response (see WL20); and, has considered, responded and stated the action in has taken in respect to the Warfield SPD (in this document). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	Concern that previous comments registered online have been removed and is this a continuation of the lack of consultation at Warfield?	
Rep No. 124b		**Response:** The Council posted a letter informing of the consultation to all properties in Newell Green and Warfield Street. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	Our neighbours said they did not receive the letter informing them of the consultation	
Rep No. 131a		**Response:** The consideration of the site took 3 years in the Core Strategy DPD. Since then the Council has began to develop further guidance in the Warfield SPD. Further targeted consultation will take place in the autumn with the final guidance being completed in the Warfield SPD in December 2011. Then the Council will expect pre-application
1.6	Concerns over the speed this is progressing. There may have been earlier consultation events but these have been restrictive in terms of dates and times	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		discussions before an application is submitted for consideration. The previous consultation events were put at accessible locations at a range of times including events during the working week, evenings and weekends. Unfortunately, resources were limited because officers organised several such events across the whole borough at the same time. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 134a		**Response:** There have been several consultations on Warfield over the years in the Core Strategy DPD and Warfield SPD as detailed in document WL21. Some of these consultations included events where people could quiz officer. In response to these comments, the Council has also held a further targeted consultation during November 2011 on a Detailed Concept Plan (see sections 1 and 3 of this report for details). **Action:** The Council held further consultation including events during November 2011.
1.6	I would like to propose a formal consultation round with all residents so all views may be aired in open discussion. This will allow informed decisions to be made	
Rep No. 155a		
1.6	What consultation events are residents being invited to and why are the Council discussing the use of green belt land before such consultation meetings have taken place.	
Rep No. 162a		
1.6	Holding consultation events only in Binfield and Crowthorne have disenfranchised the rest of the Borough. The consultation for Warfield has been treated separately to the SADPD even though it is dependent on the infrastructure plan in the SADPD. It is unsound and democratically unaccountable when the two are intrinsically linked.	
Rep No. 174a		
1.6	Please confirm whether or not you will hold further consultation meetings and the the previous meetings in Brownlow Hall and the Parish offices were a complete waste of time	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		
1.6	Please let us know when a consultation event will take place?	
Rep No. 139a		**Response:** The decision to develop the area was taken during the Core Strategy DPD process which was eventually adopted in February 2008. All details of the process can be viewed in document WL21. The Council then began the production of the Warfield SPD which is intended as a guidance document to set out the parameters of development to guide more detailed planning applications. A draft of the document was produced for this consultation in accordance with statutory regulations. The details of how the consultation was undertaken can be viewed in WL8. The Council has also held further consultation in November 2011 of which response can be found in Section 3 of this statement. Follwoing the adoption of the Warfield SPD, the Council will expect pre-application discussions before an application is submitted for consideration. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	I do not necessarily oppose the plans as I realise houses must be built to create new capacity. However I do disagree with the manner it has been brought about. It seems residents have not been consulted about the plans. Please clarify the planning and consultation process.	
Rep No. 151a		**Response:** The Council has identified the area as a major location for growth in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council also consulted extensively during the production of the Core Strategy DPD in this respect. Please see document WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. The Council has consulted in line with prescribed regulations. All details of the consultation have been published in the Consultation Proforma (please see document WL8). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	Allow Warfield residents to have the opportunity to look again at housing requirements including to reconsider the need for such high housing developments and their locations	
Rep No. 152a, 156a		
1.6	It appears that the Council has sought to do a done deal with landowners without necessary consultation planning processes in place.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 182		**Response:** This principle was established in the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD. The Council has already published a statement on this issue (see document WL23). The Council has to consider the risk in completing the SPD ahead of the Site Allocations DPD or otherwise. It is not in doubt that the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 will have a significant weight and therefore, with an effective guidance document (the SPD), it will form a robust strategy for bringing the site forward. In a perfect world, regularising the allocation in the SADPD would happen at the same time as adoption of the SPD. However, given the pressing need for housing and the need to demonstrate a five year supply of housing, the Council would find itself in a weak position should developers put in applications before 2013. Developers are currently working with the Council but fully intend to put forward applications as soon as they can. Therefore, in the desire to continue to be plan-led, the Council considers that adoption of the SPD will help deliver development that the community wants rather than a more compromised development via the appeal process. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	The future use of land around Warfield has only been agreed in principle in the Core Strategy however: • The Warfield SPD has set out detailed proposals before approval has been given • The SADPD proposes to allocate the site • The impression is the Council was always intent on proceeding at Core Strategy stage to reduce the likelihood of public scrutiny • The intention to commence development in 12-14 months is ambiguous and suggests much work is being done behind the scenes to make this happen • Preparation comes at a cost and why would the Council commit to spending if they did not intend to follow through with the plans.	
Rep No. 192a		**Response:** The Council has followed all the relevant regulations governing the production of supplementary planning documents. The site was identifies in the Council's Core Strategy DPD which was found to be sound by an independent inspector. It was widely consulted upon at several stages, backed by a robust evidence base and examined thoroughly. Please see www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/corestrategy for further information. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	Convince me that you have followed all applicable consultation, planning and approvals procedure?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 210a		**Response:** All responses to the SADPD Participation Consultation (Feb 2010) were considered (see document SAL9). The Warfield SPD Consultation Draft (this consultation) has considered all responses in this statement. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	The residents of Warfield and Binfield have not been considered	
Rep Nos. 161a, 230		**Response:** Relevant parish councils were given a set of the documents and copies of the Consultation Draft SPD for their members. Warfield Parish Council were given 2 sets of all document and a box of 100 Consultation Draft SPDs. Further copies were made available on request to local members. All parish members were made well aware of the Consultation in advance because we spoke with them on numerous occasions. Warfield Parish Council advertised the consultation in advance in the Wren newsletter. The NAAG leaflet was not correct about some of the basic facts. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.6	Very few parish Councillors had hard copies delivered to their homes so it is reasonable to conclude that the majority of residents were unaware of the consultation until they received the NAAG leaflet.	
Rep No. 3 parts i and ii		**Response:** The proposed development does not contravene the Core Strategy DPD. Part of the evidence base which the Inspector considered during the Core Strategy examination was the Major Locations For Growth Background Paper (October 2006) which, on pages 33-35, gave details of an indicative masterplan which included potential development in the vicinity of West End Lane. It is unknown what EU pollution codes this response refers to. The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which
1.12	The development of West End contravenes the Core Strategy 2008 and could not be compliant with current EU pollution codes.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 19a, 46a, 54a, 66a, 70a, 71a, 72a, 73a 75a		**Response:** The exact detail of where development will actually go was not defined at the Core Strategy DPD stage. However, the Major Locations for Growth Background paper provided an indicative plan showing development on the lower slopes of the Hill. The intention is to secure as much of Cabbage Hill as possible as open space. The Council has reviewed this issue and is now promoting more development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill in line with a revised Concept Plan. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
1.12	The Council gave an undertaking in October 2006 to not build in Cabbage Hill. This decision was understood to be integral to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The fact that CS5 has been re-designated under Policy SA9 does not alter this undertaking. Map 7 Concept Plan in the SADPD shows development beyond the boundary of West End Lane which is designated as Open Space of Public Value. I recognise that some development west of The Cut may be inevitable but suggest it is kept top the south broadly following the Park Farm complex. Request a revision before publication of the draft Warfield SPD.	
Rep No. 30		**Response:** It is unfortunate that some properties within the development will be affected. The Council has undertaken a robust process in to identifying a large scale development of which the principle was established in the Core Strategy DPD. Please see WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. The Warfield SPD paragraph 4.32 clearly states that the settings of listed buildings should be considered sensitively during the detailed design stage. The Council will work hard to ensure this occurs on the ground. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	We do not believe due consideration has been given to the impact on the local environment and community where 2,200 houses will decimate the rural nature of Warfield. We bought our house in Old Priory Lane because of its rural setting which will be ruined. It will be devalued severely and be difficult to sell because no one will pay for the calibre of our house with 2,200 dwellings around it. How will we be compensated for this loss? We bought our house for life and cannot express how upset we are.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 41a, 92a, 104a, 108a, 109a, 137a, 139a,		**Response:** The site has been agreed in principle meaning that the land is identified as a major location for growth for a comprehensive development in Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Warfield SPD adds detail on the form and content of the development. The Site Allocations DPD will regularise the site as a formal allocation. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	The site has only been agreed in principle	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** Text in paragraph 75 of the Core Strategy DPD clearly states that "*Notwithstanding the outcome of the preparation of future Area Action Plans, it is envisaged that the employment uses at land north of Whitegrove are likely to be small-scale,...* " **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12 and 1.15	*BFC: The comment in the representation was made against paragraph 1.22 but which should have been 1.12 and 1.15.* There is an inconsistency between Policy CS5 and SADPD Policy SA9 in terms of employment provision.	
Rep Nos. 104a, 113a		**Response:** The government recommends building on brownfield sites but it recognises that some greenfield sites are also required. The Council's preferred strategy for development comprises both brownfield (e.g. Bracknell town centre, Staff College and Crowthorne Business Estate) and greenfield (e.g. Warfield and Jennetts Park). This issue was examined during the production of the Core Strategy DPD where it was conclude that the Council's strategy including development at Warfield was sound in all ways. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	Why is development concentrated on a green field?	
Rep Nos. 10a, 16a, 36a, 93a, 94a, 96a, 101a, 104a, 105a, 108a, 109a, 111a, 131a, 139a, 183a, 190a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a, 229		**Response:** The Council has to consider the risk in completing the SPD ahead of the Site Allocations DPD or otherwise. It is not in doubt that the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 will have a significant weight in front of an inspector and therefore, with an effective guidance
1.12	Object to consultation on detailed use of land Warfield when proposed site has not yet been approved	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No.15		document (the SPD), it will form a robust strategy for bringing the site forward. In a perfect world, regularising the allocation in the SADPD would happen at the same time as adoption of the SPD. However, given the pressing need for housing and the need to demonstrate a five year supply of housing, the Council would find itself in a weak position should developers put in applications before 2013. Developers are currently working with the Council but fully intend to put forward applications as soon as they can. Therefore, in the desire to continue to be plan-led, the Council considers that adoption of the SPD will help deliver development that the community wants rather than a more compromised development via the appeal process. This principle was established in the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD. The Council has already published a statement on this issue (see document WL23). The dwelling numbers have never been 1700. Originally it was 2,500 which was dropped to 2,200 dwellings in the Core Strategy DPD. Please see WL21 on the link above for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. The town centre is a focus for new housing as well as other sites. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.14	There is a serious error of timing because Paragraph 1.14 clearly states that the formal allocation of the land in the SPD is linked to the formal adoption of the SADPD which will not be adopted until 2012. The SPD may be challenged. The validity of the SPD should be clarified to ensure that the development principles are enforceable.	
Rep No. 13		
1.15	The land at Warfield was only 'agreed in principle' and as such it is inappropriate to be looking at the detailed use of this land until after the SADPD preferred options have been agreed. Warfield is far too high a density and at some stage 1,700 homes was mentioned so why now 2,200? If we have no choice please consider lowering the number of houses and providing the balance of the houses in other areas such as the town centre for those starting on the housing ladder. The council must get on with the town centre redevelopment and must NOT be dependent on building more and more houses to justify it.	
Rep No. 109a		**Response:** The development will provide measures to limit congestion, improving the transport network and slow traffic speeds. The site has been agreed in principle meaning that the land is identified as a major location for growth for a comprehensive development in Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Warfield SPD adds detail on the form and content of the development. The Site Allocations DPD will regularise the site as a formal allocation. It is unfortunate that green field land will be developed.
1.12	Over the years there has been an ever increasing amount of traffic and speed with lack of speed enforcement which has eroded quality of life whilst services have not improved. I am concerned that the to build 2,200 dwelling on a green field/green belt. The explanations given are ambiguous and unclear. What is the point of creating designations when boundaries can be moved to meet the requirement of such massive housing projects.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Whilst I appreciate the need for housing I am not convinced every possibility has been explored to avoid destroying the green belt and habitat. To what extent has exploring the possibility of refurbishing brown sites such as the 3M building?	The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection the countryside. The Council explored alternatives to development at Warfield during the Core Strategy process. The adopted Core Strategy makes provision for brownfield development also such as Staff College, Crowthorne Business Estate and Bracknell Town Centre (which includes the 3M building). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 112a		**Response:** There is a need for housing and new housing is a job provider. Furthermore the Council has always and will continue to encourage employment growth in the Borough. New housing is a signal for prosperity of an area which the Council is properly planning for in line with the desire of the Government. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	Businesses are leaving and new buildings left unoccupied. New housing won't change this. We don't need more houses as there won't be jobs for the influx unless they commute clogging up our roads.	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** This is not a planning permission. The Council has consulted on this site several times during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. This process also included an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. This was a consultation regarding detail. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	It is disgraceful how the planning permission and consultation is being handled.	
Rep No. 119a		**Response:** The Council's 20 year strategy for development as set out in the Core Strategy DPD makes provision for a regenerated town centre. This will include around 1000 new dwellings. Therefore, the Council is providing for
1.12	Objection because Bracknell Town Centre is underdeveloped for an over developed suburb.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		development in the town centre as well as development on other land in the Borough. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 131a		**Response:** Alternatives were consulted upon and examined during the Core Strategy DPD process. This process also included an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council is promoting development across the Borough for example, the Staff College in Bracknell, Blue Mountain in Binfield, Bracknell Town Centre, Crowthorne Business Estate. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	This seems signed and sealed. Have alternatives been considered that do not involve concreting over a green field site? Shouldn't the houses be shared amongst a number of areas to minimise effects?	
Rep No. 141a		**Response:** This comment is more related to the Core Strategy DPD. However, there is a need for all regions and all authorities to provide for their growth needs in accordance with national planning policy. It is not in doubt that the South East needs to grow for economic and social rationale, however the level of development, infrastructure etc. are matters for debate/argument. The Council's Core Strategy has a level of housing development 2000 less than in the South East Plan. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	The South East is already very overcrowded with poor rail links and congested roads. Why encourage more people when it seems counter productive.	
Rep No. 151a		**Response:** The Council's 20 year strategy for development as set out in the Core Strategy DPD and makes provision for both brownfield and greenfield development. The land is also identified in the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5. Policy CS2 is an allocation
1.12	Building on green field is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS2	
Rep No. 170a		
1.12	Objection because it is against the 2008 Core Strategy	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		policy and the Warfield site fits into criteria 4 as an extension to the defined settlement. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep. No. 162a		**Response:** The adopted Core Strategy DPD forms part of the Local Development Framework. Policy CS5 establishes that a comprehensive development will happen, i.e. The principle of development at the location is established. The Site Allocations DPD has to be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD because it is a lower level policy document. Therefore a policy which allocates the site formally into the Site Allocations DPD is required. The term adopted is a factually correct term which is appropriate and acceptable. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	Object to the use of the term adopted whether something is adopted in the Core Strategy does not mean it is adopted into the Local Development Framework. The term has been abused consistently with regard to land at Warfield SPD and has been used to promote the idea that the development in that area has been accepted and approved when the SADPD says the site has only been agreed as an area of significant development. This is a cynical use of terminology and is wholly unacceptable.	
Rep No. 217a		**Response:** The area is not an area of scientific importance. The site has been considered in terms of transport, ecology and landscape during the Core Strategy process. Further detailed assessments of all issues such as ecology will be required to support detailed planning applications. Various options for development were proposed at the Issues and Options stage in July 2005. The methodology for carrying out a Sustainability Appraisal, proposed at the scoping stage, was used to test each of these options and predict their significant positive and negative impacts on the range of sustainability issues. Recommendations were made on the most sustainable options and these suggestions were fed into the plan-making process. This, alongside public consultation responses, informed the choice of policy approach. The Council is taking forward many of the
1.12	Why build on an area of natural beauty and valuable scientific and ecological importance? What alternative sites have been considered and what were the reasons for choosing the site? Have lessons not been learnt from the past in respect to building a new town	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		new town legacy's in planning new communities such as lots of open space, neighbourhood centres and so on. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 230		**Response:** The Concept Plan in the SADPD was produced before that in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft hence the difference. However a final version of the Concept Plan has been produced for the final Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.12	The illustrative Concept Plan in the SADPD does not coincide with the area detailed in the Core Strategy consultation.	
Rep No. 60		
1.13 to 1.15	The link between the the SADPD and Warfield SPD is appreciated but it unclear why both Concept Plans are different.	
Rep No. 3 parts i and ii		**Response:** The Council has worked with the residents of West End Lane to minimise the impact of development whilst creating a changing environment in the vicinity of their home. The residents views have been considered in detail in this consultation and the subsequent consultation on the Detailed Concept Plan. The development will need to provide necessary measures to minimise congestion. The development industry will react to market conditions in terms of building and selling properties. **Action:** The Council has met with local residents in West End Lane and their comments have resulted in changes to the Concept Plan and relevant text in the final Warfield SPD. See resulting changes in the actions to the other West End Lane responses.
1.15	I raise a strenuous objection to the development of Warfield West End. I grew up in and have lived in and around West End area for thirty years and have watched the surrounding areas systematically ravaged by similar developments. The area itself will become hopelessly over developed and bring a great deal of congestion that will destroy Warfield. We have hundreds of houses that remain empty, unsold and a blight on the landscape for years to come, yet we are now subject to make the same of this area.	
Rep No. 8		**Response:** New development will be carefully integrated alongside existing the settlements. Areas of separation and sensitive boundary treatments will be essential to ensure the successful development of the site where the new
1.15	The proposal will destroy Newell Green and Abbey Place - we need smaller developments with space between them.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		development meets the existing settlements. The Warfield SPD also defines a number of character areas within the site ensuring that the development will feel as a number of smaller developments with different features and characteristics. Additionally, proposals will be required to take account of existing policy and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) such as Character Area Assessments SPD which seek to integrate new development within existing communities, as has been achieved at Abbey Place. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 9		**Response:** Comments noted. This is a matter for consideration in the SADPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	The HA have made comments on the SADPD and these comments should be consulted in conjunction with comments on the Warfield SPD. SADPD Policy SA9 does not mention issues relating to the SRN whilst other polices do note impacts on Junction 10 of the M4 and Junction 3 of the M3. The HA is concerned with the importance of mitigating the effects of development at Warfield on the SRN given its scale.	
Rep Nos. 1a, 2a, 4, 7a part i and part ii, 10a, 13, 16a, 17a, 20a, 23a, 30, 36a, 41a, 42a, 51a, 78, 81a, 82a, 83a, 84a, 85a, 86a, 88a, 89a, 90a, 91a, 92a, 93a, 95a, 96a, 97a, 98a, 99a, 100a, 101a, 102a, 103a, 104a, 105a, 106a, 107a, 108a, 109a, 110a, 111a, 112a, 113, 114a, 116a, 117, 118a,119a, 121a, 123a, 124a, 125a, 126a, 127a, 128a, 129a, 130a, 132a, 133a, 134a, 135a, 136a, 137a, 138a, 140a, 141a, 142a, 143a, 144a, 145a, 147a, 148a, 149a, 150a, 151a, 152a, 154a, 155a, 156a, 157a, 158a, 159a, 160a, 164a, 165a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 171a, 172a, 173a, 176a, 177a, 178a, 179a, 180a, 181a, 185a, 186a, 187a, 188a, 189a, 190a, 191a, 192a, 194a, 195a, 198a, 199a, 200a, 201a, 205a, 206a, 207a, 208a, 209a, 210a, 211a, 213a, 215a, 216a part i, 229, 231, 232		**Response:** The principle of development has already been established in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council identified land at Warfield in the Core Strategy DPD. This involved extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is formally allocating the sites in the Site Allocations DPD which is again subject to consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination. Further detail on the site is being provided in the Warfield SPD which is subject of consultation, evidence and

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.15	Objection to the principle of development in SADPD Policy SA9	appraisal. This principle was established in the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD. The Council has already published a statement on this issue (see document WL23). See also document WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 14		**Response:** Comments noted. These are matters for consideration in the SADPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	The wording of Policy SA9 should mirror that in the HRA in respect to SPA specifically mentioning Strategic Access, Management and Monitoring.	
Rep No. 14a		
1.15	The wording of Policy SA9 should mirror that in the HRA in respect to SPA specifically mentioning Strategic Access, Management and Monitoring and the phasing of SANGs to be in place before the occupation of the first dwelling.	
Rep No. 15		
1.15	The wording should be amended to read '…**up to 2200 dwellings**…' The area of land in Policy SA9 is insufficient to accommodate the proposed scale of development. To achieve the target, development would conflict with PPS1 and Council Resolution regarding the protection of Cabbage Hill against development. Much of the land in undevelopable (e.g. flood plain, other environmental and open space designations) which means the remaining area of land available for development on the scale proposed becomes insufficient. Core Strategy Policy CS1 encourages sustainability for all development. Policy SA9 would lead to loss of character and identity of land in Warfield contrary to policy CS1. This policy is undeliverable and unsustainable.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Point 4 of SA9 should be amended to read as **Financial contributions towards the provision of a new Secondary School**. The last sentence of SA should read as **Policy CS5**	
Rep No. 24a		
1.15	Policy SA9 should make provision for elderly people	
Rep Nos. 48, 52		
1.15	Amend the reference to *Policy CS4* in the final sentence of Policy SA9 to read as **Policy SA9**	
Rep No 49a		
1.15	Policy SA9 is supported but is should be flexible to allow small scale extension to go ahead to contribute towards meeting housing needs. Financial contributions can be made via s106 agreements.	
Rep No 63a		
1.15	Amend SADPD Policy SA9 by adding an additional bullet point which reads as **Buffering, protection and enhancement of Local Wildlife Sites and BAP priority habitat.**	
Rep No 15a		**Response:** The designations affecting Cabbage Hill are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. However, these designations will remain until the extent of the built up area has been clarified. The designations
1.15	The Concept Plan in the SADPD differs from the SPD version. Specifically, land west of West End Lane is protected under Local Plan policy EN10(ii) and serves as a natural gap separating Binfield from Warfield. Land between West End Lane, Avery Lane and The Splash and Garth Meadows is under Policy EN14. The Concept Plan shows 8 low density housing areas and a primary school within this area.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Whilst it is recognised that some compromise may have to be made to allow the broad area to be delivered, this protected land needs to be retained and enhanced and development must have minimal impact. The existing bridleways (Quelm Lane, Avery Lane and Hedge Lane) must be retained as green corridors. These are ignored of the Concept Plan. Given these environmental constraints 2,200 dwellings is too high and it should be more like 1700 dwellings cited by both the planners and developers consortium. This level is more sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the community. The balance should be distributed equally across other developable sites in the Borough including in the south of Bracknell Forest.	whilst remaining a material consideration will have less weight since the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD. However, they will be removed/revised through the DPD process in due course. Avery Lane is to be retained and additional text will clarify this in the Warfield SPD. The additional capacity work undertaken to support a revised Concept plan demonstrates that 2,200 dwellings can be delivered on the site. **Action:** Add sentences to paragraph 1.17 which read as **As a consequence of Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 there will be the need to amend the current Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10 and EN14.These will be revised on the Proposals Map when the extent of the development is fully known following the approval of relevant planning applications and construction on the ground.**
Rep No. 18a		**Response:** Noted.
1.15	Support the general thrust of SADPD Policy SA9	
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		
1.15	General agreement with the aims and objectives of SADPD Policy SA9	
Rep Nos. 19a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a		**Response:** Map 34 does not show any Open Space of Public Value designations. The SADPD proposes to remove OSPV from the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map. Core Strategy Policy CS8, supported by its explanatory text, will still apply. The designations affecting Cabbage Hill shown on Map 34 are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy
1.15	The maps in the SADPD Preferred Options Document contradict with each other. Map 7 shows the total destruction of West End Lane which is an existing distinct settlement of mixed dwellings by new dwellings and a new road. Map 34 clearly shows Open Space of Public Value at West End Lane and Cabbage Hill with no development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 22a		**Response:** Policy SA9 of the Draft Submission SADPD (November 2011) requires the provision of infrastructure and facilities in accordance with the IDP. It is agreed that both documents should cross reference each other. **Action:** Insert cross references where appropriate in the Warfield SPD
1.15	A further criterion should be added to that states that requirements set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) should be met by new development. The SADPD IDP should cross reference to the SPD IDP and vice-versa.	
Rep Nos.19a, 26, 26i, 26a, 27, 27a, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** The Council has undertaken further work on the Concept Plan including additional consultation. A final version will appear in the Warfield SPD. Map 34 does not show any Open Space of Public Value designations. The SADPD proposes to remove OSPV from the Bracknell Forest Proposals Map. Core Strategy Policy CS8, supported by its explanatory text, will still apply. The designations affecting Cabbage Hill shown on Map 34 are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. **Action:** An amended Concept Plan has been included in the final Warfield SPD.
1.15	The maps in the SADPD Preferred Options Document contradict with each other. Map 7 shows the total destruction of West End Lane which is an existing distinct settlement of mixed dwellings by new dwellings and a new road. Map 34 clearly shows Open Space of Public Value at West End Lane and Cabbage Hill with no development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 30		**Response:** The Council has established it housing allocation and that this site will be developed for 2,200 dwellings in the Core Strategy DPD in February 2008. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Whitegrove, Lawrence Hill and Quelm Park have already had thousands of houses built so 2,200 houses represents a 70% increase. Why is there a need for 2,200 more dwellings in Warfield when so much has already been built there. We have been developed enough.	
Rep No. 45a		**Response:** Noted. The Council has produced an updated Appropriate Assessment in the Warfield SPD.
1.15	The site falls partly within 5km and wholly within 7km of the SPA. We welcome the commitment in Policy SA9 the commitment to a bespoke package of SPA avoidance and mitigation measures. Policy SA9 and reflect the SEP policy NRM6 and the Delivery Framework with suggested changes. The SADPD Concept Plan does not separate SANG from open space. The SANG/s should be at least 2 ha with good footpath connections from residential areas and parking.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Noted.
1.15	See comments on SADPD Policy SA9 (Rep Nos. 43a, 44a)	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is not appropriate to say in a policy that it should be drafted to accord with guidance (i.e. The SPD). However the Council will ensure that there is consistency between the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5, the Warfield SPD and the emerging SADPD Policy SA9. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	The SADPD will be adopted after the WSPD so it is not possible to insert the final SADPD Policy SA9. The WSPD should be drafted to say **SADPD Policy SA9 will be drafted to accord with the final SPD.** The SADPD concept plan should also accord with the final WSPD concept plan. Representations on SADPD SA9 relate to 2,200 dwellings whilst capacity analysis by BS demonstrates around 2,000 dwellings. It will be necessary to further review the site capacity through the preparation of a more detailed concept plan.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 48a, 52a		**Response:** Noted - see relevant responses to Rep Nos. 48 and 52 through this Statement.
1.15	Support allocation of Warfield. Comments on Infrastructure, Concept plan, phasing and delivery are made to the Warfield SPD.	
Rep Nos. 48a, 52a		**Response:** The site will be expected to come forward in a comprehensive manner including green field parts of the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Encourage that the Council acknowledge that greenfield sites will need to come forward early in the plan period in paragraph 2.6.3 of the SADPD	
Rep No. 54a		**Response:** This is a matter for consideration in the SADPD. Generally the points made are not agreed because: the level of housing was decided in the Core Strategy DPD; supporting text the the Core Strategy Policy CS5 states that employment provision will be small scale; and, that the Council considers that the Western side of Cabbage Hill should be provided as open space. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	The baseline housing requirement should be 12,780 dwellings in line with the South East Plan and more up-to-date household projections. This means 2000 extra dwellings which may lead to additional housing on Warfield over and above the 2,200 currently proposed. The Council should revisit the Warfield Urban Extension to consider whether there is scope to provide additional housing to meet the SEP allocation. Persimmon suggest reconsidering land on the western side of Cabbage Hill for housing development. SADPD Policy SA9 fails to report the recommendations or say why it has not followed the Employment Land Review (2009) paragraph 7.46 for some additional industrial/warehousing. Without meaningful employment provision the site will just be a new residential extension to the town, relatively distant from the main employment areas. Policy SA9 should be amended to include employment opportunities in the SPD and that any subsequent need for housing should be provided on the western side of Cabbage Hill.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	SADPD SA9 references pooling of contributions is vague and could be misinterpreted. Contributions should be ring fenced for the particular uses they are secured for e.g. roads contribution spent on roads and not spent on schools. It is unlikely a the intention of the authors but the wording is confusing. Policy SA9 should delete references to pooling contributions because developers will already understand they may be asked to contribute towards other developments. The statement in Policy SA9 that affordable housing should be provided in accordance with policy is vague and uncertain. Policy SA9 should either specify the amount or cross refer to the policy it should accord with. Developers need certainty over costs including affordable housing. It is inappropriate to allocate a site where affordable housing requirements may change. Policy SA9 says Cabbage Hill should be kept free of built development, however, the Council should reconsider the housing requirement in line with the South East Plan. If no additional land around Cabbage Hill is required for housing or other development then it should still be recognised that some small scale development would complement the proposed SANG and related recreational uses may be acceptable. Policy SA9 should be amended to give further consideration of more development at the Warfield Urban Extension. If land is not required then it should state that built development would not normally be required in connection with or to support the prosed SANG/open space. Policy SA9 should also confirm that Cabbage Hill is the preferred solution to avoiding/mitigation impact on the SPA.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 65a		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary sports and recreation facilities including enhancement of existing provision, new provision and other open space. Ancillary requirements such a changing facilities and floodlighting will also be a requirement of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Sport England supports the provision of community and recreational facilities including open space. It is important they are accessible, enhance amenity and awareness and are supported by infrastructure such as changing rooms and floodlighting.	
Rep No. 112a		**Response:** Taking each point in turn: 1. The development will provide the necessary transport infrastructure as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. 2. Flood risk will need to be addressed in detail and planning permission will not be granted until measures are secured. 3. Warfield is a desirable place to live which why it attracted many people when Quelm Park was built in the 1990's. 4. A new healthspace will be built in Bracknell and a new cancer unit has already been built. 5. The development will provide 2 new primary schools and contributions towards secondary and special needs education. 6. There is a pressing need for housing and the Council are taking a long term approach to housebuilding in line with Government policy. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Object to 2,200 dwellings because: 1. The infrastructure cannot cope with the increase in houses/cars. 2. Binfield already suffers from flooding and the stream near the 3 Legged Cross has flooded many times. The development will cause more problems. 3. Quelm Park residents have only one way out. We came here to escape from inner cities. 4. Heatherwood Hospital has been downsized so we have to travel far so the proposal will impact more of poor services. 5. The impact on schools will be detrimental and Garth Hill will be come overcrowded. 6. Why build in the current economic climate have you not learnt from Jealotts Hill?	
Rep No. 112a		**Response:** There is a pressing need for housing and the Council are taking a long term approach to housebuilding in line with Government policy. The housing will be built for existing and new residents
1.15	Why do we need the houses, and who are they for when:	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	• What will they add to an already depleted town centre? • An industrial location with very few businesses. • Infrastructure which at times can't cope. • Schools are already crowded. • Doctor's surgeries. • How are you going to solve the probability of flooding? • The hospitals. • Travel by public transport. Why does it have to be so densely populated in already crowded areas? Who is driving this through: • Government • Prospective Builders • The Council • Another?	in the borough and it is intended for it to be built by 2026. The development is included in the Council's Core Strategy DPD which is consistent with Government policy and the needs of development. The development will provide necessary infrastructure, facilities and services as detailed in the Warfield SPD including school, transport related and health facilities. A new healthspace will be built in Bracknell and a new cancer unit has already been built. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 115a		**Response**: This is a comment on the SADPD. However, taking each point in turn: • The site was identified in the Core Strategy DPD (Feb 2008) where the issue regarding the loss of green land was examined. • The effect on house prices is not a material consideration in determining planning applications. • The development will be built in phases. • The Council is spreading development around mainly in Bracknell, Crowthorne, Binfield and Warfield. • The Government has made it clear that the Council should continue to make plans for growth and therefore does not advocate pausing the planted process. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Objection to the principle of development in SADPD Policy SA9 because of: • The loss of green land; • The negative effect on local house prices; • The development turning north Bracknell into a 10-12 years building site further affecting house prices. It is unfair for Warfield to take the majority of development and it should be spread thinly across the Borough to spread the negative effect of existing areas. Until national and regional Government strategies become clearer it appears foolhardy to formulate any development plans.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 120a		**Response:** With the high amount of housing required in the plan period between 2006 and 2026 the 10,780 dwellings have/will be shared around the Borough as follows: - Bracknell Town Centre - 1000 - Bracknell large sites - 2100 - Crowthorne - 1500 - Warfield SPD site - 2,200 - Binfield - 1525 Other sites in the Borough - 2455 Please note this is approximate and reflects the Council's position up to the SADPD Draft Submission version. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Binfield and Warfield seem to be taking the bulk of new development.	
Rep No. 122		**Response:** There is no planning rationale to scrap the planning of 2,200 homes at Warfield. The location has been established in the Core Strategy DPD which forms part of the Council's development plan and is of prime consideration in the determination of planning applications. Failure to properly plan for the development will result in the development being considered by planning application only without any guidance to inform the process. This would result in planning the site by the appeal process which without proper supporting guidance would undermine the council's negotiating position for what and how the development will compromise and look like. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Suggest that the planning of 2,200 homes is scrapped.	
Rep No. 125a		**Response:** The Council's preferred strategy for development as specified in the Core Strategy DPD (February

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
1.15	Green field land should not be released until it is clear that urban and brown land won't provide the capacity for housing need. Why change the landscape when reinvestment and regeneration is much more suitable. The proposed area contains old hedgerows, mature field boundary trees, copses, varied wildlife habitat. The countryside is part of the character of existing communities and people choose to live here for peace and contact with the natural; environment. Britain must not lose rural communities by blurring the boundaries of towns and villages.	2008)comprises both brownfield (e.g. Bracknell town centre, Staff College and Crowthorne Business Estate) and greenfield (e.g. Warfield and Jennetts Park). This issue was examined during the production of the Core Strategy DPD where it was conclude that the Council's strategy including development at Warfield was sound in all ways. When allocating new sites, the Council must follow the locational principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. The development will need to assess a, protect and provide new open space, wildlife and biodiversity elements as detailed in Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 131a, 133a		**Response:** The reason why Binfield and Crowthorne were the focus for specific consultation events was that SADPD preferred 4 new locations for development (2 in Binfield and 2 in Crowthorne). The site at Warfield has already been identified in the Council's Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 which was finalised in February 2008. During the production of the Core Strategy the Council undertook similar consultation events including specifically for Warfield. Further events have also been undertaken on the Detailed Concept Plan in November 2011. See section 3 for responses. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Why have residents not been given the opportunity to attend consultation events on the Site Allocations DPD proposals?	
Rep No. 131a, 137a, 138a		**Response:** This was a comment aimed specifically at the local politicians. However the volume and concentration of development can have both positive and negative concerns such as providing a critical amount to support infrastructure provision (positive) and the development of green field land (negative). However,
1.15	Do you have concerns over the volume and concentration of development?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		all issues have been considered throughout the process including weighing up social, environmental and economic matters in an on-going Sustainability Appraisal. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 132a		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary facilities, services, infrastructure including new and retained open space as detailed throughout the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	This is supposed to be open space and the area cannot bear 5,500 extra people. It is a ridiculous increase and appears to not to have been considered.	
Rep No. 132a		**Response:** The Council have and will continue to ensure that the development is as sustainable as possible. For example, it is producing a sustainability appraisal along side the Warfield SPD which evaluates the environmental, social and economic pros and cons of the development. Furthermore, there is a need to provide housing, open space, infrastructure and facilities and the Council is trying to do this through a proper plan-led process. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	The people of Warfield won't sit back and let our community be sucked up by greedy developers who have no consideration of the environment or community matters	
Rep No. 147a		**Response:** The Council is considering all developments together including that in Wokingham as part of the SADPD process. The Council is and will continue to consider the sustainable implications of all development following due processes. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Combined with Binfield 5,500 houses is an unsustainable amount within one mile of the centre of Binfield.	
Rep No. 174a		**Response:** The site has already been identified as a major location for growth in the Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 and therefore the principle of development at the location is established. The formal
1.15	I was not aware the the site has not yet been approved what is the programme to approve plans	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		allocation of the site will be completed through the Site Allocations DPD. Finally, detailed guidance to support planning applications will be provided in the the Warfield SPD. The SPD is published with this statement and the SADPD is to be adopted in 2013. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 203a		**Response:** The secondary school will serve a wider area than Warfield. Binfield is a suitable and deliverable location in planning and education service terms. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	Policy SA9 should be reconsidered to include a secondary and special needs school in Warfield where they are needed	
Rep No. 225		**Response:** Following further consideration and consultation on the Detailed Concept Plan in November 2011, it is considered that it is appropriate to provide housing on the southerns and eastern slopes provided it is designed and built in a sensitive manner to the landscape. The Council is not convinced that the development should wrap around Cabbage Hill on the western lower slopes. There are a few existing dwellings but this by no means dictates the character of Cabbage Hill on this side. Development on the westerns side would be fragmented from the overall development on the site and could potentially compromise the gap between Binfield and Warfield. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.15	*(comments made against paragraph 1.22 by mistake)* Policy SA9 says Cabbage Hill will be open space/SANGS and kept free from development. This is inconsistent with the Draft Landscape Principles Document and comments by officers at the Developers Workshop, which clearly acknowledge the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill as being potentially suitable for development whilst the upper slopes should remain open and continue as a foreground or setting. This appraisal does not distinguish between the lower slopes on the western and eastern sides. The lower slopes on the western side specifically fronting Binfield Road is suitable for development because it is characterised by existing development including dwellings and relates closely to Binfield Road. It has a much weaker visual and functional relationship with the main parts of Cabbage Hill. Given the existence and proximity of residential properties, curtilages, and Binfield Road, it is not appropriate to allocate this as POS or SANGS. Development would not	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	have a harmful affect on the woodland character Cabbage Hill or key long distance views. This should not affect the overall balance between developable areas and the available SANGS mitigation.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The development will be considered and balanced against all development plan policies such as Saved Local Plan policies and Core Strategy DPD policies. However, it should be noted that the Core Strategy DPD policies are considered to have more weight. Proposals will also be considered against any other relevant material considerations such as the final Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.17	We welcome that development will be considered against Saved Local Plan Policies, especially EN10 and EN14	
Rep No. 54		**Response**: It is agreed that it should be amended to reflect the current status of the RSS. The opportunity to comment on overall housing numbers is in the SADPD or subsequent DPD's. The Council has agreed that a sustainable development for 2,200 dwellings should be provided in Warfield in the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 1.26 (now 1.19) to read as: *The Government ~~has revoked~~* **has set a mechanism to revoke** *Regional Spatial Strategies. Please refer to the Site Allocations DPD ~~Preferred Option~~* **Draft Submission** *Background Paper for clarification of the Council's position* **on** *~~following~~ the* **proposed** *revocation of the South East Plan and with it the housing target for the Borough.*
1.19	*BFC: The comment in the representation was made against paragraph 1.26 but which should have been 1.19.* The SPD refers to the Regional Spatial Strategy as being revoked which is incorrect. The South East Plan still has Development Plan status. The SEP requires provision for 12,780 dwellings rather than the 10,780 in the Core Strategy. The Council cannot assume that the RSS will be abolished. PPS3 advises that LPA's take an evidence based approach and recent evidence in the 2008 based household projections support 12,000 dwellings which is 1220 dwellings more that the Council's figures. There is a need to plan for additional housing. This may involve new sites as well as consideration to whether additional housing can be accommodated in Warfield. Given the scale of development it is premature to move forward with the SPD until the overall	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	baseline housing requirement is settled unless it is decided that there would be in further development at Warfield even if numbers were increased. If additional land is required for housing the western side of Cabbage Hill should be considered.	
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		
1.26	Amend paragraph 1.26 to reflect that fact that of the re-introduction of the South East Plan. However, this decision should have minimal impact on the Warfield SPD because it pre-dates the additional housing requirement in the South East Plan.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This representation is made on the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft but relates to the SADPD. It is therefore considered under SADPD Policy SA9. **Action:** Consider in SADPD Policy SA9
1.22	Policy SA9 should be amended to include the appropriate provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) to ensure that the impact of this allocation does not increase the flood risk from surface water flooding both on site and downstream of the site.	
Rep No. 123		**Response:** Taking each objection in turn: i. The development will result in the loss of countryside/green fields but there is a need to balance the needs of growth with the need to protect the countryside. The justification for developing a sustainable community in this location was established in the Core Strategy DPD which was finalised in February 2008. ii. The Core Strategy preparation included extensive, consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination by an independent inspector. The land was therefore designated as a major location of growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. The Council is formally allocating the sites in the Site Allocations DPD which is again subject
1.22	I object to 2,200 houses on Green Field Land because: i. Loss of amenity countryside ii. Lack of consultation iii. Too high intensity of housing for the land available iv Existing tax paying Quelm Park residents will have to live next to a building site for 10 years.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		to consultation, evidence, appraisal and an examination. Further detail on the site is being provided in the Warfield SPD which is subject of consultation, evidence and appraisal. iii. The densities across the site will respond to the character of each area to be developed. The development is committed to provided 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. A lower housing density across the site would mean more land taken to meet the housing numbers, hence more loss of countryside or requiring more sites elsewhere. There is a need to balance land take and densities to ensure sustainable communities are built. However, the Council has reviewed the Concept Plan and associated densities across the site in the Warfield SPD. iv There will be an extensive building programme which was the case when Quelm Park was built. The development will be required to minimise disturbance during construction phases as required by Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 140, 140a		**Response:** The level of development is considered to be right for the area. The Council has undertaken detailed capacity work in promoting the site in the Core Strategy DPD. Further work has supported the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. More work has been undertaken to support the final version of the Warfield SPD following further targeted consultation in November 2011. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.22	The number of proposed houses is too high, as Warfield has currently approx 7000 homes therefore increasing by 31% is too high. The area will lose the reason why people move to Warfield especially as the town centre will never be developed (promises never kept / realised).	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 140		**Response:** The Council is planning the whole network in a comprehensive manner taking account of all development in the borough and in Wokingham in detail. Other developments elsewhere will also be accounted for. This work will be presented in detailed modelling. The measures associated with the Warfield SPD will also contribute to the bugger and long term picture. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.22	Surrounding infrastructure will not be able to keep up with demand. We are on the crossroads of 3 major motorways M25 / M4 and M3 and influenced by the the M40.	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** Following further analysis, it is agreed that the Council considers development on the southern part of Cabbage Hill. Therefore, the Council has assessed the visual and landscape impacts of such development including on the eastern slopes such as the views to and from the hill as detailed in Landscape Paper WL26.Furthermore, part of Cabbage Hill will be provided as publicly accessible open space. However, there is a need to also make development viable and therefore a need to incentivise the landowner. This will be achieved through allowing development on the less sensitive parts of Cabbage Hill (i.e. the southern and eastern slopes). Changes should be made to the SPD accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Amend paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) to read as ~~*The west of the site will be influenced by the slopes of Cabbage Hill.*~~ **It will be acceptable to built on some parts of the southern and eastern lower slopes of Cabbage Hill, however it is not envisaged that the western slopes of Cabbage Hill will be developed.***The higher parts***of**
1.23 and 4.17	WL16 Consortium Draft Landscape Principle background document and paragraph 4.17 state that development should front onto Harvest Ride where possible. The area marked B in WL17 would have least impact on the landscape character but is should be extended as far as possible to the Binfield Road roundabout. The Area marked A should not be developed as it would be intrusive to residents in West End Lane and destroy views from Avery Lane, Qulem Park, Larks Hill.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Cabbage Hill~~*which*~~ *should be kept free of development to maintain important views towards Bracknell town centre*. **Any development on the lower southern side of Cabbage Hill should be designed to ensure that it does not dominate the horizon, so that long views to Cabbage Hill from Bracknell are not harmed. It may be necessary to provide planted screening to deliver this aim. Additionally,** ~~T~~**t***he lowerlevel development area***s** *on the***southern and***eastern side***s** *of Cabbage Hill should deliver a built form which should follow the contours of the land.* **Cutting** *into the hillsideto extend the footprint of the developable land will be resisted as this will create an unnatural land form on the hillside, difficult slopes within gardens and awkward changes of level. Key views through this part of the development towards the hill should be provided from:* • *The Cut to Cabbage Hill.* • *Lark's Hill.* • ~~*Local*~~ *Neighbourhood Centre to Cabbage Hill.*
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The Council is including as much information as is available at the time it publishes the Warfield SPD. The infrastructure requirements have also been considered through viability testing. **Action:** A revised version of the infrastructure schedule is included in the Warfield SPD.
1.23	Detail on infrastructure costs is missing, including this will allow effective viability testing. Detail on Utilities and capacities is missing and a plan showing their location should be included.	
Rep No. 84		**Response:** The Core Strategy DPD February 2008 establishes that 2200 dwellings will be provided. The issues of traffic, wildlife impact and existing villages have been consider including mitigation, measures and alternative provision in the chapters of the Warfield SPD.
1.23	2,200 houses in Warfield will completely destroy the character of the village and identity making it a suburb of Bracknell. Why does Warfield have to take such a large development? What about the huge increase in traffic and the impact on	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	wildlife, particularly, deer? Please reconsider the size of development to save the village and it's green boundaries between it and Bracknell.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 125		**Response:** The environmental report is a process called the Sustainability Appraisal which runs in parallel and is iterative to the production of the Warfield SPD. In respect to the Sustainability Appraisal: The Scoping Report is under reference WL1; and, a Draft Sustainbility Appraisal Report WL3. A final version of the report will also be published with the final Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.25	Where can I access the environmental report?	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council currently lacks a five year supply of deliverable sites against both the South East Plan and the Council's adopted Core Strategy. The Council is therefore prioritising the progressing the SADPD in order to release further land for housing development and establish a robust supply of land for housing. This includes the identification of a range of size of sites, both within and outside defined settlements. Smaller sites, that are not as dependent on the provision of large scale infrastructure (particularly those within defined settlements), will be capable of contributing to the land supply in the shorter term. In spite of the downturn in the housing market, there is evidence that there is growing interest from the development industry in progressing some of the smaller sites, including those that are currently in employment use. The Council is also engaging with the landowners/developers of the two major locations of growth that were agreed in principle through the Core Strategy in order to facilitate the implementation of these developments. Such actions accord with the Written
1.26	At the time of writing the RSS has not been revoked. The key issue remains that BFBC do not have a current 5 years housing land supply. Paragraph 1.26 should be expanded to clarify that, irrespective of the position of the RSS, the key issue is that BFBC does not have a 5yr HLS, based on the Council's agreed position set out in the relevant section of the Background Paper.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23rd March 2011) issued by Greg Clark. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The development will provide appropriate SANGs and contributions in line with current policy. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
1.27	The text refers to mitigating the impact of the SPA. Given that SANGs are being provided the term "*mitigate"* should be replaced with **avoid** throughout in this context.	

2 Responses to ' The Warfield SPD Site area and Context'

Table 2

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 58		**Response:** During the production of the Core Strategy DPD, part of its evidence base which the Inspector considered during the examination was the Major Locations For Growth Background Paper (October 2006) which, on pages 33-35, gave details of an indicative masterplan which included potential development in the vicinity of West End Lane. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.1	The extent of the proposed area to the west around Cabbage Hill and West End Lane were not on the original plan and should not be included in the area without further consultation with residents.	
Rep No. 11a		**Responses:** There will be the loss of countryside character of the area will change. The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection the countryside. The land was identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy document which was finalised in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council is producing the Warfield SPD which will provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.1	Development will have a huge effect on the local character, including the loss of some beautiful landscape and young and old trees.	
Rep No. 227		**Response:** This comment is not relevant to the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.1	Politicians should live in the area rather than living tucked away in development free areas.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 227		**Response:** The majority of Cabbage Hill will remain with a large part made publicly accessible as a country park. The woods, (Long Copse) will remain. Therefore, the hill can remain and act as a buffer/separation between settlements. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.2	Cabbage Hill should not be built on as it a beautiful area with woods (with deer), and is an important local amenity. This area should be a green buffer between settlements and a visual gap in the endless dreariness of boxy houses to be in the locality.	
Rep No. 194a		**Responses:** There will be the loss of countryside character of the area will change. The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection the countryside. The land was identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy document which was finalised in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council is producing the Warfield SPD which will provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.5	Disagree with the need to use green field land. People travel to Larks Hill and then walk in the countryside which will all be lost.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council has undertaken further consultation on a Detailed Concept Plan which included a key point relating to the development fronting the County Lane Roundabout. Therefor, this is agreed and the Concept Plan has been revised in the final version of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and include text from the Detailed Concept Plan consultation document in the Warfield SPD.
2.7	Give more emphasise to this relationship (between the site and Whitegrove Neighbourhood Centre) both in the text and on the Concept Plan.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** This site will be expected to come forward in a co-ordinated manner with other neighbouring sites so as the principle of comprehensive development is delivered. This site must demonstrate that it can deliver for example, an appropriate amount of dwellings; part of the Bullbrook River Park and potentially part of the East to West Greenway. The owners/developers have been encouraged to discuss bring the site forward with the other sites in the vicinity. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.6	Maple Green is a sustainable location because it is close to existing retail, community, medical, transport, education, sport/recreation and employment facilities. Most trees would be retained and extensive perimeter treescape will reduce the impact of the development. No ecological survey has been undertaken but bats may forage under the trees. The eastern part of the site is floodplain and an assessment will determine its extent. Land could be retained as SANG and public open space.	
Rep No. 15		**Response**: Taking each point in turn: • The Council has also reviewed key views to and from the Cabbage Hill and has concluded that the west side of Cabbage Hill has important views; the east side has views from Larks Hill to West End lane which can be protected by locating the east to west greenway; that the lower slopes on the southern edge could accommodate development; and that some development behind Wrest End lane can be accommodated. • It is agreed that new access point/s along this stretch of read will slow traffic speeds down. This could be through roundabout, junction, calming and/or crossing points. Development along Harvest Ride at this point will also contribute towards road safety. The results of the speed survey are welcomed and have been passed to transport engineers for consideration. Additional text should be provided in the SPD for clarification. • It is not agreed that the access should form part of a western spur
2.8	WPC Council has undertaken its own assessment of Cabbage Hill from existing accesses. The resulting plan will follow shortly where the more intensely coloured the areas, the more visible from different locations. These should be used to inform SANG and OSPV to maximise retention of the rural look and feel. Traffic between Quelm Park Roundabout and Frampton's Bridge Roundabout exceeds the speed limit. The results of WPC's speed survey are shown in Appendix B. Speeding needs to be controlled and could be influenced by the construction of a new roundabout to the west of The Cut bridge, which would provide access to the southern end of West End and the A3095 spur. The pedestrian bridge across The Cut can link pedestrian and cycles to Quelm Park, Quelm Lane and Garth Hill College. To achieve this, a central island is required to cross Harvest Ride at Totale Rise. The existing ghost junction, should be protected by traffic islands.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	We have seen plans to open up Garth Pond and provide a single central island on Harvest Ride. This should be constructed from the outset with a view to future capacity/safety needs.	to the A3095 because it would not provide a satisfactory alternative to the preferred location of the link road in that it would not be as attractive to motorists than the existing route through Warfield Street. However, flexibility in providing the link road should be included in the SPD to enable an alternative to the preferred route should a technical solution be found elsewhere. Additional text should be provided in the SPD for clarification. • It is agreed that the development should connect to the existing cycle network and bridge crossing The Cut can achieve this. The SPD already has text to achieve this in Development Principle W13. • The traffic island is provided outside of the Warfield SPD as part of ongoing measures related to improving existing SANGs. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9.16 (now 9.17) to read as *The development will includes the construction of a new ~~spine~~* **link** *road between the Quelm Park Roundabout and the Three Legged Cross junction* **as shown on the Concept Plan (although this the Concept Plan is flexible to allow for necessary deviations of the route subject to should specific site conditions).**Amend the first bullet point of Development Principle W15 to read as *A new ~~spine~~* **link** *road constructed between the Quelm Park Roundabout and The Three Legged Cross Junction* **unless an acceptable alternative is agreed with the Council**. Add a new bullet point to Development Principle W15 to read as **Appropriate traffic calming measures to reads within and near to the site.**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The designation will not be reviewed formally through the SPD process because the SPD does not form part of the development plan and the exact detail of where development will actually go will not be fixed in the SPD. The SPD will be material in assessing where the development will go and this will be taken account of when the actual designation is reviewed formally through a DPD. It is clear that this designation will have less weight in the determination of planning applications than Core Strategy Policy CS5 which will be supplemented by the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.8	The existing Local Plan designation of the Area of Local Landscape Importance should be reviewed through the SPD and the followed by the requisite amendment through the SADPD.	
Rep No. 141a		**Response:** It is unfortunate in some ways that areas have to change. However the need for growth must be balanced against the need to protect areas. The Council has considered this and many other issues in originally identifying the land in the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.8	I moved to Warfield because of the open space, quiet lanes and footpaths. This is sad that I may now have to move.	
Rep No. 222		**Response:** It is unfortunate that some countryside will be lost to the new community. However there will be positive benefits also as a result of this development such as opening up large parts of Cabbage Hill for recreation including walking. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.8	Although not an area for walking on Cabbage Hill and that side of the Warfield development certainly do add to the greenbelt. As these points highlight it is a good Landscape and transforming it just means the spread of the town continues. This is all very well if you want concrete but not great if you want wildlife, history trees and places.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is largely agreed although it may be necessary that in some parts a footpath deviates within the 8 metres. Furthermore some existing gardens are immediately adjacent to the
2.9	Recreational benefits needs to be in balance with the biodiversity value and flood risk. It will be important that a buffer	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	zones of 8 meters is maintained along the whole length of the Cut and the Bull Brook. The buffer zone needs to be 8 metres wide measured from bank top (where the bank meets normal levels) for the whole extent of the site. This should be without structures, hard standing, footpaths, fences, overhanging development, gardens or formal landscaping. The buffer zone should be designed and left as a natural area for wildlife with native specie planting. If the area is developed too much in to a formal river park with uniform grass banks then the biodiversity value will be lost.	rivers and therefore they will stay as such. Additional the should be added to the SPD. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.26 (now 4.39) which reads as **To allow for biodiversity to thrive, an 8 metre buffer zone should be created on both sides of the rivers, where appropriate, and managed as natural areas. These areas should be kept free from structures, hard standing, footpaths, fences, overhanging development, gardens or formal landscaping (although there may be some parts where footpaths deviate into the buffer for short sections).**
Rep No. 84		**Response:** There is an opportunity to create public access to this feature and in doing so there is a need to allow some development on the hill to ensure that it is feasible and viable. Landscape work analysing keys views and other matters shows that a level of development can be accommodated on Cabbage Hill as shown on the revised Concept Plan. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.9	All of Cabbage Hill should be protected, not just the upper slopes. The whole hill, on both sides should be free from development encroachment.	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** Jennetts Park is a planned development from which developers have not swerved their responsibilities. Developers are providing all the facilities that were originally required in the legal agreement attached to planning permission such as a school and country park. The confusion many people have had is that the timings for infrastructure and facilities is timed to the completion levels of housing development and not a fixed date. When the downturn in the housing market occurred the pace of development slowed which meant that the trigger points consequently took longer to reach, hence later provision in
2.11	How are you going to ensure we do not end up with another Jennetts Park wasteland? Developers must not swerve their responsibilities,which must be clearly stated.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		time but fully in accordance with the legal agreement. The facilities and provision from the Warfield SPD will be agreed at reasonable timings related to the development by negotiation. The Council will seek to build in contingency arrangements where possible. The Warfield SPD throughout makes it clear what facilities are required, this is consolidated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The infrastructure, services and facilities will be based upon the reasonable need from the development taking account of viability. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.11	Bloor wish to be assured as to the justification for the various facilities sought can be incorporated into a tariff as outlined in earlier comments	
Rep No. 47		
2.11	Some or all of these additional facilities will likely have a negative value. If all are entirely or mainly funded from developer s106 contributions, BS urge the Council to recognise and acknowledge this when negotiating the appropriate s106 package.	
Rep No. 226		**Response:** The development will provide new homes, a new neighbourhood centre , transport improvements and other facilities. It will also provide an increase on the amount of publicly accessible open space that exists including the retention of some key open space features. All of which are detailed in the final Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
2.11	The addition of 2000 houses will do nothing to enhance the area - there are currently sufficient facilities but a limited road network. Removing this amount of currently open space is disastrous.	

3 Responses to ' Development Principles'

Table 3

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The infrastructure requirements have been considered further and will be revised in the Infrastructure Development Plan associated with the SPD. Some elements will be through financial contributions and others through land and associated works. Therefore a single tariff is not appropriate in this circumstance. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
3.1	In principle this is acceptable (planned infrastructure and facilities) subject to the incorporation in the SPD of a tariff as briefly outlined in earlier comments	
Rep No. 34		
3.2	Bloor consider this is acceptable subject to the incorporation of a tariff as briefly outlined in earlier comments.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** The requirements that the natural environment to be protected and enhanced as part of the development and that flood risk is taken account of is already a requirement throughout the SPD. However, for clarification, an additional objective should be added which takes account of the natural environment, flood risk and recreation should be provided. **Action:** Amend paragraph 3.2 by adding a new bullet point which reads as: **To provide an enhanced natural and recreational environment which minimises flood risk.**
3.2	Welcome the inclusion of a water efficiency objective and request a further objective which ensures the natural environment is maintained and flood risk is taken account of because of the two watercourses in the site.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** The overall SPD does make provision for avoiding and mitigating the impact on the SPA. However, it is agreed that this should be included in paragraph 3.2. **Action:** add an additional bullet point to paragraph 3.2 which reads as: **To avoid and mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.**
3.2	The objectives should include reference to mitigating and avoiding the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 223		**Response:** This is not the case because the Warfield SPD, read as a whole, will create a distinct community which is also well connected to existing communities. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
3.2	Does this mean that any development will in fact form part of the Bracknell urban area and be indistinguishable from the rest of the town. This can make it difficult for an area to have an individual identity.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** This is agreed because it may be that more than one application comes forward and therefore changes should be made. **Action:** Amend paragraph 3.5 to read as *The Concept Plan and the Development Principles are based on the delivery of the site in a comprehensive manner in order that appropriate and timely delivery of infrastructure can take place and that the objectives set out above can be achieved.* **The parcels of housing can contain appropriate additional uses provided this does not detract from the objective of delivering comprehensive development including the overriding need to deliver 2,200 new dwellings on the site** *~~Any~~* **All** *planning application* **s will** *~~need~~* **be required** *to demonstrate that ~~it is~~* **they are** *consistent with the principles of comprehensive development* **by demonstrating how applications would complement and not compromise the comprehensive development of Warfield. Developers will be expected to have regard to Chapter 11 and Appendix 3 in preparing applications.**
3.5	BS support comprehensive site delivery but in an incremental manner. The final sentence of paragraph 3.5 should be amended to read **All planning applications will need to demonstrate that they are consistent with the principles of comprehensive development.**	
Rep No. 55		**Response:** The area must be developed in a comprehensive manner. A more Detailed Concept Plan has been produced following further consultation (see section 3 for responses) which forms part of the finalised SPD. This is
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the main development such as Manor Farm. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	needed to establish a design framework in which individual sites can then come forward and will give developers needed guidance as to what is considered acceptable in certain parts of the site. The Council promotes comprehensive development and therefore development should come forward in line with the identified blocks and in line Chapter 11 of the Warfield SPD **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and Appendix 3
Rep No. 56		
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan. The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the main development such as Newell Green Farm and Sumanga Farm. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	
Rep No. 57		
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan. The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the main development such as Grove Gardens. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	
Rep No. 47		
3.7	The Delivery Sequence Plan (Appendix 3) should be revisited following the preparation of the more detailed Concept Plan advocated by BS. The Delivery Sequence Plan should ensure that the phasing of development is achievable having regard to land ownership and a viable level of development to deliver infrastructure required in that phase. To deliver key infrastructure, including the link road, at an early stage, BS consider their land should be in the first phase.	
Rep No. 48, 52		
3.7	Amend to include the eastern end of the site in the first or second phase of development. The document (para.4.22) acknowledges that the eastern end would be served by the exiting centre which makes it logical to begin development in this location.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is a matter for consideration in the SADPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW1	Suggest the wording of the third paragraph should also be located in Policy SA9 of the SADPD.	
Rep No. 55, 56, 57		**Response:** Support is noted
3.1 to 3.8	General agreement of the Development Principles	
Rep No. 33		
DPW1	The principle of comprehensive development is agreed as essential, this would also avoid the occurrence of ransom strips.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 43, 44		
DPW1	This principle is supported.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council has considered the site in more detail and consider it be a sound planning rationale to bring blocks of development forward. Consequential changes to the text in the SPD are also made including Appendix 3. The document is an SPD (guidance) not a DPD (policy) but it is agreed better clarification of the word support is needed in DPW1 **Action:** Amend the first sentence of development Principle W1 to read as *The Council will expect planning applications to support the comprehensive development of Warfield including accessibility and the delivery of infrastructure***<u>having regard to Appendix 3 and Chapter 11</u>.** Amend Appendix 3.
DPW1	Bloor comments that the wording does not **require** one single outline planning permission but for applications (plural) to **support** comprehensive development. No change may be necessary provided that the finalised SPD fully incorporates the changes required to address the earlier comments.	
Rep No. 47		
DPW1	Agree with the multiple application approach and support the delivery of a comprehensive development. A more detailed Concept Plan is needed to provide a robust planning framework.	
Rep No. 49		
DPW1	To accord with PPS12 the DPD must be flexible in meeting the objectives of the Core Strategy. Whilst the general presumption of 2,200 dwellings is supported the policy must be flexible in allowing the wider objectives of the masterplan to be delivered. DPW1 should be amended to acknowledge in some circumstances that individual sites could come forward where they adjoin the urban area and conform to the SPD masterplan. The word "support" may not be explicit enough in this respect.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** It is clear the the main driver of the comprehensive development is housing. Whilst Core Strategy Policy CS5 supports mix use development, its supporting text makes it clear that, for example, that employment development is likely to be small-scale. Further clarification has already been made to
DPW1	A mixed use scheme is supported . Planning of the mix of uses is not the role for the SPD, however the SPD can support other issues within residential areas. Amend DPW1 to read as "*The Council will expect* **<u>a mix of</u>** *planning applications ~~to support the comprehensive development of Warfield~~*	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	~~*including accessibility and the delivery of infrastructure*~~ **which together follow the general guidance in this SPD. The provision of related roads and infrastructure will be tied to the main development sites by way of planning agreements.** The Council will ~~*expect*~~ **seek** partnership working between ~~*relevant*~~ **key** *interested parties including landowner, developers and infrastructure providers.* *Development proposals will be expected to reflect the Development Principles set out in this SPD."*	DPW1 as a result of comments (see above) and therefore, the suggested changes are necessary. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 213a		**Response:** The Warfield SPD forms part of the Council's strategy for development over a loner term. Developers will not plan to build housing that will not sell and they have not indicated that we should stop planning for growth. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW1	The proposal should not be being pushed through in this time of economic downturn. There are no jobs for people and it is difficult to get a mortgagee meaning homes will be left empty.	

4 Responses to ' Design and Strategy and Urban Design'

Table 4

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Support/comments are noted.
4.1 to 4.12	The Urban Design Principles are generally supported but they need to be tested through masterplanning work.	
Rep No. 55		
4.1 to 4.36	General agreement of the Design Strategy and Urban Design Principles	
Rep Nos. 56, 57		**Response:** The area must be developed in a comprehensive manner. A more Detailed Concept Plan has been produced and forms part of the final SPD. This is needed to establish a design framework in which individual sites can then come forward and will give developers needed guidance as to what is considered acceptable in certain parts of the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.1 to 4.36	General agreement of the Design Strategy and Urban Design Principles. It is considered that appropriate detail about de sign can be provided with a detailed planning application.	
Rep No. 165a		**Response:** Family homes are land hungry, providing 3 storey accommodation can reduce the amount of land needed to build new homes. However, Jennett's Park provides primarily 2 and 2.5 storey homes. Additionally the development has sold well in a tough economic climate. All new developments are designed to meet 'Secure by Design' principles, aimed to reduce the occurrence of crime. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.1	If the build is like Jennetts Park then it is going to be derogatory to the town with its ugly 3-storey buildings. The development will also bring crime.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 221		**Response:** This disagreed because many of the existing centres in the Bracknell area are successful in that they are well occupied and a focus for activity. Many are characterised by low crime and whilst there can be improvements, many have held up well to the test of time and the current economic slowdown. There will be a mix and range of people living near to the centre so there is no evidence to say this will create problems. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
4.1	This model of building a neighbourhood centre has not had great success in the Bracknell ares as many of these retails areas are struggling to be successful and meet the need of the community, having high rates of petty crime and theft and feel unsafe and unfriendly. The potential for creating a similar problem area is high.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The development will be expected to follow current design guidance such as the Designing for Accessibility Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), The Streetscene SPD, The Parking Standards SPD, the Character Areas Assessments SPD and other relevant documents. The Concept Plan is indicative **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.1	Will the council ensure that a variety of housing styles are used to make sure that the streetscape is the best possible? The use of so many straight roads in the proposed plan one hopes is only indicative.	
Rep No. 24a		**Response:** The SPD and local and national planning policy details the importance of character and context issues. However, it is important that developers are steered away from pastiche architectural styles and instead focusing on design quality, representative of this decade, that responds to the character and context of the area. The development will be high quality in design terms and will respect where relevant existing character and include a range of distinctive styles in line with the design principles in the Warfield SPD.
4.2	Modern, contemporary architectural style with sympathetic edging will be truly awful as it is a page form the developers handbook parachuted into a rural community.	
Rep No. 40		
4.2	The design should be in keeping with the surrounding villages. Another Jennetts Park is not acceptable.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The site sits between Newell Green/Warfield Street character areas and a 1990s housing development. A design response from developers to local local distinctiveness, innovation and originality would be positively welcomed. However, pastiche design is not acceptable. The text in the paragraph should be amended. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.2 to read as: *All development on the site should define and create a distinctive sense of place and character. ~~A modern, contemporary architectural style should be developed within the site~~* **High quality designs that promote and reinforce local distinctiveness and relate to their specific individual location within the site will be required. Pastiche designs will not be acceptable**. *Sensitive treatment ~~may~~***will***be required at the edges of the site where new development abuts existing areas of character, or where development affects the setting of a listed building.*
4.2	PPS1 promotes high quality and inclusive design. Local Authorities are urged to promote design policies which promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. PPS1 states that: "*Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. Local Authorities should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to confirm to certain development forms or styles."* The requirement to deliver a modern, architectural style is too prescriptive and unsubstantiated. The WSPD should comply with national policy. The requirement for a modern contemporary architectural style does not comply. BS recommend s amending the second sentence of paragraph 4.2 to read as: **High quality and inclusive design which promotes or reinforces local distinctiveness should be developed within the site.**	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** One of the aims of the development is to create a sustainable community. This will include a neighbourhood centre with shops, a school and a community centre near to the existing facilities such as Brownlow Hall. The design of the development will ensure it is distinctive in accordance with the design principles of the SPD.
4.2	Almost all of the recent developments in Bracknell (Whitegrove, Quelm Park, Carnation Drive, Blue Mountain) have no distinctive character. The all lack a centre or village like layout. I am not convinced that this will be any different.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 223		**Response:** Currently Cabbage Hill is not fully accessible to anyone other than the land owners except for visual amenity. The development will enable a large proportion of the hill to come forward as accessible open space thereby providing the opportunity for creating a fantastic recreational asset for the area. To do this however the landowner must be able to receive an incentive in some way or form. This is through provide development on the less intrusive elements of the hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.3	It is important that cabbage hill is retained as open space accessible to all.	
Rep No. 8		**Response:** This comment is noted. However, given the scale of development, it is not considered that this is an appropriate site for the suggested radical approach. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.4	We should be moving/building underground single storey thereby avoiding using habitat and not reducing the land mass any further. Sunlight could be directed into living areas and solar power should be used with the garden above. A radical approach is required.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** It is the Council's aim to protect sensitive roads in the area and due to the nature of Warfield Road and Park Road, with regards to extent of adoptable highway, we are very limited in what we can do. Most of the work is centred around junction improvements within and near to the site. These with other measures associated with the development and other schemes will determine how the road operates. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.5	What improvements will be made to the road network around the development, e.g. Warfield Road and Park Road to Bracknell?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The development will include a mix of uses including residential, schools, shops, community and other uses. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.8	The development should include a mix of uses and not end up with just a residential estate.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** This comment is accepted with some adjustments and for clarification amendments should be made. **Action:** ~~*The development should be outward facing to the surrounding areas.*~~ **The development shall be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built environments. New development should create active streetscenes, including main routes such as Harvest Ride. In some locations there is a specific need to identify the direction in which the built form should face; this is detailed on the Concept Plan as "frontage". The Concept Plan also makes reference to "key frontage". This is considered a prominent location where a specific design response is required, such as a building that turns a corner or has a clear role within the streetscene.** *Within the site the layout should look to create a built form, or in some circumstances structural landscaping, that creates an appropriate sense of enclosure to* **the** *public* **realm**. *Opportunities should be sought to create attractive, visual and physical links from key points in the development to the areas of open space within and beyond the site.*
4.9	BS accepts that an attractive visual appearance when viewed from the perimeter road network will be a legitimate expectation. The phrase “outward facing” is vague and unclear. BS recommends using the wording in PPS1, paragraph 35. Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9 to read as: **The development shall be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built environments.**	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Core Strategy policies CS10 and 12 are flexible to respond to site conditions. However to make it clear in this case the wording can be changed accordingly. **Action:** Amend the third sentence of paragraph 4.10 (now renumbered as 4.11) to read as: *Buildings should be designed ~~so as~~ to meet with current best practice in reducing carbon dioxide emissions* **having regard to the need to respond to site conditions** *and providing a percentage on site renewable generation and providing a percentage* **of** *on-site renewable energy generation. Guidance on current best practice can be found in the Sustainable Resource Management Supplementary Planning Document (October 2008), which is available online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/srm.*
4.10	The reference to contemporary architecture should be deleted and replaced with. **The development shall be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built environments.** BS supports the objective to deliver best practice design but that the WSPD is flexible to respond to constraints and opportunities. Amend the third sentence of paragraph 4.10 to read as: *"Buildings should be designed so as to meet the current best practice in reducing carbon dioxide emissions* **having regard to the need to respond to site conditions** *and providing a percentage on site renewable generation".*	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is agreed that there should be further clarification of what contemporary architecture means. Therefore, text should be amended in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.2 in line with the action in the response to Rep 47 made on paragraph 4.2 above. Amend the first sentence in paragraph 4.10 to read as **All new buildings** ~~Building design~~should be **of a high standard and quality of design, both internally and externally,** ~~.reflective of contemporary architecture~~and respond to the location and building function within the streetscene. High quality building materials should be used throughout the development. **The Concept Plan highlights a**
4.10	There is no explanation of what contemporary architecture means. The SPD should clarify whether the. If the former then the SPD should provide justification. new development should be modern or traditional.	
Rep No. 60		
4.10	Although there may be a role for contemporary architecture it may not be appropriate in all areas of the development e.g. adjoining existing residential areas.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		number of locations where there are "landmark opportunities". These are sites within the development where it is considered the buildings should be of a greater scale or be visually prominent, acting as a marker at a junction or corner, helping people to find their way around the site and creating distinctive and memorable places and streets. The locations identified will need careful design and should continue to relate to the surrounding area and context of the site.
Rep No. 223		**Response:** This is agreed and the development will have to take account of the Council's Parking Standards SPD as required by Development Principle W14 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.11	A key factor would be to provide sufficient residential parking to ensure that streets are not cluttered with cars.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The Council has prepared a more detailed Concept Plan which forms part of the adopted Warfield SPD. This gives further design guidance. However, any Design and Access Statement for parcels of land coming forward as a full planning application, or a reserved matters application, should include a design rationale to inform the detailed design process. Textual changes have been made throughout the SPD to reflect the new Concept Plan. Masterplanning will remain as an important part of bring the site forward. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.13 (now renumbered as 4.14) to read as *A detailed masterplan***(s)** *should*
4.13	A single application will not be prepared. Amend Paragraph 4.13 to read as **A detailed Masterplan should be produced for consideration of planning applications for the site.**	
Rep No. 47		
4.13	The comprehensive development should be permitted through separate planning applications consistent with the more detailed Concept Plan. Detailed masterplans will be produced to accompany planning applications. The first sentence of paragraph 4.13 should be deleted and replaced with: **Planning applications should adhere to the Figure 3 Concept Plan.**	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	To avoid delay the WSPD should contain the appropriate design rationale detail, the second sentence of paragraph 4.13 should be deleted.	*be produced to accompany ~~an outline~~ application**s** for the site. ~~This should be accompanied by a design rationale for the proposed layout, detailed context analysis and identify and characterise in detail the areas within the site.~~* **Seven character areas are identified within this SPD. The first application to be made within a character area should include a Design and Access Statement for the whole character area it covers. This statement should detail how the application meets the Design Principles set out in this section and a comprehensive assessment of the character area.** *~~Design and Access Statement must be produced and submitted for approval, for each character area, indicating how the proposed development meets the design principles set out in this section.~~*
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		
4.13	The requirement of a detailed masterplan will cause delay in bringing development forward unless the SPD makes provision for sites to come forward without impacting on the main development area.	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is agreed that as long as the proposal meets with the required construction methodology (e.g. current best practise Code for Sustainable Homes), then the planning process does not require construction methodology for the purpose of climate change adaptation. Therefore, the text should be amended as suggested. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.14 (now renumbered as 4.15) to read as *Development proposals will need to show ~~construction methods,~~ a robust approach to energy and water efficiency and other mechanisms towards mitigating and adapting to climate change.*
4.14	The SPD states that development proposals need to show construction methods. Amend paragraph 4.14 to read as "*Development proposals will need to show ~~construction methods,~~ a robust approach to energy and water efficiency....*"	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 13		**Response:** The uses specified in paragraph 4.15 of the SPD Consultation Draft need to be clarified. There is no current demand for a doctors from the health providers. However, there should be revisions to the SPD to specify the potential shops and facilities and include a dentists. The development will provide additional housing near to the exhausting centre and provide a new neighbourhood centre in the centre of the development which will aim to provide a community hub for local activity as required in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the 3rd sentence of paragraph 4.15 (now renumbered as 4.16) to read as: *Typical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5* **such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a dental surgery.**
4.15	Is the Neighbourhood Centre going to include a Doctors/dentists surgery? Will it provide smaller shops (such as newsagent's, hairdresser, take away, charity shop, coffee shop (or maybe a small craft village with coffee facilities).	
Rep No. 155		
4.22	The centre is not the hub of the community in the sense of a meeting place with pleasant views and small places to have coffee, view artwork, etc. Adding more housing will only heighten the sense of blandness. The current residents deserve real development of the diverse and vibrant centre without their quality of life being affected through the loss of open spaces.	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** The centre will be a neighbourhood centre and text will be amended as necessary throughout the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Change the text to replace all references to local centre with neighbourhood centre.
4.15	A new centre is supported but there is confusion with the retail hierarchy. PPS6 does regards small parades of shops as centres. If defined as a neighbourhood centre it would not be afforded protection in terms of its vitality and viability if defined as a local centre it would have protection. The SPD should clarify whether the centre is to be a local centre or a neighbourhood centre. The list of uses expected should include B1, D1 and D2 uses.	
Rep No. 139a		**Response:** The town centre redevelopment remains the priority for Bracknell Forest Council and significant steps are underway to deliver the regeneration. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.15	Bracknell seems to endlessly build new housing but there have been few steps taken to improving local shops and services. What plans are these and when will it be completed	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 11		**Response:** The aim is to change the current nature of Harvest Ride and driving experience by designing in features to slow traffic. Visual cues such as increased pedestrian and cycle movement along the road should inform and reduce driver speeds and give an increased sense that the area is more residential than is currently the case. This is a sound and proven urban design principle that should change the current experiences of residents along Harvest Ride. Other measure such a crossing and calming will also be required where necessary. The development will deliver a package of measure which will ensure the development mitigates any congestion it causes. There should be amendments to the text in respect to slowing Harvest Ride in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Amend the first 2 sentences of paragraph 4.17 (now 4.18) to read as *Harvest Ride currently performs a dual role as a strategic route and a* **n access** *road* **for** ~~which accesses~~ many homes in the area. And *Additional visual cues should be used to give the impression of a* ~~*more*~~ *residential road. The current speed limit along Harvest Ride is 40 mph, however*, **some** *traffic* **at times** *is* **considered to be travelling** *faster along this route* ~~*in places*~~*.*
4.17	Harvest Ride is already an extremely busy and fast road. 2,200 dwellings with 4,400 cars is simply not sustainable. Buses and pedestrian and cycleways will not decrease traffic flows.	
Rep No. 33		**Response:** In principle a junction along Harvest Ride can be an effective measure to slowing the road. However, it will need to be demonstrated that a new junction close to the Quelm Park roundabout will be acceptable in terms of highway, safety and other grounds.
4.17	Access directly off Harvest Ride will act as a calming measure to Harvest Ride. Harvest Ride should be subject to further study to reduce traffic speeds by the use of additional junctions	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 33		**Response:** Noted.
4.17 and 4.18	The site has potential for frontage to Harvest Ride and the north-south link road in accordance with the declared aims of the SPD.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Noted. Further detailed consideration has been given to the design strategy including additional consultation on a Detailed Concept Plan. This has resulted in changes through Chapter 4 and the Concept Plan. **Action:** See amended Chapter 4 and Concept Plan.
4.17	BS support this principle. The WSPD should include the design measures to provide robust framework against which applications can be prepared and determined.	
Rep No. 122		**Response:** The aim is to change the current nature of Harvest Ride and driving experience by designing in features to slow traffic. Visual cues such as increased pedestrian and cycle movement along the road should inform and reduce driver speeds and give an increased sense that the area is more residential than is currently the case. This is a sound and proven urban design principle that should change the current experiences of residents along Harvest Ride. Increased travel trips in the area will inevitably lead to an increase in noise levels but this should be counterbalanced by new development and landscaping absorbing much of the increasing noise levels. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.17	Idea is completely flawed, Harvest Ride (HR) is a main vehicular access road. Building additional homes and orientating them to face HR will not make a friendlier pass through, the area will just become noisier and more congested.	
Rep No. 132a,		**Response:** Roads such as Harvest Ride will feature additional junctions and formal safe crossing points to

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.17	The traffic to Tesco is already at its peak and we cannot imagine living here with double the traffic. Cars go much faster than the 40mph speed limit which makes the road very dangerous	help the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. This will bring the actual speed of the road down to its official speed limit and act as traffic calming features. Furthermore, where appropriate, designing development closer to the road will be which is effective in making drivers consider their speed. A requirement to slow Harvest Ride is specified in Paragraphs 4.18 and 9.19) of the Warfield SPD. Other requirements in the SPD will contribute to safety on other roads within or near to the site. The Council has assessed the impact of all developments including those in Wokingham Borough. This includes assessing improvements to the network such as junctions and roads and also modes such as buses, walking and cycling in Warfield. The aim of these improvements, which will be funded by the developer, is to limit the impact on the network and demonstrate that it does not worsen the situation. The development will be required to implement all necessary works in accordance with Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 155		**Response:** Harvest Ride will remain as an important route for vehicular, pedestrian and cycle movements. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.17	Harvest Ride needs to stay as a main access route as most residents are unable to travel to work by foot/bike due to distance, family size, physical restraints and the weather. A teacher who needs to take her children to school as well as two or more bags of marking, would be severely affected.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		**Response:** Elements of Harvest Ride will be redesigned to accommodate the increase in traffic

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.17	Object because of the increased fatality risk for residents crossing Harvest Ride because of increased traffic and existing high speeds	movements in the areas and reduce speeds along this road. New north/south pedestrian and cycle crossing points will also be provided which should create a safer pedestrian and cycle environment. New junctions and other calming measures will also slow this road down to increase its safety. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 11		**Response:** The new link road will take much of the current through traffic away from existing residential areas. Traffic modelling work demonstrates capacity to accommodate the increase in trips from the new residential units, with some junction improvements in specific locations. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.18	The new link road will rip through existing rural habitat and be liable to flooding due to its proximity to The Cut. It will increase traffic levels to an unsustainable amount.	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** New development of this scale will always impact on the existing landscape and habitats in the area. However, green corridors through the development site are promoted within the WSPD and will be required. Additionally site assets, such as Avery Lane, have already been identified and retention is being considered. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 requires that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are used in new developments. These are systems designed keep water on site and mimic natural water movements. Water management will form a key part of the layout of the site. The new link road requires that the Three Legged Cross junction is redesigned.
4.18	Concern about the proposed link road: i. It cuts off Larks Hill from Cabbage Hill having an adverse effect on the area's rural nature ii. It will completely ruin the character of Larks Hill, as it will be hemmed in by three busy roads iii. Its effect on Avery Lane - what will be done to preserve the hedge for wildlife? It is not clear if road would be on Avery Lane or parallel to it. iv. This appears to be in the flood zone for The Cut. Run off from the road may exacerbate any likelihood of flooding v. What improvements will be made to the 3 Legged Cross junction.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 15		**Response:** It is not agreed that a through road on the west side of The Cut is appropriate because it is too far from the main A 3095 route to be effective in discouraging traffic through Newell Green. However, access/es from Harvest Ride to development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill is agreed. It is considered that a route through Warfield Garage would not be direct enough to effectively act as a link road. It is agreed that the existing byways should be retained as part of the green corridor links as detailed in paragraph 7.12, but which should include further text specifically naming Avery Lane. It is also agreed that the proposed location of the centre is reviewed. Following further consideration, the centre should be located near to priory field and near to Brownlow Hall, additional text should be provided in the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.21(now 4.26) to read as The ~~character of the local~~ neighbourhood centre will ~~be to~~ provide the heart of the new development and **will be** a key intersection for pedestrians, cycles and vehicles. **The neighbourhood centre should be located adjacent to Priory Field as shown on the Concept Plan and has been located here to provide links with existing facilities such as Brownlow Hall and the pubs and restaurants of Newell Green. New development in t**~~T~~his area should provide mixed use accommodation, with medium density dwellings (**approximately 40** ~~50~~ dwellings per hectare). The ~~local~~ neighbourhood
4.18	The plan does not effectively address a practical solution for significant amounts north-south traffic. We propose two alternative routes for the new A3095: 1. Suggested by West End residents and supported by WPC is the west side of The Cut, joining Harvest Ride at a new roundabout . The the new roundabout would slow down the traffic and split the traffic between the A3095 Warfield Road and B3018 Binfield Road. This should lessen the traffic at Newell Green sufficiently for a village centre. 2. Start through the Warfield Garage site, then intersecting Watersplash Lane before continuing to Quelm Park roundabout. This would allow a village centre to be constructed adjacent to it. However, siting the centre there would produce the peculiar effect of existing development on Forest Road/Warfield Street accentuating the difference rather than harmonising old and new. It means Larks Hill would be enclosed by 3 busy roads. Either option allows the existing byways to be retained as a green corridor. It is crucial that significant consideration is given to this issue. The route, density of housing and neighbourhood centre must be reviewed.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		centre should be designed around a tightly defined “market square”, providing a clear sense of arrival and central focal point of the new community. **The neighbourhood centre should demonstrate the following character principles:** • **The space will be defined by a mostly continuous frontage.** • **The Neighbourhood Centre will consist of a primary school, residential buildings and small retail facilities, with the potential and flexibility to accommodate health facilities, such as a dentist, and community uses. Buildings will therefore need to be designed to have flexibility in terms of uses.** • **The central square should provide opportunities for activities to spill out into the space from surrounding buildings.** • **The Primary School (number 1 on the Concept Plan) will provide an active frontage onto the square with the potential to incorporate community uses from separate public access points.** • **Drop off for the school, visitor parking and play facilities should be accommodated within the square.** • **Dwellings should consist of terraced town houses and flats and be more urban character in comparison to**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		other areas in the development. • **As Newell Green approaches Warfield Street to the north, the frontage should become less continuous and be fragmented to reflect the existing grain, with semi-detached and detached houses.** Amend the second bullet point in paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) to read as **Avery Lane which runs** ~~*Running*~~ *from Watersplash Lane northwards to the Three Legged Cross Junction (Warfield BW 8)* **which may include access routes across it at less sensitive parts**. **Avery Lane will remain as an informal byway leisure route. Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane.**
Rep No. 36		**Response:** This junction will be modified as part of the development as specified in paragraph 9.19 (now 9.21) of the Warfield SPD. Flooding potential will be a consideration in the process of designing the junction. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.18	Extra traffic exiting from the new road at the 3 Legged Cross will be hazardous as it is already congested and prone to flooding.	
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** It is yet to be determined what the speed of the new link road will be but its aim will be to serve as an access to development as well as relieving pressure on Newell Green. However, further amendments should be made to the SPD for clarification.
4.18 and 4.19	If the new link road has a speed of 20 mph and a local centre then it will not achieve the aim of deflecting traffic from Newell Green. Traffic will still use the existing route despite the current plans.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: Amend paragraph 4.30 (now 4.22) to read as *The new A3095 link road could provide an opportunity for a tree lined boulevard space as there are some trees with Tree Preservation Orders in the vicinity of the proposed route. Character along the A3095 link should change as densities and treatments* **vary along the route.** ~~*are influenced by development to the south, open space areas, the Local Neighbourhood Centre and the character of Newell Green to the north*~~*. The north end of this route should be a transitional area, providing a looser, less formal built form, using boundary treatments such as low, red brick walling, as seen within Newell Green.* **The proposed character principles in this chapter will shape development to the east and west of the route and will influence the design and treatment of the road further south.**
Rep No. 58		**Response:** The link road was always intended to take place as a phase to the construction of Harvest Ride. The development will provide an East to West Greenway which will route through Larks Hill and continue via a new crossing point to Cabbage Hill. Larks Hill will not be ruined as a consequence. The road will run in parallel with Avery Lane and the SPD should provide further text to clarify this. The road will be outside of the 1 in 100 year flood zone but the SPD already ensures that the road should adapt to the risk of flooding in paragraph 9.16 (now 9.17). The Three Legged Cross will be improved via a new junction of which the details are not yet finalised. It is agreed that adequate underpasses are provided
4.18	Concern over the new link road because: • It will cut Larks Hill from Cabbage Hill. • It will ruin the character of Larks Hill making it hemmed in by 3 busy roads. • It will impact on Avery Lane, it is not clear whether it will run parallel or through Avery Lane. • It appears to be in the flood zone which may cause flooding problems. What improvements are being made and who pays for improvements at the dangerous 3-legged cross junction. Any road should provide adequate underpasses for wildlife. Recommend that the link is not built.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		to allow free passage for wildlife. Further text should be made to the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add a new 3rd and 4th sentence to paragraph 9.16 (now 9.17) which reads as **The road will run adjacent with Avery Lane to ensure that Avery Lane remains intact except, where appropriate, the provision of access points across at less sensitive points. Adequate underpasses for wildlife should be provided along the road at agreed locations.**
Rep No. 84		**Response:** The new link road will distribute and balance traffic between the new link road and through Warfield Street. An improved junction at the Three Legged Cross will help to achieve this. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.18	Harvest Ride was built to divert traffic away from Warfield village during the last development 15 years ago, all will happen is that there will be increased traffic on this road. A link to the 3 Legged Cross will make it even busier and with that will affect the desirability and business of the pub.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		**Response:** The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. The development will also be required to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and provide suitable on-site renewable energy generation in compliance with the Core Strategy DPD.
4.18	Object because the new road will cause heavy pollution	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 218		**Response:** Whilst there are merits in a centre along the new link road other considerations make it difficult to achieve such as retaining Avery Lane. Further analysis and consultation has been carried out which has resulted in locating the centre east of the link road to a site adjacent to Priory Field and near to Brownlow Hall. The Warfield SPD has been updated accordingly. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.21 (now 4.26) which reads as *The ~~character of the local~~ neighbourhood centre will ~~be to~~ provide the heart of the new development and* **will be** *a key intersection for pedestrians, cycles and vehicles.* **The neighbourhood centre should be located adjacent to Priory Field as shown on the Concept Plan and has been located here to provide links with existing facilities such as Brownlow Hall and the pubs and restaurants of Newell Green. New development in t** *~~T~~his area should provide mixed use accommodation, with medium density dwellings (***approximately 40** *~~50~~ dwellings per hectare). The ~~local~~ neighbourhood centre should be designed around a tightly defined "market square", providing a clear sense of arrival and central focal point of the new community.* **The neighbourhood centre should demonstrate the following character principles:** • **The space will be defined by a mostly continuous frontage.** • **The Neighbourhood Centre will consist of a primary**
4.18	If the A3095 is re-routed along Warfield BW8 (Avery Lane) it is the wrong place for a neighbourhood centre.	
Rep No. 15		
4.21	A neighbourhood centre adjacent to the new A3095 might create a similar design to the square in Priestwood that would not work, but would be a much busier thoroughfare. The natural location would be on the east side of Newell Green, opposite The Brownlow Hall, with secondary frontage to Warfield Street. This location would not lend itself to high density housing and be better suited shops, Parish Council office, doctor and dental surgeries, augmenting the existing facility of Brownlow Hall.	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 54, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		
4.21	The neighbourhood centre should be relocated behind Warfield Garage or opposite Brownlow Hall which is quieter for local residents to use.	
Rep No. 47		
4.21	50 dph is too prescriptive pending consideration of site conditions, layout and design. Delete the phrase "*medium density dwellings (50 dwellings per hectare)*". The reference to a "market square" is both too prescriptive and lacks precision. An alternative acceptable wording would be: *"The local neighbourhood centre should be designed ~~around a tightly defined "market square",~~ to* **provide** *~~ing~~ a clear sense of arrival and central focal point of the new community ~~Buildings around the "square" should create a sense of enclosure~~ and incorporate landmark*	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	building qualities. Key vistas should run ~~from the square~~ into the development areas on both the east and west sites, ideally giving a visual link to green corridors and open spaces. Visual links should also be provided ~~from the "square"~~ to the proposed primary school."	**school, residential buildings and small retail facilities, with the potential and flexibility to accommodate health facilities, such as a dentist, and community uses. Buildings will therefore need to be designed to have flexibility in terms of uses.** • **The central square should provide opportunities for activities to spill out into the space from surrounding buildings.** • **The Primary School (number 1 on the Concept Plan) will provide an active frontage onto the square with the potential to incorporate community uses from separate public access points.** • **Drop off for the school, visitor parking and play facilities should be accommodated within the square.** • **Dwellings should consist of terraced town houses and flats and be more urban character in comparison to other areas in the development.** • **As Newell Green approaches Warfield Street to the north, the frontage should become less continuous and be fragmented to reflect the existing grain, with semi-detached and detached houses.**
Rep No. 11		**Response:** A number of measures such as physical measures, junction, crossings and design solutions will be used. The development will also need to
4.19	A 20 mph speed limit is unlikely to be adhered to unless physical measures are introduced which cause vibration and pollution issues	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		demonstrate through Environmental Impact Assessment that and pollution and noise matters are mitigated. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		**Response:** Support is noted.
4.20 to 4.32	It is appropriate to put forward Character Areas in the SPD	
Rep No. 186a		**Response:** The development will need to ensure that any heritage assets within or near the site are considered and sensitively treated. For example, the setting of listed buildings will need to be addressed in development schemes. Furthermore, the Quelm Stone and community orchard will be retained in Larks Hill. Text should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 7.2 to read as *The Warfield SPD site has high quality existing green features which enhance the character of the site such as Cabbage Hill, Larks Hill* **(including the community orchard and the Quelm Stone)**, *Priory Field*, **Garth Meadows** *and the~~Bridleway~~* **bridleways** *which will remain after the development is completed.*
4.20	The development will destroy the historical character of the area	
Rep No. 20a		**Response:** Many of the existing centres in the Bracknell area are successful in that they are well occupied and a focus for activity. Many are characterised by low crime and whilst there can be improvements, many have held up well to the test of time and the current economic slowdown. There will be a mix and range of people
4.21	A neighbourhood centre is flawed and does not work in practice.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		living near to the centre so there is no evidence to say this will create problems. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 33		**Response:** The timing of the provision of the centre is a matter for negotiation. The Council will strive to deliver the centre as early as possible in the development having regards to the economics of development and other considerations. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.21	It is doubtful that the local centre could be finalised and built 100% within phase 1 and it should itself be phased	
Rep No. 40		**Response:** The development will be a sustainable community where people want to live in. The town centre is to be regenerated as part of the Council's long term strategy for the borough in the Core Strategy DPD (Feb 2008). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.21	Where will the people shop Bracknell has failed dismally to regenerate the town centre so why would people want to live in the area. Given the houses will come the town centre cannot continually be delayed.	
Rep No. 85a, 103a		**Response:** A new supermarket has been constructed in Bracknell town Centre to add to the 2 existing supermarkets. Therefore there is not a need for a new supermarket at the site Further, the Council has not received any representations from supermarkets in this consultation or on earlier consultations relating to the Core Strategy DPD. The need for Tesco's to extend their operating hours is a separate planning matter. The Warfield SPD makes provision for localised provision of shopping.
4.21	There are no proposals for further amenity in the area such as an alternative supermarket.	
Rep No. 157a		
4.21	We do not need any more shops	
Rep Nos. 177a, 178a		
4.21	Tescos have a monopoly and its store is at capacity. New houses will only bring more Tescos/superstores which we don't want	
Rep No. 195a		
4.21	The infrastructure is most of the retail facilities in Bracknell doesn't have the ability to cope with thousands of new shoppers.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 10a		**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.22	Tescos has been expanded and is now so overcrowded I now shop elsewhere	
Rep No. 114a		
4.22	Object because Tescos is already at capacity	
Rep No. 140a		
4.22	Tescos will want to extended their opening hours which will destroy the lives of people who live in the area. We don't need anymore as we have lots including a new Waitrose which I am pleased about.	
Rep No. 144a		
4.22	There is no supermarket planned. Tescos will open longer causing traffic issues for nearby residents	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
4.22	Object because of the lack of shopping in the area	
Rep No 196a		
4.22	If Tescos does not get extended hours how can the Warfield development go ahead. The development will need to be served by its own retail units.	
Rep No. 33		**Response:** This is agreed although subject to market testing, some shopping provision in a new neighbourhood centre is likely to be required. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.22	Tescos supermarket will have a large impact on what is economically feasible in the local centre	
Rep No. 34		See response in paragraph 5.4
4.22	Please see comments on Paragraph 5.4.	
Rep No.15		**Response:** To obtain part of Cabbage Hill for public access there is a need to ensure an incentive for

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.23	Development on any part of Cabbage Hill should be resisted. It is an area of local landscape importance through Local Plan Policy EN10. Its protection is further supported by Bracknell Forest Councillors.	the landowner to do so. Landscape analysis as shown in background paper WL24 shows that some development on the eastern and southern slopes can occur without compromising the visual aspect of the hill. The Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 designation is more recent than the local plan EN10 designation and therefore carries more weight in determining planning applications affecting the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 16a, 85a, 102a, 103a, 108a, 132a,145a, 154a, 166a, 167a, 168a, 170a, 171a, 204, 217a		**Response:** The Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 designation is more recent than the local plan EN10 and EN14 designations and therefore carries more weight in determining planning applications affecting the site. Part of Cabbage Hill will be made publicly accessible as a recreational country park. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.23	Need to protect the integrity of Cabbage Hill (EN10) and river corridors (EN14)	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** Following further analysis, it is agreed that the Council considers development on the southern part of Cabbage Hill. Therefore, the Council has assessed the visual and landscape impacts of such development including on the eastern slopes such as the views to and from the hill as detailed in doc ref WL24. Furthermore, part of Cabbage Hill will be provided as publicly accessible open space. However, there is a need to also make development viable and therefore a need to incentivise the landowner. This will be achieved through allowing development on the less
4.23 and Figure 3	Cabbage Hill should be preserved and provided as open space. It has commanding views and is important in landscape terms. Development should be restricted to not going beyond West End Lane from Forest Road to West End Stables. Development should be restricted to the south of the stables following Harvest Ride in a south westerly drift.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		sensitive parts of Cabbage Hill (i.e. the southern and eastern slopes). Changes should be made to the SPD accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Amend paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) to read as ~~*The west of the site will be influenced by the slopes of Cabbage Hill.*~~ **It will be acceptable to built on some parts of the southern and eastern lower slopes of Cabbage Hill, however it is not envisaged that the western slopes of Cabbage Hill will be developed.** *The higher parts* **of Cabbage Hill** ~~*which*~~ *should be kept free of development to maintain important views towards Bracknell town centre.* **Any development on the lower southern side of Cabbage Hill should be designed to ensure that it does not dominate the horizon, so that long views to Cabbage Hill from Bracknell are not harmed. It may be necessary to provide planted screening to deliver this aim. Additionally,** ~~*T*~~*the lower level development area* **s** *on the* **southern and** *eastern side* **s** *of Cabbage Hill should deliver a built form which should follow the contours of the land.* **Cutting** *into the hillside to extend the footprint of the developable land will be resisted as this will create an unnatural land form on the hillside, difficult slopes within gardens and awkward changes of level. Key views*

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		through this part of the development towards the hill should be provided from: • *The Cut to Cabbage Hill.* • *Lark's Hill.* • *~~Local~~ Neighbourhood Centre to Cabbage Hill.*
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** Noted. The Council will endeavour to ensure that the development provides new and protects existing green features in accordance with Chapter 7 Green Infrastructure of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.23 to 4.28	We support the use of existing green features as open space and strongly urge developers to be held to this intention.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The Council has reviewed the Concept Plan and undertaken a further consultation during November 2011 (see section 3 for responses). Following consultation and analysis, the development will go beyond West End Lane to the south and continue fronting Harvest Ride in the least visually sensitive parts of the site. **Action:** The Concept Plan has been amended including text relating to it.
4.23	BS support development on the lower slopes of the eastern side of Cabbage Hill. BS is currently undertaking detailed analysis to demonstrate how development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill could take place in a manner which maintains key views of the upper slopes and Long Copse.	
Rep No. 50		
4.23 and Figure 3	The development should not extend beyond the properties in West End Lane. Development should not also extend beyond the cluster of properties off Watersplash Lane. The slopes of Cabbage Hill should be free of development between Harvest Ride and Long Copse. There are fine views of Cabbage Hill from people in Binfield, Warfield and Bracknell Town Centre.	
Rep No. 53		
4.23 and 4.24	Cabbage Hill needs to be treated sensitively. It is agreed some part of the east part can be developed on less visually sensitive parts. If additional land is needed for housing then consideration should be given to possibly developing on the western side of the hill whilst protecting the most visually sensitive parts.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 54		**Response:** Following further analysis, it is agreed that the Council considers development on the southern part of Cabbage Hill. Therefore, the Council has assessed the visual and landscape impacts of such development including on the eastern slopes such as the views to and from the hill as detailed in doc ref WL24. Furthermore, part of Cabbage Hill will be provided as publicly accessible open space. However, there is a need to also make development viable and therefore a need to provide incentives to the landowner. This will be achieved through allowing development on the less sensitive parts of Cabbage Hill (i.e. the southern and eastern slopes). Changes should be made to the SPD accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) to read as ~~*The west of the site will be influenced by the slopes of Cabbage Hill.*~~ **It will be acceptable to built on some parts of the southern and eastern lower slopes of Cabbage Hill, however it is not envisaged that the western slopes of Cabbage Hill will be developed.**
4.23 and Figure 3	Cabbage Hill should be preserved and provided as open space as a priority. It has commanding views and is important in landscape terms. Development should be restricted to not going beyond West End Lane from Forest Road to West End Stables. Development should be restricted to the south of the stables following Harvest Ride in a south westerly drift.	
Rep No. 119a		**Response:** The Council has had to balance the need for growth and protecting existing designations such as the Local Landscape Importance and River Corridor. The Core Strategy DPD polices are higher order to the saved local plan
4.23	Objection because Cabbage Hill is of Local Landscape Importance and River Corridor	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		policies. Development on part of the designations has been the intention since considering the site during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. Evidence in support of the Core Strategy DPD included the As a consequence the current Local Landscape Importance and River Corridor will be revised as a result of Policy CS5 and the Warfield SPD through a subsequent DPD process. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 141a		**Response:** The development will need to ensure that key views to, from and over Cabbage Hill are maintained. The development will provide part of Cabbage Hill as publicly accessible open space. Cabbage Hill is not nor has been marked to become a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It has been identified as open space however. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.23	The open view over Cabbage Hill will be lost forever. Access to open space and peace is a fundamental right and should be rated more highly than by the Government and Council. Cabbage Hill is to be marked for Scientific Interest so why is it being considered for development.	
Rep No. 141a		**Response:** This is disagreed because the proposal is consistent with both the Local Plan and Core Strategy policies. The BSP was superseded by the South East Plan and is not a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.23	The proposal is contrary to Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (BFBLP) Policy EN10, and polices CS8 and CS5 of the Berkshire Structure Plan (BSP).	
Rep No. 169a		**Response:** This is disagreed because Cabbage Hill is recognised as an asset which will largely be converted into a publicly accessible open space. There will be some
4.23	Cabbage Hill is an area of beauty with the council owned areas next to it. Building on it is an act of vandalism and it should be treasured not destroyed.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		development on the southern and eastern slopes which will not harm the views, to and from the hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 171a		**Response:** Development provides new SANGS. Currently Cabbage Hill is not fully accessible to anyone other than the land owners except for visual amenity. The development will enable a large proportion of the site to come forward as accessible open space thereby providing the opportunity for creating a fantastic recreational asset for the area. To do this however, the landowner must be able to receive an incentive in some way or form. This is through provide development on the less intrusive elements of the hill. Most of Cabbage Hill will remain. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.23	Cabbage Hill is supposed to be SANG but most is going to be taken.	
Rep No. 202a		**Response:** Any development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill will be required to be designed to minimise its impact and where appropriate will be screened to ensure long views to Cabbage Hill are not compromised. Additional text should be added to the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) which reads as: **Any development on the lower southern side of Cabbage Hill should be designed to ensure that it does not dominate the horizon, so that long views to Cabbage Hill from Bracknell are not harmed. It may be necessary to provide planted screening to deliver this aim.**
4.23	The level of development on the north side of Harvest Ride rises above the contour level to its south (which was upheld by a previous Inquiry in 1989). It will create a prominent northern horizon of Bracknell.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 225		**Response:** Whilst there are merits that there can be development on the southern and eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill, the Council does not agree that there should be development on the western slopes of the hill. It is the intention to provide as much as possible of the western side of Cabbage Hill as part of the SANG solution. The Council will support the land owners to bring this forward and text in the SPD will make it clear that this will be the preferred option for SANG provision. Alternatively, the land could be used to provide the passive element of Open Space of Public Value (OSPV) which could have a visual aspect until it becomes available for public access. **Action:** Add additional sentences to paragraph 7.8 which read as: **Should the land on the western slopes of Cabbage Hill be not secured as SANGS then it may be possible for this land to contribute as Passive OSPV subject to the full provision of SANGS in accordance with Development Principle W6. This passive OSPV could have a visual aspect until it becomes available for public access.**
4.23	The lower slopes on the western side of Cabbage Hill are also suitable and appropriate for some development. The Draft Landscape Principles Document notes that a visual appraisal and analysis of the topographical characteristics has identified the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill as being potentially suitable for development whilst the upper slopes should remain open and continue to act as a foreground or setting. This appraisal does not distinguish between lower slopes on the western and eastern sides. The lower slopes on the western side specifically fronting Binfield Road is suitable for development because it is characterised by existing development including dwellings and relates closely to Binfield Road. It has a much weaker visual and functional relationship with the main parts of Cabbage Hill. Given the existence and proximity of residential properties, curtilages, and Binfield Road, it is not appropriate to allocate this as POS or SANGS. Development would not have a harmful affect on the woodland character Cabbage Hill or key long distance views. This should not affect the overall balance between developable areas and the available SANGS mitigation.	
Rep No. 234		**Response:** The majority of Cabbage Hill will be kept free from development. However, there is a need to also make development viable and therefore a need to provide incentives to the landowner. This will be achieved through allowing development on the less sensitive parts of Cabbage Hill (i.e. the southern and eastern slopes). Binfield and Warfield will not merge as a result of this development.
4.23	The Cabbage Hill land to the rear of West End should be kept free of development for its natural beauty and abundant wildlife and because of the pledge made by previous councils that villages and towns would always have distinct boundaries. Development will merge Binfield with Warfield.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 3 parts i and ii		**Response:** The Council has reviewed the Concept Plan to include development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill because this is considered to be less intrusive. Further consultation has also been undertaken on a Detailed Concept Plan during November 2011 which has resulted in changes to the Concept Plan which has resulted in safeguarding West End Lane as much as possible. Consequential changes to relevant text in the SPD should also be made. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill and to not include housing to the west of the rear gardens to West End Lane between Shosanna and Pine View.
4.24	I understand some development is inevitable east of West End Lane, however the latest decision to build into Cabbage Hill seems to contradict what was decided at the full Council meetings in October 2006. We are now subject to proposals on Cabbage Hill which until now had not been planned. The densities should be revised to mitigate the need to intrude onto Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No.15		**Response:** The Council has reviewed to the views to and from Cabbage Hill and consider there are development opportunities on the eastern and southern slopes. This will also enable land to be provided on Cabbage Hill as a country park (including SANG) by providing an incentive to the land owner to bring it forward for such use. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.24	Cabbage Hill is the most prominent feature in the local landscape which also separates Binfield and Warfield. The views of Cabbage Hill that can be preserved are dictated by West End Lane and by topology. The S, SE and SW flanks leading to the copse are far more prominent than the E and NE flanks and flat summit. Views from Avery Lane is already interrupted by the existing West End development. Views from the summit over Bracknell and the S, SE and SW flanks are not interrupted. Since the development will be unable to provide additional OSPV for the existing community of Warfield, we believe there should be no development on Cabbage Hill and it should be used for SANG and OSPV.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.24	The idea of creating River Parks and SANGs that cover the Flood Zones is a good strategy towards managing flood risk and provides wildlife and amenity benefits. The intention to leave space along watercourses, de-culverting watercourses where possible and maximising the use of SUDS represents best practise.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is agreed that the existing wording needs further clarification and should therefore be amended. **Action:** Amend the 2nd sentence of paragraph 4.24 to read as *the design, scale and massing of the development to the east* **and south** *of Cabbage Hill should be carefully designed to* ~~*reduce*~~ **minimise** *its visual impact* **and ensure satisfactory assimilation into the landscape**
4.24	The term to "*reduce its visual impact"* is imprecise. Amend the 2nd sentence to read as "t*he design, scale and massing of the development to the east of cabbage Hill should be carefully designed to* ~~*reduce its visual impact*~~ **ensure satisfactory assimilation into the landscape**.	
Rep No. 84		**Response:** To ensure that a large part of Cabbage Hill is provided as a Country Park which will include enhancements to biodiversity and wildlife from the current highly intensive agricultural uses it is necessary to provide an incentive to the land owner to bring the land forward which includes developing on the less sensitive lower slopes of the hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.24	The lower slopes of Cabbage Hill should remain free from development to minimize any visual impact and to protect wildlife.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is agreed and additional text should be added to the SPD. **Action:** Add an additional sentence to paragraph 4.27 (now 4.39 in the final Warfield SPD) which reads as
4.25	For any large rivers such as The Cut and the Bullbrook a buffer zone of 8 metres should be provided. The PPS25 sequential test will be needed for any development within the flood zone.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Clear span bridges should be used to cross watercourses. If there are existing culverts then no development should be provided within 8m so that access and maintenance are easy.	**To allow for biodiversity to thrive, an 8 metre buffer zone should be created on both sides of the rivers, where appropriate, and managed as natural areas. These areas should be kept free from structures, hard standing, footpaths, fences, overhanging development, gardens or formal landscaping (although there may be some parts where footpaths deviate into the buffer for short sections).**
Rep No. 32		
4.27	*River Crossings (Paras 2.5, 4.5, 4.27, 4.28, 8.24, 9.17 etc) (Comments on consultation limehouse entered on Para 4.27 & 4.28)* All river crossings should be clear span bridges designed not to obstruct flood flows.	
Rep No. 32		
4.28	All river crossings must be by clear spanning structures with the abutments set back from the watercourse on both banks to provide a bank width of 8 metres beneath the bridge. Bridges shall be a minimum of 8 metres from the bank top of the watercourse to provide an unobstructed corridor to allow the movements of otters and other animals.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is agreed and additional text should be included in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add new sentences to paragraph 4.25 (now 4.39) which reads as **Careful consideration should be given to not lighting the river edges so that the river habitats are not harmed by light pollution.The water edges should largely be undisturbed from public activity, however, there should be some intermittent areas where the public have access to the waters edge but keeping a natural buffer on the opposite side of the watercourse.**
4.25	Careful consideration of the type of lighting along the river edge must be given because of its important habitat for aquatic insects. The river channel with its wider corridor should be considered Intrinsically Dark Areas and treated as recommended in the Institute of Lighting Engineers “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution”.	
Rep No. 32		
4.25	Agree with the provision of recreational assets alongside the river corridor and with no development and they are SANGs or Open Space in line with the PPS25 sequential approach.A balance needs to be achieved between keeping habitat and a river corridor for biodiversity, but opening it up also for recreation purposes. Include • Some constant areas of natural buffer zone and habitat on both sides of the watercourses.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	• Intermittent areas where public have access to the waters edge but keeping a natural buffer on the opposite side of the watercourse. • Locations which act as a natural focal point for people to be directed to keeping other areas undisturbed. Require a more specific principle which ties in to the requirements of the RiverPark.	
Rep No. 92a		**Response:** Development will not be built in the flood zone. The Warfield SPD in paragraphs 4.26 and 4.28 state that the flood zones of The Cut and the Bullbrook are required to be converted into accessible River Parks. The development will also need to carry out a flood risk assessment and mitigate the risk where necessary as stated in paragraph 8.20. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.25	Building near to The Cut could be a disaster as it is flood plain	
Rep No. 195a		
4.25	No building should be erected near to The Cut as it is flood plain	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
4.25	Object because there will be building on the flood plains	
Rep No. 194a		**Response:** The development will need to carry out a flood risk assessment and mitigate the risk where necessary as stated in paragraph 8.20 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.25	Concern over the development impact on the natural drainage system because The Cut floods and will get worse. The Cut supports varied wildlife and development will cause negative consequences.	
Rep No. 234		**Response:** Not all of this land is within the flood zones. Land which is will form part of the River Park as required by paragraph 4.26 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.25	Oppose to development at West End because the land fronting the brook is flood plain and unsuitable for building.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** Land which will form part of the River Park as required by paragraph 4.26 of the Warfield

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.26	The proposal disregards the natural function of The Cut as a wildlife corridor. Higher density housing here is inappropriate and detrimental	SPD will also be a key wildlife corridor. However, further clarification should be made in the SPD. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.25 (now 4.39) which reads as:**The River Parks should also be enhanced for their wildlife, biodiversity and drainage functions.** Amend the last sentence of paragraph 4.25 (now 4.39) to read as *Therefore ~~both~~* **these** *aims can be reconciled by providing two new River Parks making both rivers accessible to the residents living there.*
Rep No. 33		**Response:** Noted.
4.26	Part of the site is within the flood plain of The Cut. Concentrating development fronting Harvest Ride and the north-south link road could leave communal grounds allowing views and access to The Cut blue route. The principle of higher density housing facing the cut is agreed and should be promoted. This would enable flatted development to take advantage of the higher quality public realm created around the blue route.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is agreed that the SPD should be flexible to deliver satisfactory layout solutions in this area although it is a valid planning reason that the majority of housing fronts onto the river parks. Whilst the Council understands that the market is difficult in respect to building apartments the opportunity to provide some apartments is a desirable urban design solution. Changes should be made to the SPD to clarify this issue.
4.26	The requirement for housing to front onto the River Park is too prescriptive and denies other opportunities for layout solutions. The WSPD should be flexible by amending the second sentence to read as: *"~~Housing in this area should font onto the River Park~~* **Residential development in this area should include housing which fronts onto the River Park** *creating high quality housing and surveillance for the area."*	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Apartments in this location will not be appropriate from a landscape and marketing perspective. Delete the third sentence of paragraph 4.26.	**Action:** Amend paragraph 4.26 (now 4.40) to read as *The flood zone at either side of The Cut should form* **the western** ~~*one of the river park*~~*s. Housing in this area should front onto the River Park creating high quality housing and surveillance for the area.* **Although the majority of dwellings will be houses there is scope in part for a** ~~*A*~~ *higher density* ~~*approach*~~ **element which** *could be provided here such as* **building some** ~~*providing*~~ *apartments over looking the river*, **with***underground parking, balconies and limited private space, taking advantage of a surrounding area of high quality public realm. The aim is to ensure that The Cut River Park feels as though it is owned by all the residents living nearby.*
Rep No. 55		**Response:** This is agreed. The Warfield SPD should be amended to make it clear that the delivery of the river parks are necessary to ensure comprehensive development across the site. The Council agrees that the Concept Plan should be amended to reflect current floodzone 3. The Council further looks forward to reviewing the evidence from Peter Brett Associates and any relevant confirmation from the Environment Agency. The Council cannot consider drawing 22856/001/002 without such further information. will expect to see evidence from the Environment Agency of agreeing changes to the extent of the flood plain near Manor Farm before agreeing the extent of development in this area other than that shown on the revised Concept Plan.
4.26	The Council needs to consider a mechanism to bring forward the River Parks because a significant proportion of the land is in private ownership. Paragraph 4.26 advises that the flood zone either side of The Cut should form a river park. The Council should make it explicit that it encourages development that maximises development potential adjacent to agreed flood plain areas. In respect to Manor Farm, negotiations have taken place to establish the extent of flood plain.	
Rep No. 55		
Figure 3	Map provided recommending a revised Concept Plan in respect to Manor Farm. It is assumed that only 0.33 ha of developable land is identified on the Concept Plan is because of the extent of the flood plain. However, our consultants have established that approximately 1 ha of land falls outside of the anticipated 1 in 100 year (plus climate change) flood area. Allocating 1 ha as developable area	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	would still leave half the site for public open space as part of the Riverside Park meeting the objectives of the SPD.	**Action:** The developable area has been amended on the Concept Plan and add new paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47 which read as: **This site is located in the south west corner of the overall site and is accessed from Binfield Road. The Manor Farm area is somewhat isolated ~~where this site is isolation~~ from the main development, but must similarly contribute to the policies and design principles set out in this document.** **This area sits alongside The Cut. There is an opportunity to provide pleasant dwellings overlooking The Cut river. Additionally, the site is adjacent to Manor Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building. Any development within this area therefore should protect and enhance the setting of the listed building as far as is possible. Development in this area will also need to pay particular attention to issues of flooding and factor into any design proposals measures to limit the impact of flooding for future residents in this area. Development in the Manor Farm area should demonstrate the following character principles:** • **Informal dwellings following the topography of the landscape, should front onto The Cut river.** • **Access roads and long front gardens to provide an element of protection and separation from the flood zone where necessary.** • **Subject to agreement with the Environment Agency the**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		developable area may be increased to that shown on the Concept Plan. • **Additional open space to form OSPV/SANGS should be provided within this ~~with~~ development area. ~~facing onto it~~.** • **Access for pedestrians and cyclists to the Anneforde Place Play Area to be provided.** • **A new pedestrian bridge across the Cut to connect to a new leisure route through to Binfield Road should be provided** • **The layout, landscaping and design of this area should p~~P~~rotect the setting of the Listed Farmhouse.** • **A formal pedestrian crossing across Binfield Road should be provided.**
Rep No. 33		**Response:** Part agreed in that the Quelm Lane byway will link to both The Cut River Park and Avery Lane. The Concept Plan should be revised for clarification. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
4.27	Qulem Lane byway (Warfield BW13) should be diverted along the footpath associated with the north-south link road or along The Cut River Park	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** This is agreed and the revised Concept Plan will reflect a maximised development footprint beyond the 1 in 100 flood plain. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to provide more developable land in this area.
4.28	There is a contradiction between the existing local centre suggesting medium or high density housing and this proposal. The park to the east of the Bull Brook already provides a wildlife corridor. Therefore the higher density can be achieved on the western side of the stream without compromising it and would be consistent with the existing development.	
Rep No. 57		**Response:** In respect to Grove Gardens, it is agreed that the Concept Plan should be revised and therefore it has been revised to
4.28	The Council needs to consider a mechanism to bring forward the River Parks because a significant proportion of the land is in private	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	ownership. Paragraph 4.28 advises that the flood zone either side of The Cut should form a river park. The Council should make it explicit that it encourages development that maximises development potential adjacent to agreed flood plain areas. In respect to Grove Gardens a significant proportion of land falls outside of the flood plain. And this should be identified for housing.	reflect a greater development area whilst protecting the area from flood risk and enabling the objective of contributing to the Bull Brook River Park. The Council encourages and expects developers to work together on delivering the river park (and other elements to achieve comprehensive development). **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to provide more developable land at Grove Gardens.
Rep No. 33		**Response**: Support is noted.
4.29	The principle of promoting higher residential densities along main arteries and key nodes is supported.	
Rep No. 48, 52		
4.29	The approach of medium density housing along local strategic routes and housing front roads is supported.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** It is normal to assess and protect important trees either individual specimen or groups as appropriate. However, for clarification it is agreed that specific references should be made in the SPD. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.29 (now 4.21) which reads as: **Where existing roads are tree lined, they should be kept as far as possible to maintain the character of the area.**
4.29	It should be clarified that this comment refers to new roads within the development area; where existing roads are tree lined (as in the case of Jigs Lane North and Strawberry Hill) they should be kept to maintain the character of the area and provide a linkage with the historic landscape character.	
Rep No 122		**Response:** The development will provide safe pedestrian and cycle routes and crossing points. The development will also bring other benefits such as measures to slowing Harvest Ride as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD.
4.29	Increased pedestrian activity means more accidents and people do not want to live off a main street which is noisy and dangerous.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 8		**Response:** Abbey Place comprises new development within Newell Green. The development will be required to ensure that the character of Newell Green is maintained including the need for applications to comply with the Character Areas Assessment SPD. Text is provided in the SPD to ensure this happens. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.31	Abbey Place and Newell Green will be swallowed up.	
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** Noted.
4.31	We welcome the conclusions for the Character Areas SPD which for Area A Newell Green which recommends tree cover and hedgerows as a separation from Bracknell.	
Rep No. 56		
4.31	It is agreed that development backing onto Newell Green respects the grain and character of the existing area. However further detailed guidance is required to take account of the minimum 35 dph required. A balance is needed between the character and grain of the existing area and achieving density requirements.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** Officers including a conservation expert have visited the site in response to this representation (see WL25). It is agreed that the character and setting of The Old Farmhouse could be preserved through converting the barn as a separate dwelling subject to detail and appropriate consents. Changes should be made to the SPD for clarification. Action: Add a new paragraph 4.38 which reads as **The Old Farmhouse in West End Lane is a Grade II listed farmhouse with**
4.31	The character and setting of The Old Farmhouse on West End Lane would be preserved by the sympathetic development of the unlisted period barn and other out buildings creating an attractive enclave of character dwellings at the end of the West End cul-de-sac.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		an associated yard and barns forming 'listed' curtilage buildings.The barns already have an ancillary residential use to the listed farmhouse. Given this site's context within the overall main development, and following an initial review in terms of historic building conservation (see document WL25), it may be acceptable to separate the principal use of the Listed Farmhouse and garden from the main barn, outbuildings and yard, to create a new individual dwelling in the barn. However, this would be subject to the merits of a proposal, submitted for approval of the Local Authority. Furthermore, development should treat the setting of The Old Farmhouse sensitively and protect the original (existing) attached garden, and include a landscaped buffer to the front of The Old Farmhouse.The size of the buffer is shown indicatively in the Concept Plan
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted. Green roofs are required where appropriate in the development as specified in paragraph 7.20. **Action:** No change to the SPD required.
4.32	A green East-West link is welcome which will complement existing and new north-south links. Green Roofs should also be included especially in high density development if they front SANGs or River Parks.	
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** Noted. The Warfield SPD will be a material consideration in the determination planning applications affecting the site. Other considerations such as public rights of way and Tree Preservation Orders also protect some of the existing features.
4.32	We support the statement that hedgerows, footpaths and bridleways within the site should be maintained and strongly urge developers to be held to this intention.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 155		**Response:** The site will protect existing publicly accessible open space s and provide substantial new open spaces as detailed in Chapter 7, Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.32	A parcel of green belt being preserved does not compensate for the majority being sacrificed. The natural identity is greatly valued and will be lost forever.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The reference to Design Codes has been reviewed. The development site has been split into 7 character areas. In addition to the Design and Access Statement which will accompany the outline planning application(s), a design code for each character area will be required to be submitted to, and approved by, the Planning Authority prior to the submission of any Reserved Matters application(s) in that character area. This is to ensure that the character areas are clearly defined and a clear design approach is established for each area. All Reserved Matters applications will then be required to implement the approved Design and Access Statements and Design Codes. Text should be amended in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.34 (now renumbered as paragraph 4.49) to read as*A design code is a technical delivery document, providing illustrative design rules and requirements which provide a quality benchmark for the site.* ~~The design code should be a tool for implementing the design rationale and vision for the development. It should provide detailed design standards for future~~
4.34	A Design Code is too detailed to be a requirement at the outline application stage. The outline stage should set the broad parameters within development will take place and Design Codes drawn up.	
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		
4.34	Greater detail is needed regarding the extent of detail to be incorporated in the design code to provide clarity. There is also concern that providing a Design Code before development commences would also delay the development. Further problems are that the preparation of the masterplan has to be reached before the submission of the design code. This would prevent sites coming forward that can be developed.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		~~provision.~~*Design codes should be informed by the defined character area and should be submitted as part of the Design and Access Statement for each character area*
Rep No. 104a		**Response:** Core Strategy Policies CS10 and CS12 seek to minimise carbon emissions from new development through passive design and compliance with current Code for Sustainable Homes best practise standards. These policies also require that a percentage of the development's energy demand be offset as a result of implementing renewable energy measures. Standards and thresholds are subject to change as the Core Strategy is reviewed and is subsequently amended to taken into account any future changes in technology and reflect changes in Building Regulations. The development will need to promote alternative modes of transport as well as the car such as pedestrian, cycle and public transport. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.35	The extra traffic and buildings will adversely impact on the environment when we all need a lower carbon footprint.	
Rep No. 106a		**Response:** The development will be required to plant new trees and vegetation and to retain important individual or groups of trees. The development will also be required to ensure suitable wildlife and biodiversity habitats are created throughout the site. All this and more information about green infrastructure can be read in Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.35	Trees and wildlife will be lost and the new buildings will create more CO2 which will effect the environment.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 109a		**Response:** Developers will have to adhere to Core Strategy policies CS10 and CS12. These policies promote Sustainable Construction and require the developer to incorporate energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy generation into the design of the development. It is also a requirement of developers to meet with current best practice standards in Code for Sustainable Homes and/or BREEAM. These standards require the developer to considered the following issues from the outset thus incorporating sustainability into the design of the development: Energy and Carbon Dioxide; Water; Materials; Surface water runoff; Waste; Pollution; Health and wellbeing;Management; and Ecology. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.35	What are the provisions for sustainable energy solutions e.g. Solar, wind or grey-water?	
Rep Nos. 177a, 178a		**Response:** The Council's strategy in addressing climate change is to encourage development to reduce its overall carbon footprint. Core Strategy policies promote sustainable construction and require the developer to incorporate energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy generation into the design of the development. This will result in reducing the overall Carbon footprint of that new development. However we are working to the Government's agenda in implementing zero carbon development and therefore providing development that creates no additional burden on the environment when assessing carbon emissions.
4.35	Object because of environmental implications - the importance of what impact we can all have is being drummed into us, what are the developers and Council doing about this?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 54		**Response:** Currently Building Regulations require developments to comply with energy efficiency standards that are considered to be on a par with Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) Level 3 standards. The Sustainable Resource Management SPD supports policies CS10 and CS12 and states that development should meet with current best practice and that currently the minimum requirement is that new dwellings should meet with CfSH Level 3 as a minimum. This minimum requirement will rise to Level 4 in 2012/2013 when Building Regulation requirements increase so that they are level with CfSH Level 4. Policies CS10 and CS12 were found to be acceptable at the examination of the Core Strategy and therefore it is considered reasonable to target energy efficiency and energy demand through the planning process as long as the requirements are no greater than current Building Regulation requirements. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.36	Developers should be encouraged but not required to exceed the Code for Sustainable Homes levels required by Building Regulations. The SPD should set out minimum requirements to give certainty. The requirement to source building supplies from a sustainable supply and have the least possible energy consumption during the manufacture and delivery seems to be beyond the role of planning. This should be encouraged not a requirement.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Agreed, the WSPD does not prescribe technical solutions. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.36	BS support the principle of sustainable resource management. The WSPD should not seek to prescribe the technical solutions but which should be determined at the planning application stage.	
Rep No. 124b		**Response:** The decision to develop in the area was taken in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The process included widespread consultation and an examination in
4.37	We bought the house because of the open fields behind and now it is distressing knowing we will be overlooked.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 31		public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. Text in paragraph 4.31 (now 4.22) of the Consultation Draft SPD requires a sensitive treatment to boundaries of existing character areas such as on Forest Road. However, it is agreed that additional text should be included in the SPD to reinforce this issue. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.31 (now 4.23) to read as *Housing parcels backing onto Newell Green,* **Warfield Street,** *Strawberry Hill, West End* **Lane** *etc. will need to respect the grain and character of development of the existing area* **and ensure that existing houses are not unacceptably overlooked by new development.**
4.45 Figure 3	Concern that there appears to be a lack of buffer between the proposed housing and existing housing on Forest Road. A landscape buffer to address the visual intrusion and provide habitat is required.	
Rep Nos. 38, 39		
4.45 Figure 3	Our property currently benefits from open fields and mature trees on our boundary and we would prefer for it to remain unchanged. We would like the land behind us to provide a gap/green wedge between Newell Green/West End and Bracknell.	
No. 203a		
4.45	Gaps between existing settlements should be preserved.	
Rep No. 33		**Response:** Support is noted.
DPW2	The principles of urban design and design strategy are agreed.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** This is agreed and therefore additional flexibility in the WSPD is required and amended text is required. **Action:** Amend the first two paragraphs of Development Principle W2 to read as: **~~A~~ Planning applications will need to demonstrate that they are consistent with the principles of** **comprehensive ~~scheme of~~ development ~~should be prepared for the site~~, including the delivery of infrastructure and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area avoidance and mitigation measures.**
DPW2	DPW2 needs to be worded in order to allow flexibility and pragmatism whilst ensuring development meets overall aims and objectives	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		The Concept Plan shown in Figure 3 shall guide future planning applications for all or part of the site. A single overall detailed masterplan or set of detailed masterplans which will fit together to cover the site in a comprehensive manner should be provided which accord approximately with the areas shown in Appendix 3. ~~as part of an outline application for the whole development site in advance of any detailed planning applications being submitted.~~ Individual masterplans should accompany planning applications for the development in accordance with the Figure 3 Concept Plan unless otherwise agreed with the Council in writing. **In order to minimise the need to travel, and to provide one of the local focal points of activity within the development, a 'local neighbourhood centre' should be provided within the development.** **The design strategy and urban design principles should inform the design and layout of all development proposals coming forward for the site.** **The design and layout of the development should respond to the Character Areas as detailed at paragraphs 4.25 - 4.47.** **All development should meet the Standards of Development and Further Guidance as set out paragraphs 4.56 - 4.62.**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Noted. See responses and actions to all the other comments made by this representer throughout the document.
DPW2	Subject to comments on paragraph 4.34 this principle is supported.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is agreed that a single application is unlikely to be achieved due to fragmented ownership and market conditions. Therefore additional flexibility in the WSPD is required and amended text is required. **Action:** Amend paragraph 3.7 to read as T*he Council has developed a ~~draft~~ sequence (Appendix 3) ~~for consideration which will, if agreed,help~~ to inform more detailed phasing of the site.***<u>**This sequence indicates the approximate areas for individual detailed masterplans to be submitted with relevant planning applications.**</u> Amend the first two paragraphs of Development Principle W2 in line with the action for Rep No.34 on DPW2 above.
DPW2	BS consider that the delivery of the development through a single planning application is unworkable. BS consider that the development should be permitted to come forward through a number of discrete planning applications which accord with a more detailed Concept Plan. Amend Development Principle W2 to read as: **Development Principle W2** **~~A~~ Planning applications will need to demonstrate that they are consistent with the principles of comprehensive ~~scheme of~~ development ~~should be prepared for the site,~~ including the delivery of comprehensive infrastructure.** **~~A detailed masterplan should be provided as part of an outline application for the whole development site in advance of any detailed planning applications being submitted.~~** **<u>Planning applications for the development shall comply with the Figure 3 Concept Plan</u>.**	
Rep No. 49		**Response:** This is disagreed that DPW2 should be revised in this instance because the Council has consistently maintained that the development must be comprehensive and this was agreed by the development industry during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. It may be acceptable for some smaller sites to come forward from the remainder of the development. Such sites have been considered by officers, where it is considered
DPW2	DPW2 should be amended to recognise the role smaller applications that are in general conformity with the masterplan can play in providing housing to meet housing supply over a five year period.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		as a logical planning rationale to confirm the situations where it may be acceptable or otherwise to bring an individual site forward. Additional text has been added to the WSPD for confirmation on this issue. **Action:** Add new paragraphs 11.5 to 11.7 which read as **Site Accumulation** **The Council has assessed the individual sites comprising the development area and considers it to be sound planning to group the sites together to provide comprehensive development.The suggested blocks as shown in Appendix 3 are:** • **Central Block 1** • **Western Block 2** • **Eastern Block 3** • **Manor Farm Block 4** • **Cabbage Hill A** **Therefore, the site could be masterplanned broadly in line with these blocks as shown in Appendix 3. The Council advocates planning applications to be submitted in accordance with the masterplan areas. However, provided the masterplans are approved, there may be circumstances where some site or individual development could come forward independently because of their relationship/location to the main development and subject to the requirements of the SPD. These are:** • **Land at Watersplash Lane which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Western Block 2 development. • **Land at The Splash and West End Stables which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Cohesive groups of sites within Eastern Block 3 provided major infrastructure subject to the provision of satisfactory primary school provision being put in place.** • **Land at Manor Farm (see paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47).** **There will also be opportunities to convert some existing dwellings into additional dwellings subject to planning permission, such sites include The Old Farmhouse in West End Lane (see paragraph 4.25) and The Barn on Watersplash Lane which may be suitable to convert into two or three dwellings. The timing of development at The Barn will be dependent on whether or not the whole of the area at Watersplash Lane comes forward for redevelopment. Other plots will be considered provided they do not frustrate the Development Principles and other text in this SPD.**
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is agreed that a single application is unlikely to be achieved due to fragmented ownership and market conditions. Therefore, additional flexibility in the WSPD is required and amended text is required. Additional text to include SPA Avoidance and mitigation should be provided. It is agreed that
DPW2	The requirement for a single outline application should be changed and DPW2 amended to state that applicants should be required to demonstrate how their application would complement, and not compromise the longer term masterplanning of Warfield and the principles of the Warfield SPD once adopted.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The reference to the delivery of infrastructure should also include SPA avoidance and mitigation. The definition of Local Neighbourhood Centre needs to be reconsidered in light of PPS6.	the terminology relating to the Local Neighbourhood Centre is reconsidered in light of PPS6. **Action:** Amend the second sentence of paragraph 3.5 to read as: **The parcels of housing can contain appropriate additional uses provided this does not detract from the objective of delivering comprehensive development including the overriding need to deliver 2,200 new dwellings on the site.**Amend the first two paragraphs of Development Principle W2 in line with the action for Rep No.34 on DPW2 above. Change the text to replace all references to local centre with neighbourhood centre.
Rep No. 60		**Response:** It is agreed that a single application is unlikely to be achieved due to fragmented ownership and market conditions. Therefore, additional flexibility in the WSPD is required and amended text is required. **Action:** Amend the paragraph 3.7 in line with the action for Rep No.47 on DPW2 above. Amend the first two paragraphs of Development Principle W2 in line with the action for Rep No.34 on DPW2 above.
DPW2	The SPD should include a detailed masterplan to accelerate development and allow complimentary applications to be considered. Amend the second paragraph of DPW2 to read as **The masterplan shown in figure 3 shall guide future planning applications for all or part of the scheme.**	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** Taking each point in turn: 1. The site is big enough to accommodate 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. The density of development will vary across the site with higher
4.45	The foothills of Cabbage Hill and around West End was not shown on the original (albeit vague) plans and it is wrong to include it without further consultation. I recommend:	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	1 Lower density 2 Remove the western extent of development (West End, Cabbage Hill lower and land abutting Avery Lane) 3 Do not provide a north/south link road from Harvest Ride to 3 Legged Cross 4 Locate the neighbourhood centre opposite Brownlow Hall as this will be more centrally placed for the existing residents if suggestion 2 adopted 5 If 2 above adopted then only provide one primary school	densities for example, around the local centre and near the centre which includes Tesco's. 2. The development needs of the site means a spread of development across the site. That said, Avery Lane will be protected and development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill will enable a large area of Cabbage Hill to be opened up for publicly accessible open space. 3. The road link forms part of the Council's long term road strategy for the area. An alternative routes will need to demonstrate they can perform the role effectively in a safe effective manner which does not create traffic problems within the site of elsewhere. 4. This is agreed and the new neighbourhood centre will be located near Brownlow Hall as shown on the revised Concept Plan. 5. Two schools are required. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.21 (now renumbered as 4.26) which reads as: **The neighbourhood centre should be located adjacent to Priory Field as shown on the Concept Plan and has been located here to provide links with existing facilities such as Brownlow Hall and the pubs and restaurants of Newell Green.**
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is agreed that a more detailed plan should be provided. Further detailed work to review the Concept Plan has therefore been undertaken and a new plan is
4.45	The Concept Plan should represent a more detailed and measurable Ordnance Survey based plan. The phrase "*The plan is*	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	conceptual" does not reflect the status or importance of the Concept Plan and should be deleted. BS agrees that not all of the existing properties will necessarily be redeveloped and a more detailed Concept Plan should respond sympathetically to these properties in order to provide, where appropriate, buffering.	published in the final version of the SPD. It is agreed that the term *The plan is conceptual* should be deleted and replaced with alternative text. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan. Amend the Seconds entrance of paragraph 4.45 (now 4.60) to read as *This plan ~~is conceptual and~~* **does** *not* **mean** *all existing properties within the site area will necessarily be redeveloped.*
Rep No. 57		
4.45 Figure 3	Map provided recommending a revised Concept Plan in respect to Grove Gardens to include more developable land. The proposed amendment is based on land outside of the flood plain and reflects more clearly the design principles of the SPD.	
Rep No. 60		
4.45 Figure 3	The Concept Plan should be a more detailed Masterplan by being larger in scale following an Ordnance Survey base and detailed constraints.	
Rep No. 3 parts i and ii		**Response:** The development provides for a wide range of housing needs as demonstrated through the identification of land for comprehensive development in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council has policy provision in place for providing equine related business in the countryside. The development will retain existing bridleways throughout the development **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	I am part of a family business whose income and livelihood relies solely upon running an equine livery yard which will not survive given the development and resultant traffic congestion in the area. It will be untenable.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** Taking each answer in turn: *Local centre* - 1. It is agreed that Avery Lane should be protected and should be retained as part of the green corridor links as detailed in
4.45 Figure 3	**Overall Layout** The concept of a thriving local centre is welcomed but the proposal does not appear coherent because:	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	1. development must respect Quelm Lane and Avery Lane, as well as Tree Preservation Orders. It is impossible for new development to face the new A3095 if in a straight line to the Quelm Park Roundabout. 2. Medium density housing around the new centre will be out of place next to Larks Hill and The Cut. The local centre needs to be in a location with available land all around it. We suggest two alternative routes for the new A3095: 1. The west side of The Cut, joining Harvest Ride at a new roundabout close to the existing bridge over The Cut. 2. Through the Warfield Garage site, then intersecting Watersplash Lane at the end of Avery Lane before continuing to Quelm Park Roundabout. Either option would allow the existing byways to be respected and retained. Warfield currently has no allotments, though the Parish Council has a statutory obligation to provide them. The SPD offers the opportunity to deliver sufficient allotments for the new and existing communities. They must be within easy walking distance and discourage use of cars. They should be located in three smaller location where the topology does not lend itself well to other development.	paragraph 12, but which should include further text specifically naming Avery Lane 2. It is also agreed that the proposed location of the centre is reviewed. Following further consideration the centre should be located near to priory field and near to Brownlow Hall, additional text should be provided in the SPD to clarify this. *Alternative routes.* 1. It is not agreed that a through road on the west side of The Cut is appropriate because it is too far from the main A 3095 route to be effective in discouraging traffic through Newell Green. However, access/es from Harvest Ride to development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill is agreed. It is considered that a route through Warfield Garage would not be direct enough to effectively act as a link road. *Allotments* - It is agreed that further text on how the allotments should be provided is included. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.21 (now 4.26) which reads as: **The neighbourhood centre should be located adjacent to Priory Field as shown on the Concept Plan and has been located here to provide links with existing facilities such as Brownlow Hall and the pubs and restaurants of Newell Green.** Amend the second bullet point in paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) to read as **Avery Lane which runs** ~~*Running*~~ *from Watersplash Lane northwards to the Three Legged Cross Junction (Warfield BW 8*) **which may include access routes across it at less sensitive parts**. **Avery Lane will remain as an**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		informal byway leisure route. Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane. Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.18 (now 7.19) which reads as **They must be within easy walking distance of residential areas and discourage use of cars. They should be located on two or three smaller sites where the topology does not lend itself well to other development.**
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The Concept Plan was not detailed enough to reflect all the requirements of the Draft SPD. However, a more detailed revised Concept Plan has been provided but it should be noted that it is not intended to show all features in the development such as all trees to be retained, the location of allotments or drainage areas. These are still requirements and the text in the final version of the Warfield SPD clarifies this. The Concept Plan should be amended to provide potential locations. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan
4.45 Figure 3	Whereas section 4.32 highlights the importance of retaining existing rights of way, hedgerows and trees, the concept plan disregards them. The WPC concept plan (Appendix A), showing development, existing landscape and route for A3095 respect the character of the area and should be adopted.	
Rep Nos. 19a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a		**Response:** Taking each answer in turn: 1. and 2. These are matters for consideration in the Site Allocations DPD. However, it should be note that further capacity work indicates that the site can accommodate 2,200 dwellings. 3. It is not appropriate to development on Garth Meadows because it is convented land and an
4.45 Figure 3	West End Lane can be protected by: 1. Increasing the density and size of developments in Binfield. 2. Increasing the density and size of the Crowthorne Business Estate. 3. Moving development to Garth Meadows or the edge of Cabbage Hill fronting Harvest Ride.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	4. Increase density of housing to the east of the proposed local centre and link road. This area has been widely developed and of no landscape significance.	existing Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). Following consideration and appraisal it is agreed that some development could front Harvest Ride on the southern side of Cabbage Hill. The SPD and Concept Plan should be amended to clarify this. 4. Further capacity work in producing a revised Concept Plan has demonstrated that the site can accommodate 2,200 dwellings. From this work it is also agreed that densities should be revisited across the site to provide more clarification of the text in the WSPD. Higher densities should be provided at eastern end near to the Whitegrove Neighbourhood Centre. The SPD and Concept Plan should be amended to reflect this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Amend paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) to read as ~~*The west of the site will be influenced by the slopes of Cabbage Hill.*~~ **It will be acceptable to built on some parts of the southern and eastern lower slopes of Cabbage Hill, however it is not envisaged that the western slopes of Cabbage Hill will be developed.** *The higher parts* **of Cabbage Hill** ~~*which*~~ *should be kept free of development to maintain important views towards Bracknell town centre.* **Any development on the lower southern side of Cabbage Hill should be designed to ensure that it does not dominate the horizon, so that**

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td><u>long views to Cabbage Hill from Bracknell are not harmed. It may be necessary to provide planted screening to deliver this aim.</u> Additionally, <s>T</s>the lower level development area<u>s</u> on the<u>southern and</u>eastern side<u>s</u> of Cabbage Hill should deliver a built form which should follow the contours of the land.<u>Cutting</u> into the hillside to extend the footprint of the developable land will be resisted as this will create an unnatural land form on the hillside, difficult slopes within gardens and awkward changes of level. Key views through this part of the development towards the hill should be provided from:

• The Cut to Cabbage Hill.
• Lark's Hill.
• <s>Local</s> Neighbourhood Centre to Cabbage Hill.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep Nos. 19a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a</td><td rowspan="2">Response: Taking each point in turn:

1. The Council cannot reduce the numbers as they are stated in the Core Strategy DPD.

2. In response to discussion with local residents, the Council has revised the Concept Plan to respect the existing settlement.

3. There is scope for development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill to south west of West end Lane. The Concept Plan has been amended accordingly.

Action: Amend the Concept Plan</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.45 Figure 3</td><td>KWEGC hopes that:

1. Developing alternative sites can significantly reduce the housing numbers for West End Lane.

2. Due respect will be shown to preserving an existing settlement.

3. The important landscape features of the western edge of the proposed extension will be preserved in their entirety.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep Nos.19a, 26, 26i, 26a, 27, 27a, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224</td><td>Response: Taking each section in turn:</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.45 Figure 3	A. Please that opinion is now sought on whether to develop of the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill or not on either side of West End Lane. B. KWEGC believes that there is scope to divert some housing to other sites without losing the benefits of a concentration of development which would relieve pressure to build in and around areas of significant landscape (the Valley of The Cut, West End, Cabbage Hill and Larks Hill). We propose alternatives in our response to the SADPD. C. The best semi-natural features must be protected (i.e. the Valley of The Cut, West End, Cabbage Hill and Larks Hill). The Borough's Landscape Analysis of Gaps/Green Wedges document: 1. Recommends the area becomes a green wedge 2. refers to the importance of recreation and biodiversity. 3. States there is visual continuity of the whole area including The Cut. 4. States development would harm the character of the landscape and function of the green wedge. Development for the area and around the lower reaches of Cabbage Hill/West End and part of the Valley of The Cut will compromise West End Lane and destroy the visual continuity with The Cut and wider countryside. The plan contradicts the Council's own advice in the major Location for Growth Background Paper in that it It would also negatively affect distinct settlement patterns.	A. Noted. B. The is a matter for consideration in the SADPD. C. The Council recognises that there are no easy choices when delivering housing sites. The landscape analysis was on piece of evidence that was considered in the production of the core Strategy DPD. Other evidence such as the Major Locations for Growth Background Paper included an indicative masterplan which included development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill. The Council consider that development which is designed in a sensible manner can be provided on the lower eastern and southern slopes of Cabbage Hill. It is necessary to ensure that the settlement pattern of West End Lane is maintained and protected. Therefore, the Concept Plan should be revised and text specifically to West End Lane is required. **Action:** Add a new paragraphs 4.34 and 4.35 to read as: **There are two components to the West End area, the existing West End Lane and issues that relate to existing residents and their properties, and new development which will sit around the existing lane.** **With regard to the existing lane and the existing homes, West End Lane should remain semi-rural in its character and should therefore not be paved or lit and remain unadopted. West End Lane will still provide access to the existing properties to the north but will be stopped up to**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The fine views from Larks Hill would also be lost and the Council's Sustainability Objective 6 - To protect and enhance...The Borough's characteristics countryside and its historic environment...would be compromised. Local Councillors approved an addition to the Local Development Framework in October 2006:"*That in approving the submission Core Strategy DPD the Council recognised the burden to fall on Binfield and Warfield Parishes to help meet the Government's housing numbers and commits to protect the area, ensuring any development will be sympathetic and appropriate to its semi-rural nature, whilst enhancing existing, important local open spaces.* KWEGC hopes this will play a significant part in preserving the rural nature of The Cut bordering West End, Cabbage Hill and Larks Hill in protecting habitat areas in the Council's Biodiversity Action Plan and by retaining gaps between settlements. Propose that: 1. Increase density and size of sites in Binfield and Crowthorne (Specific comment to SADPD) 2. Increase density of housing to the east of the proposed local centre and link road. This area has been widely developed and of no landscape significance. 3. Preferably, any development should take place only at the southern end of the lane in the area of Park Farm and the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill bordering Harvest Ride.	**vehicles at a point to be agreed with the Council and will not be an access to the new development. All new development in the vicinity should respect the amenity and privacy of existing dwellings and should be designed so that existing dwellings are not unacceptably overlooked. To achieve this there should not be any development to the west of (behind) the existing properties between West End Cottage and Shoshanna. In addition, a planted wooded buffer zone of at least 20 metres in width will be provided to the east of West End Lane. There should be no vehicular access across this buffer but there should be pedestrian and cycle access at a point to be agreed ~~point~~ south of the stopped up part of West End Lane to allow access to the Cut River Park and ~~the~~ Cabbage Hill Country Park. This also provides the opportunity to retain the existing Farm Shop which runs parallel to the east side of West End Lane from its entrance on Forest Road.**
Rep No. 32		**Response**: This surface water overland flows are not established at this time and will be too detailed to include in the SPD. However, additional text should be included
4.45 Figure 3	The EA is very happy with the proposed layout in terms of flood risk. The green corridor in the east could follow the surface water overland flow route to prevent the overland flow route from being obstructed by development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The document should state at detail design stage the overland flow route should be identified and the green corridor route adjusted to cover this.	in the SPD to make it clear that it is a consideration at the detailed design stage. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.23 (now 7.24) which reads as: **The detailed overland surface water flow routes should be identified at the detailed planning stage and, as a consequence, it may be necessary to adjust green corridor routes in some parts of the site to accommodate the flow routes.**
Rep No. 25a		**Response:** The development is required to be sympathetic to the semi-rural nature of the area in general. Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD sets out how this will be achieved. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	The proposals seems to contravene the the statement made at the Council meeting in October 2006 "that there should be no new development intrusion into Cabbage Hill which has long been recognised as a area of special environmental importance".	
Rep No. 25a		**Response:** Following further consultation, the Concept Plan and accompanying text has been revised so that: 1. Development will be south of the majority of properties on West End Lane and behind the Old Farmhouse. 2. That West End Lane is closed off for vehicular through traffic. 3. The favoured option for a new primary school is the option 2 shown on the Detailed Concept Plan consultation document which is east of The Cut. 4. There will be a landscaped buffer to the front of West End Lane between the lane and the
4.45 Figure 3	Recommend that: 1. All development is kept south of West End Lane although some infilling may be appropriate. 2. West End Lane is kept as a Cul-De-Sac which would help retain its semi -rural nature. 3. The primary school is moved south of Home Farm with its main access from Harvest Ride. 4. The Local Farm Shop is retained. 5. Utilising less sensitive areas. I live in an original farm cottage dating back before 1930 which has always had open views to the countryside. It would seem out of character to surround this an the land in general with development to the front and more importantly to the rear into Cabbage Hill.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		development. It is reasonable to assume that the farm shop could be included in this buffer. 5. There will be development to the front of the properties in West End Lane but the Warfield SPD will specify that there should not be development to the rear. **Action:** Add new paragraphs in line with the action to Rep Nos.19a, 26, 26i, 26a, 27, 27a, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224 on paragraph 4.45 figure 3 above.
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** This is largely agreed and amended text will be provided which adds detail to paragraph 7.10. Furthermore, opportunity should be taken to include Strawberry Hill as part of this route thereby extending the bridleway. **Action:** Add a new paragraph 7.11 which reads as: **<u>For clarification the route should include:</u>** • **<u>Connections across the Bullbrook;</u>** • **<u>A new bridleway along Strawberry Hill;</u>** • **<u>The Hedge Lane Bridleway to Old Priory Lane;</u>** • **<u>A link across the north of Priory Field to Larks Hill and/or Watersplash Lane;</u>** • **<u>A link from the ford across the Cut following West End Lane to Park Farm;</u>** • **<u>A link across Cabbage Hill to Hazlewood Lane and access to the byways and bridleways in the north of the borough.</u>**
4.45 Figure 3 and 7.1, 7.10 and 7.12	To maximise space for housing the east to west greenway should follow existing Public Rights of Way. A new path is needed across the Bullbrook to Maize Lane and then: • Hedge Lane Bridleway to Priory Lane • Across the north of Priory Lane to Larks Hill or Watersplash Lane • From the ford across the Cut following West End Lane to Park Farm • Across Cabbage Hill to link with Hazlewood Lane and to access the byways and bridleways in the north of the borough. Leisure routes to the northern network will also need to be strengthened via Osbourne land and Gibbins Lane.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Add a new bullet point to paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) which reads as **<u>Leisure routes to the northern network which will also need to be strengthened via Osbourne Lane and Gibbins Lane</u>**.
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** The favoured route of the link road is between the three legged Cross and the Quelm Lane Roundabout. A route parallel to Avery Lane can ensure that the most direct route possible is provided. A route west of The Cut would not necessarily fulfil the function of the current A3095 and would also encourage more traffic along Forest Road. It is agreed that there should be access from Harvest Ride to the development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill. However, it is a sound planning rationale to connect the development as much as possible and therefore a vehicular bridge across the Cut will achieve this. Access should be provided from Harvest Ride also and the Concept Plan should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
4.45 Figure 3 and 9.16	The volume of traffic on the link road has been seriously under estimated. The new spine road should act as an extension to the A3095. It should be resisted to the west of The Cut leaving an adequate Green Buffer zone with the houses on West End Lane. It should join Harvest Ride approximately where Park Farm has its gates. This will: • maximise space for housing east of The Cut. • Eliminate the need for a road bridge across The Cut. • Help preserve the character of West End Lane including making it into a cul-de-sac. • Provide access to development on the southern and south eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill and east of the new road. • Provide an efficient route into Bracknell freeing Newell Green from a high volume of traffic and making the local centre greener for residents.	
Rep No. 54		
4.45 Figure 3 and 9.16	The new spine road should act as an extension to the A3095. It should be resisted to the west of The Cut leaving an adequate Green Bufferzone with the houses on West End Lane. It should join Harvest Ride approximately where Park Farm has its gates. This will: • maximise space for housing east of The Cut. • Eliminate the need for a road bridge across The Cut. • Help preserve the character of West End Lane including making it into a cul-de-sac.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	• Provide access to development on the southern and south eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill and east of the new road. • Provide an efficient route into Bracknell freeing Newell Green from a high volume of traffic and making the local centre greener for residents.	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** Following further analysis, it is agreed that the Council considers development on the southern part of Cabbage Hill. Therefore, the Council has assessed the visual and landscape impacts of such development including on the eastern slopes such as the views to and from the hill as detailed in doc ref WL24. Furthermore, part of Cabbage Hill will be provided as publicly accessible open space. However, there is a need to also make development viable and therefore a need to provide incentives to the landowner. This will be achieved through allowing development on the less sensitive parts of Cabbage Hill (i.e. the southern and eastern slopes). Changes should be made to the SPD accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Add new text a new sentence to paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) in line with the action to the relevant reps above.
4.23 and 4.45 Figure 3	Cabbage Hill should be preserved and provided as open space. It has commanding views and is important in landscape terms. Development should be restricted to not going beyond West End Lane from Forest Road to West End Stables. Development should be restricted to the south of the stables following Harvest Ride in a south westerly drift.	
Rep No. 33		**Response:** The SPD should be amended to include text relevant to the parcel at The Splash. **Action:** Add new bullet points to paragraph 4.41 which read as
4.45 Figure 3	The site is prominent to Harvest Ride and could therefore deliver higher density development which could be 3 – storeys high and act as a focal point.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The site should be allocated at 50 dph. The Concept Plan shows little potential for developable land directly north of Harvest Ride so the developable areas should be maximised as much as possible where the front Harvest Ride Some of the areas designated as housing are too narrow to be developed efficiently	• **Dwellings to front onto The Splash in the south of this area and follow the rhythm of development along this lane.** • **Within the parcel alongside The Splash, informal courtyard and mews development will be appropriate.** • **To the east of the parcel within The Splash area, development should overlook the existing footpath/cycleway, creating natural surveillance and activity.**
Rep No. 34		**Response:** This part of the site will be expected to come forward with other land adjacent as detailed in Appendix 3 of the Warfield SPD. It is a sound planning rationale to include at least one pedestrian and cycle bridge across the Bull Brook as part of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Development on Maple Green will be compatible with the Concept Plan and integrate with existing development. The site could be provided early in the development. The site could provide a green, SANGs, perimeter trees, sensible mix of housing, cycle and pedestrian links, vehicular access to Jigs Lane North and future pedestrian link northwards. It might also provide a future pedestrian and cycle bridge across the Bull Brook probably funded by later development in the wider SA9 area. The site could provide around 85 dwellings.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Development should maximise land as much as possible recognising the Development principles in the Warfield SPD. The western boundary of the site is fixed by the Concept Plan which should be adhered to unless agreed with the Council. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Paragraph 4.45 states that the purpose of the Concept Plan is to inform future proposals but it has too much low density housing which will mean capacity problems for the site. The Concept Plan provides insufficient detailed interpretation of the design principles. Further work is welcomed including fixing the western boundary of the development area which would provide a clear framework within which a comprehensive masterplan can be developed.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Taking each point in turn:

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.45 Figure 3	The Concept Plan should achieve the following objectives. 1) provide a robust framework 2) enable applications to come forward incrementally while ensuring comprehensive development 3) enable infrastructure costs to be equalised across the development area 4) remove the need to prepare a further detailed comprehensive masterplan. The Concept Plan in the WSPD is not r sufficiently detailed to achieve these objectives. The WSPD should contain a more detailed Concept Plan which is based upon an Ordnance Survey plan. BS is currently preparing a more detailed Concept Plan which will detailed concept for the development of the BS land and act as a starting point in a proposed process of joint working . <u>Cabbage Hill</u> BS supports the proposal for development to be located on this part of the site. Landscape appraisal work undertaken to date has illustrated how development can be satisfactorily assimilated on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill. BS is undertaking further detailed analysis to illustrate how residential development could be accommodated in this area. The further work will also illustrate how the design of development could respond sympathetically to existing development at West End. Development needs to be located on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill in order to secure the viable delivery of key infrastructure, such as the link road. <u>Primary School Location</u>	1. Agreed. 2. This is part agreed. It is necessary that applications covering large parts of the site come forward. If separate applications are to come forward then a joint detailed masterplan or an agreed set of masterplans covering the whole site should be produced. 3. This is agreed and Concept Plan should be revised. 4. As in 2 above. The Council welcomes joint working. It is agreed that development should be provided on the southern and eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill , where appropriate. It is agreed that the school should be provided on the eastern side of The Cut (Option 2 of the Detailed Concept Plan). **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	A more appropriate location for this school would be on the eastern side of The Cut and adjacent to the proposed link road. This would enable the school to form part of the proposed Local Neighbourhood Centre and to benefit from the potential for the shared use of facilities. This location will also reduce travel demand by facilitating shared trips and also make it more central to the proposed new residential development area.	
Rep No. 48, 52		**Response:** It is agreed that the Concept Plan should be revised in this area to reflect an opportunity to provide a higher density around the existing centre. **Action:** Revise the Concept Plan to include a higher density around the Whitegrove Centre.
4.45 Figure 3	The Concept Plan should be amended to include medium density housing in the vicinity of the Whitegrove centre	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** There is no need to review the baseline housing figures for Bracknell Forest because the Core Strategy DPD review is scheduled to begin in 2012. To review the numbers in the SADPD would delay housing and would risk being incompatible with the current Core Strategy DPD. Therefore, the site should be for 2,200 dwellings as detailed in the Core Strategy. The Council's preferred option is to include the land on the western side of Cabbage Hill as open space either as SANG or as passive open space of public value. The Council will act, if necessary, in a coordinating role to bring this land forward as a SANG or otherwise. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	There is a need to review the baseline housing requirement for Bracknell which may mean masterplanning to accommodate more development. Until it is complete it is not possible to comment conclusively on the Concept Plan. Without prejudice, the Concept Plan is generally supported for the level of development proposed although some land should be considered for employment in the local centre. Persimmons is generally supportive of development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** This is largely agreed and amended text will be provided which adds detail to paragraph 7.10.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.45 Figure 3 and 7.10 and 7.12	To maximise space for housing the east to west greenway should follow existing Public Rights of Way. A new path is needed across the Bullbrook to Maize Lane and then: • Hedge Lane Bridleway to Priory Lane • Across the north of Priory Lane to Larks Hill or Watersplash Lane • From the ford across the Cut following West End Lane to Park Farm • Across Cabbage Hill to link with Hazlewood Lane and to access the byways and bridleways in the north of the borough.	Furthermore,opportunity should be taken to include Strawberry Hill as part of this route thereby extending the bridleway. **Action:** Add new paragraphs in line with the action to Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224 on paragraph 4.45 figure 3 above.
Rep Nos. 55, 56		**Response:** The Concept Plan is high level and is not intended to represent exact housing parcels. A revised housing parcel has been developed and consulted further. **Action:** A revised Concept Plan has been included in the final Warfield SPD
4.45 Figure 3	Some parcels of land on the Concept Plan appear too small to provide effective land parcels to provide the desired housing density of 35 dph.	
Rep No. 56		**Response:** The Concept Plan shows the need for an east to west connection through the centre of the site. A revised Concept Plan shows this intention in more detail. Therefore, the main route through the centre of the site will connect Watersplash Lane at a point somewhere near the Larks Hill Community Orchard and then connect with Newell Green. Should the whole of Watersplash Lane not come forward for redevelopment then it will be necessary to stop the lane up to through traffic other than pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the junction of the new route as described above. There will be scope for some frontage housing along the northern part of the closed off part of Watersplash Lane.
4.45 Figure 3	The is concern that the Concept Plan shows a possible transport corridor which bisects the Millgate Homes landholdings linking through to Abbey Place. We object to a major road link to Abbey Place because it is inappropriate due to the restricted nature of Abbey Place. Also the relationship between this new corridor and Watersplash Lane needs to be considered because it reduces the potential housing blocks. Smaller scale transport links are acceptable e.g. for pedestrian and cycleways.	
Rep No. 78		
4.45 Figure 3	Watersplash Lane is too small to cope with additional traffic. It is enjoyed by young families, dog walkers and horse riders. The Watersplash is one of the few remaining natural spots in the area.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: A revised Concept Plan has been included in the final Warfield SPD and add new new paragraph 4.28 which reads as **The junction between Watersplash Lane and Newell Green road is unsuitable to take significant numbers of additional traffic from new development in the vicinity. Therefore, a new access road should be designed to the south of the existing housing on Watersplash Lane as detailed on the Concept Plan. The intention is to redevelop as much of the land in and around Watersplash Lane as possible. However, should some of the existing dwellings not come forward for redevelopment, it will be necessary to retain access the eastern end of Watersplash Lane for the existing dwellings as a small cul-de-sac accessing Newell Green as they do currently. A minimal number of additional new units on the north edge of the lane could front onto the lane and use this existing access. However, access would not be allowed here for the remaining development parcels which would use the new access and junction on Newell Green.**
Rep No. 63a		**Response:** The Concept Plan is not intended to include every aspect of the development. However, it is agreed that for clarification, the Concept Plan should be amended to include LWS's and buffers. Text in the Draft SPD already requires appropriate buffers and this is carried forward in the final Warfield SPD.
Figure 3	Amend Plan to protect and buffer Local Wildlife Sites	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: Amend the Concept Plan to include LWS's and indicative buffer.
Rep No. 84		**Response:** This is disagreed because much of the hill has been farmed intensively over the years which has restricted wildlife activity to a degree. By introducing development on the less sensitive parts of the hill can provide incentives the land owner to bring the land forward so that the majority can be converted to a publicly accessible open space. Enhanced landscaping works such as planting new hedgerows can ensure the hill becomes even more of a haven for wildlife. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	It is absolutely NOT appropriate to build on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill. It should be protected in it's entirety and the hill, it's outlook and wildlife should be protected.	
Rep No. 214a		**Response:** Noted.
4.45 Figure 3	I am grateful for the part of the proposal thats leaves the western facing edge of Cabbage Hill green. The views and landscape are important in maintaining a countryside feel. To have housing in this area would totally change the character from a semi-rural village into an urban housing estate.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The east to west route is a greenway; it is a pedestrians and cycle leisure route and not for traffic. In some parts there may be traffic alongside but the development will not allow a full full movement across the site for general vehicle transport. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	How will you prevent the east west cross way becoming a diversionary route for Forest Road?	
Rep No. 225		**Response:** Land on the lower southern and eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill are now included as

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.45 Figure 3	Amend the Concept Plan to show development on lower lying land on the western side of Cabbage Hill fronting Binfield Road. The Draft Landscape Principles Document and comments by officers at the Developers Workshop clearly acknowledge the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill as being potentially suitable for development whilst the upper slopes should remain open and continue as a foreground or setting. This appraisal does not distinguish between the lower slopes on the western and eastern sides. The lower slopes on the western side specifically fronting Binfield Road is suitable for development because it is characterised by existing development including dwellings and relates closely to Binfield Road. It has a much weaker visual and functional relationship with the main parts of Cabbage Hill. Given the existence and proximity of residential properties, curtilages, and Binfield Road, it is not appropriate to allocate this as POS or SANGS. Development would not have a harmful affect on the woodland character Cabbage Hill or key long distance views. This should not affect the overall balance between developable areas and the available SANGS mitigation.	developable land on the revised Concept Plan and included in the Harvest Ride and Park Edge character areas. Design responses area specified in relation to key views and the treatment of development around the edge of Long Copse in Chapter 4 of the SPD. The western slopes of Cabbage Hill are considered to relate more to Binfield village. Cabbage Hill is clearly visible along Temple Way, Forest Road and pedestrian routes in the area and creates a green conclusion to views within Binfield. At this time, this area is considered visually sensitive and important in terms of the character and setting of Binfield and is therefore being retained as OSPV/SANGS. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 230		**Response:** These are saved policy designations in the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan. The Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 is a higher order policy and twill therefore hold more weight that existing local plan policies. Therefore as a result of the development at Warfield there will be a need to make a consequential amendment to the EM10 (ii) a and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough proposals Map in due course. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Land around West End Lane, is protected by policy EN10(ii)(a) and land land west of Avery Lane, east of The Splash and land at Garth Meadows are designated under policy EN14. The Concept Plan shows development on these areas which must be retained and protected.	
Rep No. 234		**Response:** Following further analysis, it is agreed that the Council considers development on

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
4.45 Figure 3	Development on original areas on the southside of Cabbage Hill and West End and accessed from Harvest Rise seems more logical and there are other areas within Warfield where infill would be appropriate.	the southern part of Cabbage Hill. Changes should be made to the SPD accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include development and access to it from Harvest Ride on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and to clarify that some development will be acceptable east of West End Lane. Add new text a new sentence to paragraph 4.23 (now 4.31) in line with the action to the relevant reps above.
Rep No. 234		**Response:** It is agreed that West End Lane should become a cul-de-sac to preserve its identity. Therefore changes should be made to the Concept Plan and accompanying text to ensure this happens. **Action:** Add new paragraphs in line with the action to Rep Nos.19a, 26, 26i, 26a, 27, 27a, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224 on paragraph 4.45 figure 3 above.
4.45 Figure 3	West End should be protected and the original houses kept as much as possible in their present environment by making them into a cul-de-sac.	
Rep No. 140a		**Response:** The majority of Cabbage Hill will be provided as a country park for new and existing residents to enjoy. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Cabbage Hill (purple) is an area of green space protected under Policy EN10), which will be destroyed	
Rep No. 153a		
4.45 Figure 3	Can the planning ensure Cabbage Hill is saved e.g. lawned space for children, dog walkers and unmowed space for wildlife?	
Rep No 113		
4.45 Figure 3	Inappropriate to develop housing on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill (mauve areas of concept plan)	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 140a		**Response**: The development will need to demonstrate and ensure that there will be an adequate drainage system including natural drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems are provided. A detailed flood risk assessment to support planning applications is a requirement for the consideration of planning applications affecting the site. A drainage application will also need to be approved across the site **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Concerns that the first twelve sections (on concept plan) highlighted as being areas for a primary school, low and medium density housing will affect the water table.	
Rep No. 8		**Response:** The development will take account of existing wildlife areas, first by assessment then by protecting those areas in need of protected as agreed with the Council. The Council has to deliver significant development including housing. Just building smaller developments of around 20 houses only: will be land hungry; would not deliver necessary infrastructure; and, require hundreds of such sites to meet future needs. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Will the wildlife corridor rear of Abbey place remain? It needs to or it will be destroyed. We need opens spaces between smaller developments limited to around 20 properties similar to Abbey Place with no through traffic and providing wildlife corridor/habitat.	
Rep No. 154a		**Response:** Larks Hill be not be built on as detailed in 2.5, 4.23, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and Development Principle W5. of the SPD. Limited development should be provided in the purple land which has been refined in a revised Concept Plan. Development should be spread out across the site for many planning and market reasons as set out in the SPD. For example removing development from the purple land will result in unacceptably high densities elsewhere in the site i.e.
4.45 Figure 3	Larks Hill and Cabbage Hill should be protected and therefore Option 2 (not building on the mauve land) which should reduce the number of houses to be built.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		meaning more flatted development which are difficult to provide in the market and does not meet the need for more family houses. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 12		**Response:** The Council agrees that any footpaths to be provided should be safe including in highways terms. A full safety audit should be carried out before the exact position of the footpath is agreed and therefore it may be necessary to move it away from Blakes Cottage as a result. Text in the SPD should be revised to clarify this but for any access points along Forest Road. Any development north of the bridleway (Hedge Lane) will be required to be designed to be sensitive to the existing character of Warfield Street as specified in the Warfield SPD. It is understood that the covenanted land referred to is a small piece of land. If such a covenant prevents development then it will be necessary to review it. If it cannot be reviewed then the land will remain undeveloped. The Council will consider access points across the Bridleway if necessary although it may be possible to again access either site of it. **Action:** Add sentences to new paragraph 4.47 which reads as **There should be a leisure pedestrian/cycle way connection to link Gibbins Lane. This route should be beyond the woodland buffer and the boundary to Blakes Cottage to ensure the amenity of existing residents is not harmed.** Add a sentence to paragraph 7.12 which reads as **Safe**
4.45 Figure 3	A connecting path to Warfield Street next to Blakes Cottage should not be provided because it is unsafe due to the bend in the road. All the land north of the bridleway should act as a buffer the new development. However, i f not all can, then as much as possible should be provided. The land south of Nibbs Knock is covenanted and cannot be developed so it is difficult to see how land beyond the bridlepath can be accessed.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		<u>access points to Forest Road should be agreed with the Council.</u>
Rep No. 20a		**Response:** The SPD has been produced to deliver a comprehensive development which has been identified in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD. Which was adopted in February 2008. All issues such as development in the countryside were consider during the production of the Core Strategy following consultation, appraisal and examination. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	The proposal is bad urban planning and simply a sprawl. The area was meant to be an open, rural area, why has this changed?	
Rep No. 122		**Response:** The Council's strategy is to build sustainable urban extension as specified in the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The development at Warfield will provide significant green elements including wildlife corridors and areas as detailed in Chapter 7 Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	If new homes must be built please build them close to A roads and the motorway. It was my understanding that Watersplash Lane and West End Lane were reserved for wildlife.	
Rep No. 181a		**Response:** The Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5 identifies the area as a major location for growth. However, development will be required to be sensitive to existing as prescribed in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
4.45 Figure 3	Original plan to keep Warfield separate from Bracknell. Current proposals will remove the physical separation between the existing communities. Warfield will completely loose its character.	

5 Responses to 'Housing and Employment'

Table 5

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 60		**Response:** Noted. It is agreed that it may be acceptable to have other uses mixed within the site although this should not detract from overall housing needs of the development which is 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 3.5 which reads as **The parcels of housing can contain appropriate additional uses provided this does not detract from the objective of delivering comprehensive development including the overriding need to deliver 2,200 new dwellings on the site.**
5.1 to 5.12	We agree with the housing principles, however, other uses should be mixed within the housing areas.	
Rep No 204		**Response:** There is still a housing need. The government encourages planned growth and the Council are taking a long term strategy to providing for this growth as set out in the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.1	The housing numbers are out of date as they were produced before the current housing crisis. Including the impact because of job losses with many companies leaving Bracknell. The housing numbers should be reduced or the plans put on hold.	
Rep No. 215a		**Response:** There will be a mix of type and size of dwellings for all ages with appropriate facilities and infrastructure which will continue to make Warfield a desirable place to live. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.1	Object because Warfield will be turned into a “Super” estate with social problems	
Rep No. 221		**Response:** The level of affordable housing is appropriate and consistent with Council policy on this matter. There will be amenities and facilities provided as part of the development to support all housing and there are also existing facilities nearby also. It would not be appropriate to polarise affordable housing solely within the town centre. It is
5.1	I object to the high level of social housing in this development at a distance from the town centre and access to amenities. There is concern for under provision for safe and sufficient off road parking.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		sensible and sustainable in all ways to provide affordable housing across the borough including elements on large sites such as Warfield. The development will be required to make provision for on and off-street parking in accordance with guidance such as the Parking Standards SPD and the Streetscene SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The development will provide a proportion of affordable housing in line with policy and need. The need is derived from the Council existing housing register so it will be existing residents that take up the affordable properties. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.1	Affordable family accommodation is important for key workers and the development should reflect this. Does though the provision of affordable housing increase the pressure on housing by drawing people in rather than reducing demand?	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The development will be required to make provision for on and off-street parking in accordance with guidance such as the Parking Standards SPD and the Streetscene SPD. The Streetscene SPD also provides guidance to assist on raising the standards for all aspects of the public realm and streetscene. Development will be expected to respond to these documents in a positive manner. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.2	Will the design ensure that all houses have front gardens and driveways to improve the streetscape.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The character of the area will change because of the scale of the overall development. However, the SPD sets out specific guidance principles and specifies that landmark buildings should be provided. Careful design will result in such buildings integrating well within existing features. It is agreed that further clarification should be made in the SPD on landmark buildings.
5.3	A more specific definition of 'Landmark Buildings' should be provided.	
Rep No. 155		
5.3	Local features and identity will be either diminished or undermined by such buildings	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: Add a new sentence to paragraph 5.3 which reads as: **Landmark buildings will be buildings of distinctive character and form and will help to provide a point of reference within the development, emphasise the hierarchy of a space or conclude a view.** Amend the last sentence of paragraph 5.3 to read as: *They should be carefully sited to ensure they are key elements along vistas within the development* **in line with the Detailed Concept Plan.**
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The Council appreciates the efforts of the Parish Council in submitting their hard work. The proposed development in this response will not be achievable because of a number of factors such as the number of dwellings (circa 1500) would not justifiably provide the amount of open space also shown on the plan (i.e. 1500 dwellings would be required to provide around 42 hectares of OSPV/SANG) whereas the proposal shows 73 hectares. This would not pass the test of reasonableness in providing open space way in excess of the Council's standards for provision. This means that the developable area is much larger to accord with the Core Strategy. However, the densities across the site have been reviewed in a revised concept plan taking account of key views and other considerations. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
5.4	35 dwellings per hectare would be very difficult to achieve. The SPD states that new development must respect and provide balance to the existing development, which limits most of the area suited for development. A 2:1 ratio of medium density to low density housing would be needed. We have used this ratio in our concept plan (Appendix A) because it would produce an inside-out development, where the density at the periphery will be greater than that which exists. Combined with the need to protect the semi-rural appearance of the area, results in a sustainable level well below 2200 houses.	
Rep Nos. 19a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a		**Response:** There is a need to provide some development in the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill to enable a large part of the hill to become publicly accessible. The Council has reviewed the Concept Plan which includes the parts of Cabbage Hill where housing can provided. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
5.4	Housing densities should be revised to mitigate the need for intrusion into West End/ Cabbage Hill	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 19a, 46a, 54a, 66a, 70a, 71a, 72a, 73a 75a		**Response:** It is agreed that the Consultation Draft SPD was not as clear as it could be in terms of densities across the site. Additional clarification should be provided. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
5.4	It has always been understood that densities would range across the whole site. Currently a standard density is applied across the site which is only increased around the local centre. The densities should be revised to include more in the eastern side to mitigate the intrusion into Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council has carried out further work on the design principles are detailed for each character area and these should inform development proposals coming forward in the future. The Concept Plan and the proposed densities and design principles have been reassessed as part of this work. The densities stated are considered appropriate and achievable within each of the character areas and respond to national and local policies, including Core Strategy Policy CS1 which requires the efficient use of land to achieve the principle of sustainable development. Amendments should be made to the SPD and Concept Plan for clarification. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.14 to read as: *A detailed masterplan should be produced to accompany ~~an outline~~ application**s** for the site. ~~This should be accompanied by a design rationale for the proposed layout, detailed context analysis and identify and characterise in detail the areas within the site.~~* **Seven character areas are identified within this SPD. The first application to be made within a character area should include a Design and Access Statement for the whole character area it covers.This statement should detail how the application meets the Design Principles set out in this section and a comprehensive assessment of the character area.** ~~*Design and Access*~~
5.4	It is inappropriate to look for a minimum average density across the Warfield area. The densities should respond to the character of each part of the area and development. The Development Concept illustrated at our Appendix B would do just that with Maple Green. Delete from paragraph 5.4 : ~~*A minimum average housing density of 35 dwellings per hectare should be provided across the developed parts of the site. Density should be informed by the character areas as detailed at paragraphs 4.20-4.32 and the Concept Plan. Higher densities will be expected along the main arteries and around key nodes within the site, and near to the Local Neighbourhood Centres*~~ and replace with **Densities should respond to the character of each part of the area and the character of each part of the proposed development**.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		~~*Statement must be produced and submitted for approval, for each character area, indicating how the proposed development meets the design principles set out in this section.*~~
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** Whilst the Council cannot prevent applications to the contrary, the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Furthermore, the Council has also published The Character Areas Assessments Supplementary Planning Document which again is a material consideration. The Council therefore has sufficient guidance to resist poorly designed planning applications in this respect. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.4	We welcome the statement that lower density elements should be provided where housing backs onto existing settlements and strongly urge developers to be held to this intention.	
Rep No. 40		**Response:** The densities across the site will respond to the character of each area to be developed. The development is committed to provided 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. A lower housing density across the site would result in more land taken to meet the housing numbers, hence more loss of countryside or requiring more sites elsewhere. There is a need to balance land take and densities to ensure sustainable communities are built. However, the Council has reviewed the Concept Plan and associated densities across the site in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.4	35 DPH is too high it should be more like 25 dph to keep it in character with surrounding development. PPG3 allows each planning authority to determine its own density and such a high density should be resisted.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** This is disagreed because the consortium assessment is not based on all the land proposed. The Council has undertaken additional work (see document WL22) which concludes that 2,200 dwellings are achievable if the site
5.4	Currently with the various land takes and a density of 35 DPH the capacity of the site is between 1900 and 2000 dwellings. The Consortium would like to further work with the Council to refine this view.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		is planned comprehensively and includes some elements of higher densities at appropriate locations. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 47		**Response:** A more detailed Concept Plan has been provided which has been consulted upon during November 2011 and revised in the final version of the Warfield SPD. Densities will need to respond accordingly although there may be certain density variations throughout the development depending on local site conditions. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.4	A minimum average housing density should be treated flexibly to reflect site constraints and should only be fixed following the production of a detailed Concept Plan which identifies residential development areas of variable densities.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** In preparing the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document a detailed analysis of land available for development, open space requirements, character, context and density assessments have taken place and have informed the character areas and densities considered achievable and appropriate for each area. The Borough Council also has Parking Standards adopted in 2007. National policy, as well as Bracknell Forest's Core Strategy Policy CS1, requires the use of land efficiently to achieve the principle of sustainable development. This principle underlies all development proposals within the Borough. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.4	The minimum density has been removed from PPS3 allowing for lower densities. Is there a local aspiration for lower densities than 35 dph and what effect will this have on land take? Changes to PPG13 move towards additional parking to serve residential development which could also reduce average densities. This needs to be tested.	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** The densities across the site will respond to the character of each area to be developed. The development is committed to provided 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. A lower housing density across the site would mean more land taken to meet the housing numbers, hence more loss
5.4	Lower the housing density.	
Rep No. 143a, 190a		
5.4	The housing density is too high and is excessive over-development	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		of countryside or requiring more sites elsewhere. There is a need to balance land take and densities to ensure sustainable communities are built. However, the Council has reviewed the Concept Plan and associated densities across the site in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 223		**Response:** Development of the Jennett's Park site is not yet complete. However, the parcels that are complete deliver between 33 dwellings per hectare (dph) and 61 dph, with the majority of parcels delivering between 40 and 45 dph. Jennett's Park has agreed character areas which has lead to variations in character, streetscene, context and, consequently, densities across the site. The Countryside Park at Jennett's Park provides a significant public amenity for residents in addition to gardens providing private amenity. This is considered appropriate for residents. The Warfield SPD Concept Plan provides significant areas of public amenity, including Cabbage Hill, the river parks and the proposed East to West Greenway. This is in addition to the envisaged private amenity of gardens. It is also worth bearing in mind that national policy, as well as Bracknell Forest's Core Strategy Policy CS1, requires the use of land efficiently to achieve the principle of sustainable development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.4	How does 35 compare with existing developments? The densities used at Jennets park means there is very little personal space for residents in terms of gardens. This can only lead to problems in the future. By adopting a too higher density there is a danger that you will be creating the slums of tomorrow. Higher densities also increase traffic congestion and pollution and lead to a loss of quality of life in an area.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** It is agreed that adequate garden provision should be provided to allow for activities such as children's play. However there needs to be a balance with making more efficient use of land. The developers also build to the
5.5	Family housing should have adequate gardens provided rather than public amenity space. Children cannot just be taken to the park if they need to play.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		demands of the market and if there was a demand for larger gardens they would seek to react to that demand. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** There needs to be a balance between providing small and large sized homes on the site. It is not the responsibility of the SPD to solely react to current market needs only where larger family house are easier to sell. The development is longer term and therefore a more balanced and considered approach to the type of dwellings to be built is required. Therefore the approach of the SPD is correct in seeking a balance of the type and size of dwellings to be built. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.7	The approach to providing smaller homes for older people should not be approached because the SHMAA also recognises that there is not a linear relationship between household and dwelling sizes.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The level of affordable housing is appropriate and consistent with Council policy on this matter. There will be amenities and facilities provided as part of the development to support all housing and there are also existing facilities nearby also. It would not be appropriate to polarise affordable housing solely within the town centre. It is sensible and sustainable in all ways to provide affordable housing across the borough including elements on large sites such as Warfield. It is agreed that it should be distributed across the site as required in Paragraph 5.9. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.9	Providing affordable housing so far from Bracknell Town Centre needs to be considered carefully to ensure it is sustainable. Affordable family accommodation should be distributed across the whole of the new development, not in one place or type.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** There will be a range of densities across the site. Development will need to demonstrate they can meet the overall objectives of the site including the need to deliver 2,200 dwellings. Since the publication of the Consultation Draft
5.9	The key working housing element should comply with the definition in PPS3 : Housing, and Circular 05/05. It should be acknowledged that the target provision will be subject to viability testing.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The first sentence of paragraph 5.9 should be amended: *The Council policy is to target 23% affordable housing provision subject to viability testing and an element of key worker housing".*	SPD the Council has (in March 2011) clarified its revised affordable housing position. Therefore, the text in the SPD should be amended for clarification. The development will be built over a long period of time and the relevant standards could be subject to change over that time. To prescribed them in the SPD will result in the SPD being inflexible to change on this issue. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 5.9 to read as*The Council's policy is for ~~23%~~* **up to 25%***affordable housing. ~~and an element of key worker housing~~.*
Rep No. 53		
DPW3	The SPD should ,make it clear there will be areas where densities less than 35% dph will be acceptable. Paragraph 5.9 refers to a proportion of 23% affordable housing which should be repeated in DPW3. Reference should be made to clusters of affordable housing being acceptable. The term "best practice standards" is imprecise and any particular standard should be included in DPW3	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** It is agreed that the text could be clearer and it should be amended. **Action:** Amend the last sentence of Paragraph 5.9 to read as: *Affordable housing should be clustered in small groups* **of up to 25 units***throughout the development and be designed to reflect the layout and style of the private housing on the site.*
5.9	What is meant by affordable housing clusters should be clearer and be amended to read as **smaller clusters of up to 25 units.**	
Rep No. 114a		**Response**: A sustainable community needs a range of types of housing. It is not a planning consideration to stop planning a sustainable community based on house values. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
5.9	Object because low cost housing bring the value of higher value areas because of the people who move in them.	
Rep No. 117		**Response**: A sustainable community needs a range of types of housing. The level of affordable housing is appropriate

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
5.9	If a proportion of housing is social then there will be an increase in demand of services and costs which will far exceed Council Tax	and consistent with Council policy on this matter. There will be amenities and facilities provided as part of the development to support all housing and there are also existing facilities nearby also. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 213a		**Response:** The development will largely meet the needs of the housing market area Bracknell Forest fall within. There will be movements in and out as people move in or out of the area. This response in unfounded because there is no evidence that the area will not becomes "drop-off" point for troublesome tenants from elsewhere. The affordable element will meet the needs of people on the local housing register. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
5.9	Do we become a drop off point where the Council can be forced to re-house troublesome tenants form other boroughs across London?	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** It is not sustainable to polarise the affordable housing into one large area. Instead the development will include small cluster of affordable housing distributed across the development and they are required to be designed to reflect the layout and style of the private housing as specified in paragraph 5.9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
5.9	Mixing affordable and non affordable housing has got to managed sensibly and sympathetically otherwise it can lead to resentment and a breakdown of social cohesion. Would it not be best to put all the social housing in one area? Will building standards and quality be the same?	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The Lifetime Homes Standard sets out a number of design principles considered to be implicit in good housing. These principles relate to providing homes that meet the needs of a wider range of households, though perhaps not aimed at single occupancy homes. However, a Lifetime Home will better meet the requirements of families with young children and push chairs as well as people as they get older and
5.11	How can a house be ok for a single person who then gets married and has two children? Is the plan to make all the houses the maximum size one would require in ones lifetime?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		people with some disabilities. The additional functionality and accessibility that these houses provide is also helpful to everyone in ordinary daily life, for example when carrying large and bulky items, moving furniture and accommodating guests such as older relatives with limited mobility. Some of the principles of the Standard can be incorporated into smaller houses for single people and will ensure the houses can accommodate adaptation should it be needed in the future. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Support is noted.
5.12	Subject to the alternative delivery mechanism it is credible to forecast housing delivery commencing in 2012/13. BS are committed to the submission of a planning application in 2011/12 in order to deliver both the necessary infrastructure and housing completions in 2012/13.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** If the market cannot sell the dwellings in that it is not commercially profitable then the developers will likely slow down the rate of build of wait until it is appropriate to build. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
5.12	What happens if the market does not want any new houses i.e. they don't sell or it is not commercially profitable? Will the scheme only be started if there is a minimum development guarantee?	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** It is agreed that the term "innovative" could be misleading and it is therefore being deleted and the text is being amended as stated in the action below. National policy, as well as Bracknell Forest's Core Strategy policy CS1, requires land is used efficiently to achieve the principle of sustainable development. This principle underlies all development proposals within the
DPW3	Bloor are concerned at the requirement for “innovative designs” and minimum average density. The appropriate designs are those which are of high quality, meet peoples’ needs, and respond to market demand. These need not necessarily be “innovative”. It is inappropriate to look for a minimum density across the site. Density should respond to the character of each part of the area and development. Amend DP3 to read as *The*	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Council will seek high quality ~~and innovative~~ designs for housing development. ~~A minimum average density of 35 dwellings per hectare across the site will be sought~~. **Densities should respond to the character of each part of the area and the character of each part of the proposed development**. *The housing mix should broadly follow the recommendations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Report (2010) as detailed at paragraphs 5.7 and 5.10, or any superseding evidence base. A proportion of affordable housing should be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted policy.* **Affordable** *housing should be located throughout the development and be integrated seamlessly to the same design standards as the rest of the development. Housing proposals will meet current best practise standards, for example, Building for Life Standards, the relevant code for Sustainable Homes Level and Lifetime Homes*	Borough and setting a minimum average density across the whole development site is therefore considered appropriate. Chapter 4 of the SPD separates the site into 7 character areas. Each character area is defined and design principles stated which will guide achievable densities appropriate to the character of that area. It is not considered necessary to duplicate information within DP3. The suggested inclusion of the word "affordable" is already quoted in the text. **Action**: Amend the 1st sentence of Development Principle W3 to read as: *The Council will ~~seek~~* **require***high quality ~~and innovative~~ designs, that promote and reinforce local distinctiveness and relate to their specific individual locations for all housing development.*
Rep No. 60		**Response:** It is not necessary to include this text in Development Principle W3 because DPW3 already refers to the Council's policy on affordable housing. Paragraph 5.9 already prescribes that the provision should be in small groups up to 25 dwellings. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
DPW3	Registered Social Landlords do not want affordable housing units spread throughout development. Instead, small groups of affordable housing should be mixed in with the market dwellings so they can be managed in a coordinated manner. Amend the 5th paragraph of DPW3 to read as: **Affordable housing should be located throughout the residential areas in small groups. The mix and tenure to be in accordance with the Council's affordable housing policy at the time of the planning application unless viability assessment justifies an alternative provision.**	
Rep No. 35a		**Response:** The site is well located in respect to existing employment areas in the Borough including the town centre.

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>5.13</td><td>The development is dominated by housing and should also include a mix of employment otherwise residents will need to drive to employment with potential implications for RBWM's roads.</td><td rowspan="8">Whilst more employment on the site does provide the opportunity for those living in the site to access employment it does not guarantee it. The Council's employment review clearly states that the need for employment space is limited notwithstanding any exceptions;and the intention of the development is not to provide large scale employment opportunities but to form part of the wider borough strategy for growth as set out in the Core Strategy DPD. This was expressed and agreed with at the examination into the Core Strategy DPD. There is always going to be a degree of commuting to and from the borough including RBWM. However, more people travel from RBWM to Bracknell Forest for work that the other way so it is probably more pertinent that RBWM ensures that their development provisions consider the impacts on Bracknell Forest roads more so or as equally as Bracknell Forest does in respect to RBWM's road network. Bracknell Forest has an over supply of available employment floorspace and the over-riding need is for sites to provide the Borough with housing. Other sites proposed have mixed uses including elements of employment.

Action: No changes to the SPD required.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 40.</td><td rowspan="7">Response: The site is well located in respect to existing employment areas in the Borough including the town centre. Whilst more employment on the site does provide the opportunity for those living in the site to access employment it does not guarantee it. The Council's employment review clearly states that the need for employment space is limited notwithstanding any exceptions; and the intention of the development is not to provide large scale employment opportunities but to form part of the wider</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.13</td><td>Where will the people work if there is little employment to be provided. What is the economic strategy if employers are leaving the borough.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 114a</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.13</td><td>Object because employment for local people will become ever more difficult.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 137a</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
5.13	Where are the new residents going to work when business are moving away which will result in more unemployment, and crime.	borough strategy for growth as set out in the Core Strategy DPD. This was expressed and agreed with at the examination into the Core Strategy DPD. People will therefore work within the borough or elsewhere as currently happens. New employers will be encouraged into the Borough also. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 144a		
5.13	Will there be enough jobs to support the local population?	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
5.13	Object because there is no job creation in Bracknell so it will just be commuters which the roads cannot cope with.	
Rep No. 189a		
5.13	There are not enough jobs in the Borough which will get worse once companies such as Quintiles and BMW leave.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** There will be a minimal loss of employment as a result of this development. However, where there is losses such as equestrian related activities, the Council's planning policies allow for such activities further afield in the countryside. The development will create for example, construction jobs and jobs within the school, community facilities and in the local centre. Therefore, there will likely be a net increase in job opportunities as a result of this development. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
5.13	would it be possible to ascertain the level of employment that is being lost as a result of this development. How does that compare with the jobs being created?	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Viability is already a material consideration in determining planning applications and therefor, it is not necessary to include this in the SPD. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
DPW3	Development Principle W3 is supported subject to the comments on Paragraphs 5.4 and 8.7. The SPD should also make it clear that the proportion of affordable housing provision will be subject to viability testing over the development lifetime.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 54		**Response:** The SPD is consistent with the Core Strategy DPD paragraph 75 which states that employment uses on the site are likely to be small scale. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.13	Paragraph 5.13 fails to report the recommendations or say why it has not followed the Employment Land Review (2009) paragraph 7.46 for some additional industrial/warehousing. Without meaningful employment provision the site will just be a new residential extension to the town, relatively distant from the main employment areas. Paragraph 5.13 should be amended to include employment opportunities in the SPD and that any subsequent need for housing should be provided on the western side of Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No. 121a		**Response:** The development is part of the overall strategy for development and growth in the borough such as new opportunities that come about with the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre. The development will provide necessary infrastructure improvements include additional publicly accessible open space and, if appropriate, library contributions as specified in the Warfield SPD **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
5.13	Bracknell is losing companies and they are not looking to come to Bracknell. The Town Centre has not been regenerated despite the hype. It is a sad indictment of our area.	
Rep No. 131a		
5.13	Is there sufficient employment or and/or public transport to enable people to work further away?	
Rep No. 155a		
5.13	There are not sufficient employment opportunities. Any money should be invested in supports for residents to find work, improving cultural (such as libraries) and outdoor facilities to support their wellbeing, and free college courses. Green belt land offers quality of life too when the recession bites.	
Rep No. 194a		**Response:** There is a need for new housing as identified in the Core Strategy DPD. New people will come from a combination of people from within and beyond the Borough. The Borough is well
5.13	Where are the people coming from? I don't see any sign of more jobs being created and large companies have already pulled out of Bracknell.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		positioned within the Thames Valley to attract growth and new job opportunities especially taking a longer term view. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Support is noted.
DPW4	Development Principle W4 is supported.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** The SPD makes provision for small scale employment. However, the pressing need is for housing which the SPD make provision for. **Action**: No changes to the SPD required.
DPW4	Changes should be made to incorporate employment opportunities in the SPD and that any subsequent need for housing should be provided on the western side of Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The overriding need of this development is for housing. Development will be expected to demonstrate it is comprehensive including making provision for 2,200 dwellings. Therefore, development which detracts from this will not be supported. Text should be added to the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 5.13 (now 5.14) which reads as **Development proposals for uses other than housing beyond the Neighbourhood Centre will need to demonstrate that they do not detract from the objective to provide 2,200 dwellings on the site and the other development principles in this SPD.**
DPW4	Certain employment uses can be located in residential areas such as care home and surgeries. Not all employment spaces should be provided just in the proposed Local Neighbourhood Centre. Amend DPW4 to read as: **Generally employment floorspace should be located with Local Neighbourhood Centres. This will not however preclude uses which are complimentary to residential areas which also provide employment.**	

6 Responses to 'Infrastructure'

Table 6

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 1a		**Response:** The development will be required to provide the necessary infrastructure to meet the demand in generates. For example, the development will provide transport improvements, schools, a community facility, open space and other amenities. The development will be required to produce and environmental impact Assessment prior to the grant of planning permission which will assess potential pollution impacts and recommended remedies in accordance with Development Principle W16. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	The will be an increase in traffic, pollution and use of amenities when the infrastructure is not prepared for a dramatic increase in population.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** This is agreed and the Council will seek to ensure the phased provision of infrastructure within the SPD and in negotiations with developers. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.2 to read as: *New housing development ~~is expected to~~* **will** *generate the need for* **two new primary schools** *~~around 800 primary school places.~~* **because** *~~C~~***c***urrent primary school facilities would be unable to accommodate the additional demand created by this development.* **Given that there is likely to be no spare capacity in existing primary schools in the area, it is essential that one of the schools is built very early in the development.The other should follow later at a timing to ensure an unacceptable burden is not placed upon the Council to accommodate children waiting for schools places within the site.**
6.1	The delivery of infrastructure in a phased manner is essential. A primary school and other key infrastructure needs to be in phase with house building.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** There are a number of elements of infrastructure which are needed by all development such as primary school provision and SANGS. The SPD has been revised to reflect the Submission Version SADPD IDP. The development will provide a range of in-kind or financial contributions in-lieu of provision. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Existing infrastructure is likely to be adequate to support early development at Maple Green in light of the deficit in housing land supply. Bloor recognise a need to contribute a justifiable infrastructure and facilities through a tariff in the SPD	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The SPD will give as much information as possible on infrastructure requirements. However, the detail of many of the requirements is a matter for negotiation and dialogue at the planning applications stages. There is no legal mechanism to set a local tariff at this stage as the development will likely be granted permission prior to the adoption of a CIL tariff. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1 and Appendix 2	The SPD should quantify the financial burden to fall on development for infrastructure provision as a prerequisite to ensure the proposal is viable. The total costs in Appendix 2 should be shown as a tariff for each development hectare.	
Rep No. 109a		**Response:** The provision of a hospital is a matter for the relevant health authority and the Government. The Warfield SPD sets out clearly what other infrastructure requirements are expected from the development such as green infrastructure (Chapter 7) social and physical infrastructure e.g. education (Chapter 8), and transport and accessibility infrastructure (Chapter 9). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	What are the provisions for necessary infrastructure such as emergency services, hospitals, schools, road/traffic management etc.?	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools new roads, community facilities, open spaces. The Council has a paid contract for waste disposal. It is not the duty of the Council to provide a new hospital, however the Council has
6.1	Warfield is struggling with schooling, policing, dentists, hospitals, road and path conditions, environmental waste, traffic congestion and future funding. How can Warfield cope?	

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>worked in partnership with the health authorities to deliver a new cancer unit in Bracknell and to deliver a new healthspace in Bracknell Town Centre. The Council will be required to manage its maintenance budgets efficiently over the next few years. New text should be added to the SPD to specify that a dentists should be provide in the new neighbourhood centre.

Action: Amend the second sentence of paragraph 4.15 to read as: Typical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 <u>such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a Dental Surgery.</u></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 118a</td><td rowspan="10">Response: The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools, new roads, community facilities, open spaces and a neighbourhood centre. There will be substantial contributions towards a new secondary school to be built in Binfield. All are detailed in the Warfield SPD. The SPD will also support appropriate proposals for housing for older people. It is not the Government's strategy to provide a large hospital in Bracknell. Instead a new healthspace is planned for Bracknell Town Centre and a new cancer unit is already in place. The PCT has been consulted but has declined the need for a new health centre on the site but would rather focus on access to the forthcoming new healthspace. However, should a doctors practice wish to locate in the centre, it is likely the Council would support it. It is agreed that a dentists should be provided sand new text should be added to the SPD.

Action: Amend the second sentence of paragraph 4.15 to read as: Typical uses might include small scale retail, services</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.1</td><td>Our road, schools, shopping will be affected.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 119a</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.1</td><td>Objection because local infrastructure cannot cope.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 131a</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.1</td><td>No mention of doctors and dentists</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 138a</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.1</td><td>Concern about the impact on:
Doctors -
hospitals - the closest being Heatherwood but without an A&E. Hospitals are at breaking point and you are risking lives by overstretching them even more
schools, - we could not get our son into the local schools and if the proposed school is not built quickly then it will be a waste of the paper it's written on.
NHS dentists,</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	• Roads with increased traffic and pollution. • recreation areas, - why build on countryside and recreational spaces when there are industrial and empty offices in Bracknell. Some never been used. • police and fire • Unemployment and crime • Demand on water supplies - how are the water companies going to supply the new • development?	*and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5* **<u>such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a Dental Surgery.</u>**
Rep No. 142a, 181a, 190a		
6.1	The local infrastructure cannot cope such as schools, traffic, power and doctors.	
Rep No. 153a		
6.1	Can the Council see there are enough schools and heath centres because the Warfield health centre is very overcrowded.	
Rep No. 154a		
6.1	How can the existing infrastructure cope with additional traffic and healthcare?	
Rep No. 155a		
6.1	The increase in housing will place pressure infrastructure to support educational, employment, transport and social needs of the people of Warfield	
Rep No. 158a		
6.1	The infrastructure that connects this development is limited	
Rep No. 164a		
6.1	There is not enough infrastructure to support all the new housing	
Rep No. 165a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
6.1	The existing infrastructure (roads, surgeries and Tesco's) will be under strain	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
6.1	Object because of the impact on local services	
Rep No. 170a		
6.1	Objection because development will place a strain on existing infrastructure	
Rep No. 172a		
6.1	Warfield area hugely populated, facilities and services stretched to the limit. Roads, supermarkets health care, schools utilised to their maximum. No infrastructure to support such an increase.	
Rep No. 175a		
6.1	There will be a strain on local services and extra demand on secondary school places.	
Rep No. 176a, 185a 197a		
6.1	2,200 dwellings will place a strain on local amenities such as surgeries and supermarkets.	
Rep No. 179a		
6.1	More housing will simply increase congestion in schools and on the roads.	
Rep No. 204		
6.1	The roads and services will not be able to cope with such a large scale development	
Rep Nos. 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		
6.1	Where are all the amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists social space and a hospital?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 215a		
6.1	5,500 people will have a horrendous impact on local infrastructure including schools and roads	
Rep No. 217a		
6.1	How can the infrastructure support such a development?	
Rep No. 231		
6.1	The infrastructure cannot cope, we don't have enough schools, parks, play areas or hospitals.	
Rep No. 10a		
6.4	Unless additional services such as schools, shops and recreational areas are provided the development should not go ahead.	
Rep Nos. 89a, 92a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The infrastructure cannot cope with this many homes	
Rep No. 95a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area cannot sustain further housing estates what about the provision of schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals etc.?	
Rep No. 96a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure is already under strain such as daily traffic jams, overs subscribed schools, no hospital and poor care for the elderly.	
Rep No. 97a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure cannot cope such as roads, schools, hospital and retail.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 99a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	New development will cause strain on infrastructure and amenities such as schools, shops, doctor's roads etc.	
Rep No. 101a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	With new houses our amenities will become even more clogged up such as doctors, library and supermarket. In the face of public spending cuts can our GPs, hospitals, schools cope with the influx of new residents	
Rep No. 104a		
6.4	The roads, facilities and infrastructure cannot and will not be able to cope.	
Rep No. 173a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure cannot cope such as schools, doctors and supermarket	
Rep No. 125a		**Response:** The development will be required to be built in phases in which a negotiated level of infrastructure is provide. Detailed timings are a matter for negotiation and for example one of the primary schools will be expected to be delivered early in the development. Broad timings are indicated in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Concern that the development will happen in a piecemeal manner so that infrastructure is not provided until the final phase of development. In the mean time existing infrastructure cannot cope and traffic increased.	
Rep No. 126a		**Response:** The development is required to ensure that its infrastructure needs are met including the impact of transport generated from it. The Warfield SPD in Chapter 9 describes the transport requirement such as bus access, walking and cycling, travel plans and parking and highways access / improvements. The development will also make provision of other infrastructure, open space and
6.1	Development will ruin the area causing congestion and fights for school places etc. etc.	
Rep No. 127a		
6.1	It will result in overcrowding of an area which already has severe pressure on roads and services	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		facilities as detailed in the SPD. The development will also provide 2 new primary schools on site which will accommodate all children from the new community. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 131a		**Response:** The required infrastructure will be provided throughout the development in a phased and timely manner following negotiations. The infrastructure requirements at Jennets Park have been delivered in accordance with trigger points tied to a legal agreement based on the number of housing completions. It took longer than anticipated because the rate of building slowed i.e. The longer it has taken to build the housing the longer the time to provide necessary infrastructure. The Council will take account of realistic time scales for house building and the delivery of associated facilities when it comes to negotiating agreements with the developers in respect to Warfield. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Will the infrastructure come first or after development? Jennetts Park shows after.	
Rep No. 150a		
6.1	As with Jennetts Park a substantial proportion of house were built but the promised infrastructure not yet established. Concern that the development will happen in a piecemeal manner so that houses will be built casing a strain on existing roads, schools and medical amenities.	
Rep No. 136a		**Response:** The development will provide high quality housing, accessible open space and other facilities which will provide a high quality of life for residents within or nearby. The Council have and will continue to engage with the Highways Agency on this and other plans in respect to motorways including the M4. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Objection because the development will cause a diminution of our quality of life with a massive influx of people pushing the boundaries of an already creaking infrastructure - getting onto the M4 is already a nightmare, has anybody thought of that?	
Rep No. 147a		**Response:** Developers have faced recent problems because of the financial crisis which has affected their ability ton borrow money or to sale houses at the price and within the timescale they originally programmed. This has had a
6.1	Developers in Bracknell have a poor record of delivering housing and community facilities to plan and on time.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		consequential knock on effect on the timing of providing some community facilities. The timing of which in legal terms was related to the number of dwelling they complete. Therefore a slow down in building houses has meant a slow down in delivering associated facilities. The facilities and houses are still provided but understandably at a slower rate. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 148a		**Response:** The development will provide faculties for youths such as a basketball/skateboard are as described in Paragraph 8.12 (now 8.13) of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	The common areas will be lost which means that youths will have nowhere to go?	
Rep No. 182		**Response:** It is correct that some wider impacts such as health care cannot be offset by s106 money because such provision is a matter for relevant organisations and health authorities and paid for by taxes. The relevant organisations, health authorities and government have been consulted during the production of the Core Strategy DPD and the Warfield SPD and none have raised a strategic objection on housebuilding because of health provision. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	There will be a wider impact on local facilities including health care that cannot be offset by s106 monies e.g. multipla-hospital diagnostic and treatment services.	
Rep No. 191a		**Response:** The development forms part of the Core Strategy DPD which sets out all the borough growth for the future including the town centre. The development will provide the necessary infrastructure it places a demand for. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Why build more when the town centre or infrastructure is not sufficient	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 194a		**Response:** Planning permission was not granted 3 years ago but the Core Strategy DPD was completed then and included a high level policy which states there will be development in the location. The detail of which including infrastructure is being developed in the Warfield SPD. The PCT has been consulted but has declined the need for a new health centre on the site but would rather focus on access to the forthcoming new healthspace in Bracknell town centre. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	Where is the supporting infrastructure. I am not aware of any imminent plans even though planning permission was granted 3 years ago? Where will other facilities e.g. doctors and hospitals be provided?	
Rep No. 196a		**Response**: The Warfield SPD sets out the detail such as education and highways. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1	I will not support mass building plans until I see detail that takes into account retail units, education, highways and community use buildings	
Rep No. 226		**Response:** This is a specific comment on the SADPD. However, taking each comment in turn: • Housing need is driven by a number of factors such as migration, household composition, projections of population growth, local housing needs etc. • The station at Amen Corner is desirable rather than a guaranteed deliverable. • The level of commuting in and out of the borough is broadly equal in that 50% live and work in the borough with the other 50% of residents commuting out. There are also an equivalent numbers of other jobs in the borough to which people commute into the borough. These statistics will be revised when the 2011 Census results are made available.
6.1	The planning official at a Binfield event confirmed several things that lead to a conclusion that this whole plan is ill-conceived and not thought out and is driven by BFBCs own agenda rather than by genuine housing need. The planning official we spoke to conceded: To create sufficient jobs in the borough to employ many of the additional c 25,000 population (c25% increase) is extremely ambitious. The previously proposed new railway station at Amen Corner was unlikely to happen. Many of the people living in the new houses would be commuting by car outside of the borough to work. BFBC have no idea of the proportion of people currently living and working in the borough versus those that travel by car to work outside the borough, so have not modelled likely future commuter patterns. Unless the Bracknell town centre redevelopment went ahead,	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	the additional people would be driving to Reading/Windsor/Wokingham etc to do their shopping. The planned highway improvements would only tackle junctions and do nothing to increase road capacity. We would end up with: • Significantly higher levels of commuting traffic. • A deterioration in the quality of life to meet South East housing targets as the homes have to go somewhere and places like Windsor and Maidenhead aren't taking any. If the houses get built without the town centre and/or M3/4 improvements, we would end up with a completely dysfunctional transport system. The number of additional vehicles on our roads directly contradicts BFBCs green agenda. The additional c10,000 houses in the borough was driven as much by the council as opposed to being driven by genuine need. One has to question BFBC's real motives they are self-seeking / financial, not housing need driven. For example: BFBC would benefit from the New Homes bonus, which could be a key driver in helping to plug any funding reductions. Using the LGC New Homes calculator, 10,000 additional houses brings £90m over six years. He went on to say that the additional houses / people would act as additional pressure to go ahead with the town centre redevelopment and M3/M4 corridor improvements. The information readily conceded by the official evidences a lack of robust consideration of the rationale, risks and consequences, and a complete absence of any joined up thinking. It also leads to the conclusion that BFBC are using the quality of our lives as a massive gamble to further their own ends of additional funding and pressure to redevelop the town centre and M3 / M4	• The Council is committed to delivering a regenerated town centre. • Junction improvements are proven capacity improvements, other measure include: new link roads (Amen Corner and Warfield), public transport improvements and additional to the pedestrian and cycle network. The Council has undertaken significant modelling of the network taking account of improvements and background growth etc. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	corridor. For these two fundamental reasons, this plan is flawed and should not proceed any further.	
Rep No.s 7a part i and part ii,		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools, new roads, community facilities, open spaces and a neighbourhood centre. All are detailed in the Warfield SPD. It is likely that infrastructure provision will be secured via s106 agreements and other highways agreements. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.4 and Appendix 2	What additional infrastructure will there be? Will the development be included in a s278 agreement or will areas remain private. How will the Borough be able to look after new infrastructure given the harsh winter last year. Where will the new road link into the existing roads? Will existing infrastructure be able to cope?	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The development will be expected top provide the necessary infrastructure provision it generates and therefore, for clarity the first sentence of paragraph 6.4 should be amended. **Action:** Replace the first sentence of paragraph 6.4 to read as: ~~*The provision of infrastructure will, on the most part, be fully funded by the development.*~~ **The development will provide for necessary infrastructure and services. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan details potential sources of funding including that from developers.** Delete the word *However* from the second sentence of paragraph 6.4
6.4	The balance between developer funding and from other sources will vary across the range of infrastructure provision. The provision of infrastructure being for the most part fully funded by the development is not necessarily accurate in all instances and the first sentence of paragraph 6.4 should be replaced with: **The Infrastructure Development Plan contains details of potential sources of funding.** The word "*However*" should also be deleted from the second sentence.	

7 Responses to 'Green Infrastructure'

Table 7

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No.1a		**Response:** There will be a loss of countryside because of development needs. However there will not be a loss of accessible recreational areas because existing areas such as Larks Hill be be kept and new areas such as Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided as part of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	We enjoy walking our dog and appreciating the countryside and further development will reduce our choice	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 54, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** This is largely agreed and amended text will be provided which adds detail to paragraph 7.10. Furthermore,opportunity should be taken to include Strawberry Hill as part of this route thereby extending the bridleway. **Action:** Add a new paragraph 7.11 which reads as: **<u>For clarification the route should include:</u>** • **<u>Connections across the Bullbrook;</u>** • **<u>A new bridleway along Strawberry Hill;</u>** • **<u>The Hedge Lane Bridleway to Old Priory Lane;</u>** • **<u>A link across the north of Priory Field to Larks Hill and/or Watersplash Lane;</u>** • **<u>A link from the ford across the Cut following West End Lane to Park Farm;</u>** • **<u>A link across Cabbage Hill to Hazlewood Lane and access to the byways and bridleways in the north of the borough.</u>** Add a new bullet point to paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) which reads as
Figure 3 Concept Plan and 7.1, 7.10 and 7.12	To maximise space for housing the east to west greenway should follow existing Public Rights of Way. A new path is needed across the Bullbrook to Maize Lane and then: • Hedge Lane Bridleway to Priory Lane • Across the north of Priory Lane to Larks Hill or Watersplash Lane • From the ford across the Cut following West End Lane to Park Farm • Across Cabbage Hill to link with Hazlewood Lane and to access the byways and bridleways in the north of the borough. Leisure routes to the northern network will also need to be strengthened via Osbourne land and Gibbins Lane.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Leisure routes to the northern network which will also need to be strengthened via Osbourne Lane and Gibbins Lane.
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Support is noted.
7.1	We are pleased about the approaches to Green Infrastructure, spaces for wildlife, River Parks and flood risk. You have clearly considered previous comments made good use of your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted. It is agreed that further text should be included in the SPD in respect to amphibians. **Action:** Amend the last bullet point to paragraph 7.35 (now 7.38) which reads as: ~~*An updated Great Crested Newt Survey*~~ **A reptile and amphibian survey including on additional ponds not subject of earlier survey work (April to October).** Amend the last bullet point in paragraph 7.38 (now 7.41) to read as *Ponds including provision for amphibian foraging areas* **and connections to other ponds/habitats.** Amend paragraph 7.39 (now 7.42) to include a new bullet points which reads as **Ponds.** Amend the Concept Plan to show green links between relevant ponds.
7.1	Chapter 7 is excellent and really places an importance on the need to incorporate Green Infrastructure and SUDS. The desire to incorporate Green Roofs, enhance ponds and promote amphibian foraging areas should be included.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The SPD gives details of the required provision and it is necessary for landowners/developers to work together to deliver the development and its associated infrastructure provision. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 6.4 which reads as: **Developers will be expected to work in partnership and, where appropriate, equalise land values to deliver the full**
7.1	The SPD should explain how the green infrastructure provision will be delivered where all the landowners have not signed an equalisation agreement.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		range of open space, SANGS and associated infrastructure and services. The Council will act in a coordinating role to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure on specific projects such as schools and open space/SANG provision.
Rep No. 78		**Response:** This is agreed and all the accessible open spaces which exist which are The Cut, Larks Hill, Priory Field and Westmorland Park will remain. Whilst some countryside areas will be lost to development other area will be made accessible to the public where they previously were not such as Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided as part of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The existing development in and around Warfield need green space for enjoyment and identity.	
Rep No. 118a		**Response:** The development will result in the loss of countryside/semi rural land but there is a need to balance the needs of growth with the need to protect the countryside. The development will increase the amount of publicly available open space. This is because the development will retain the existing accessible open space areas of Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth Meadows. The development will also provide additional open space areas which will be accessible including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	Beautiful countryside will be lost which with Cabbage Hill is important to local residents. It should not be built on.	
Rep No. 126a		
7.1	Leave our countryside alone	
Rep No. 143a		
7.1	Object because this area is very popular with the local community including walkers and families. This is green field countryside land and should be left alone.	
Rep No. 144a		
7.1	Object to loss of recreational areas	
Rep No. 145a		
7.1	Object because it is a beautiful natural landscape enjoyed for picnics, walking and cycling.	
Rep No. 165a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
7.1	There are enormous health benefits from having green spaces	
Rep No. 185a		
7.1	Object because we need to protect green land for recreation and health benefits	
Rep No. 190a		
7.1	The decrease in semi-rural open space is unacceptable	
Rep No. 216 part ii		
7.1	Warfield is losing more countryside which is used by residents and would all be lost by this development	
Rep No. 137a		**Response:** No part of the site is designated as Sites of Special Scientific Importance (SSSI). There are 3 designated Local Wildlife Sites all of which will remain. There will be a loss of countryside because of development needs. However, there will not be a loss of accessible recreational areas because existing areas such as Larks Hill be be kept and new areas such as Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided as part of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The proposal will eliminate large green spaces which we were under the impression that the site had special scientific protection status	
Rep No. 142a		**Response:** The land subject of the SPD is not designated as Green Belt. It was designated as land outside defined settlements on the Local Plan Proposals Map, however, following the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD in 2008 the area is not designated on the Bracknell forest Borough Proposals Map as a Major Location for Growth. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	Object because it will destroy a beautiful area of green belt with fantastic views. Green Belt is there for a reason not just reserved for building whenever the local council or government feels like it	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 147a		**Response:** The development will create its own character which will include a substantial green element as detailed in Chapter 7 Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The character of the area will be lost along with valuable areas of natural beauty, trees and green borders.	
Rep No. 150a		**Response:** The Council will require that as much of existing biodiversity will be protected as possible. Where some habitats will be lost there will be a need to compensate by providing equal or better quality features. Full survey, and assessment of biodversity is required to properly ascertain what elements should remain and what mitigation should be provided. Examples are that existing Local Wildlife Sites should be retained and that new hedgerows should be planted in Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The proposed area contains old hedgerows, mature trees, copses, varied wildlife. We moved to the Warfield not Bracknell to enjoy the countryside. We have a duty to keep these rural communities in Britain before town boundaries blur creating endless urban sprawl.	
Rep No 151a		**Response:** Larks Hill will not be built upon but retained and enhanced as specified in paragraphs 2.5, 4.23, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and Development Principle W5. The community orchard is to be retained and text will be added to the SPD to clarify this. The Council has to find development sites to meet its housing allocation in the Core Strategy DPD (10,780 dwellings between 2006 and 2026). This site with other will form part of that allocation. Therefore the site is needed. There will be the loss of some fields and country lanes. There will be an increase in safe dog walking areas because the existing Larks Hill and Garth Meadows will remain and addition open space ares will be provided. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 7.2 to read as *The Warfield SPD site has high quality existing green features which enhance the character of the site such as Cabbage Hill, Larks Hill*
7.1	The development is proposed on green field and which is designated for use by the community including a community orchard. Larks Hill is natural habitat used for recreation and dog walking. The new sports pitches are not sufficient alternative for Larks Hill.	
Rep No. 197a		
7.1	Surely there are enough housing developments and there should be smaller developments only. Building on the edge of green belt land will result in the loss of some great features, including the community orchard, the historical Quelm Stone, safe dog walking areas and quiet country lanes.	
Rep No. 229		
7.1	The land is an important recreational feature used for jogging, ramblers, dog	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	walkers, children and is the site of the historic Quelm Stone.	**(including the community orchard and the Quelm Stone)**,*Priory Field***, Garth Meadows***and the ~~Bridleway~~* **bridleways** *which will remain after the development is completed.*
Rep No. 122		
7.18	The communal fruit orchard should protected and expanded for the benefit of residents & wildlife.	
Rep No. 160a		**Response:** A comprehensive development at Warfield was agreed in early 2008 following extensive consultation and an examination. Further consultations have also been carried out in the SADPD and in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. Planning for new communities is a difficult process that results in difficult choices including providing for housing needs. The site is green field but it was accepted at the examination into the Core Strategy that the Council could only deliver its housing allocation through a combination of brown field and green field sites. Detailed assessment of biodiversity and habitats will be required including necessary compensation, mitigation and enhancement measures **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The land is greenfield and has considerable landscape and green lung value as well as noted value of biodiversity and river corridors	
Rep No. 175a		
7.1	It is not acceptable to saturate Warfield on green field sites	
Rep No. 188a		
7.1	Object because of loss of green field land. Why is Warfield being saturated?	
Rep No. 193a		
7.1	Object to development on greenfield land	
Rep No. 164a		**Response:** The Council will require a net gain in biodiversity and that as much of existing biodiversity will be protected. Where some habitats will be lost there will be a need to mitigate. Full survey, and assessment of biodversity is required to properly ascertain what elements should remain and what mitigation should be provided. Examples are that existing Local Wildlife Sites should be retained and that new hedgerows should be planted in Cabbage Hill. The development will increase the amount of publicly available open space. This is because the development will retain the existing accessible open space areas of Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth
7.1	The area is semi rural and development will result in the loss of habitat and wildlife. Recreation space is already very limited and there will be even less with the vast number of dwellings	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Meadows. The development will also provide additional open space areas which will be accessible including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 177a, 178a		**Response:** The character of the area will change. The Council must balance the need for new housing and facilities with protection the countryside. The land was identified as a major location for growth in the Council's Core Strategy document which was finalised in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public and was concluded with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council has a duty to provide for the future growth has made tough decisions on how it will be achieved. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The main reason I moved to Warfield was because it was surrounded by fields, farming and equestrian land. Building on it would force me to think of moving away.	
Rep No. 187a		
7.1	We moved to Warfield because it is on the edge of Bracknell. Whilst the plans incorporate green space it is no substitute for open countryside. We need to protect green land around Warfield for the recreational pleasure of residents.	
Rep No. 182		**Response:** The EN10 and EN14 Local Plan designations are affected by the newer and overriding Core Strategy Policy CS5 designation which clearly states there will be a comprehensive development on the site. Priory Field will be retained. Existing Local Wildlife Sites will be retained including the site at Strawberry Hill. There will however, be the loss of farm land. The Warfield SPD provides text to ensure the character of Newell Green and Warfield Street are retained. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	There will be a loss of green land sites, wildlife recreational space and areas of natural beauty. Concerned about negative impact on Policies EN10 and 14 land and the loss of Priory Field and Strawberry Lane as open green spaces. There will be a negative impact on farm land and villages of Newell Green and Warfield Street. It will impact negatively on the quality of life of local residents.	
Rep No. 189a		**Response:** Whilst the area will become more urbanised and there will be the unfortunate loss of green spaces/countryside, there will be an
7.1	The green spaces will be lost and replaced with a concrete jungle.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		increase in publicly accessible open space provided and the provision of infrastructure and community facilities which will make it a sustainable community. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Np. 191a		**Response:** The wider Bracknell Forest area is characterised by large scale extensions from the early new town through to large developments in the 80s, 90, and 2000's including a substantial development in Warfield. Large development have the advantage over lots of smaller development in for example, providing a critical mass to support infrastructure, schools and community facilities. The Council's strategy for growth (the Core Strategy DPD, February 2008) was widely consulted upon and debated through examination whereby it was found to be sound that a large scale development at Warfield was acceptable (sound). The development will retain areas of natural beauty such as Larks Hill and make others publicly accessible,such as part of Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	The development is too big and will destroy a natural beauty spot.	
Rep No. 200a		**Response:** The agricultural value of the site was weighed up in considering the site during the production of the Core Strategy. It was concluded that development should go ahead. There are 3 designated Local Wildlife Sites all of which will remain. There will be a need to assess, retain, mitigate and provide new habitat. There will be a loss of countryside because of development needs. However there will not be a loss of accessible recreational areas because existing areas such as Larks Hill be kept
7.1	The site is important farm land and an area for wildlife and recreation.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		and new areas such as Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided as part of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		**Response:** Once the development is completed there will be an increase in publicly accessible recreational areas which includes retaining existing open spaces and creating new (e.g. at Cabbage Hill and two new river parks). **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	We enjoy family walks around the area proposed as a building site	
Rep No. 207a		**Response:** The new development will provide its own natural element such as parks, trees green routes etc. It will be a high quality development and enhance Warfield as a place to live. Warfield is a very large parish and will still have significant other countryside areas, farms, country pubs and so on. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	We moved to Warfield because of its fields, farms shops, country pubs, parks, trees and quiet estates	
Rep No. 215a		**Response:** Whilst there will be the loss of countryside, there will be significantly more than the odd park or green corridor provided. The development will increase the amount of publicly available open space. This is because the development will retain the existing accessible open space areas of Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth Meadows. The development will also provide additional open space areas which will be accessible including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	There will be an overriding destruction of open spaces which cannot be compensated by the odd park or green corridor.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 221		**Response:** The Concept Plan has been revised to make it more detailed however, there are green infrastructure elements which will still be required as prescribed in the final Warfield SPD. **Action:** Revise the Concept Plan
7.1	The layout does not give enough provision for green space including links and an insufficiently wide river corridor to take account of flooding and the mess of humans and wildlife. Biodiversity and the green landscape are not fully addressed.	
Rep No. 226		**Response:** The document does make references to telecommunications and Broadband in paragraph 8.30 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. However it is agreed and additional text will be provided in the SPD to make reference to the provision of appropriate Internet capacity. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.30 (now 8.33) to read as *Development will be required to provide up-to-date telecommunications*, **for example, opportunities should be sought to install fibre optic links from houses to the High Speed Broadband exchange** ~~*including broadband*~~
7.1	One aspect of infrastructure that appears to be not considered at all is internet connectivity. Currently, the Binfield / N Bracknell has slow ADSL lines. It would be environmentally sensible to enable as many people that can to work at home as much as they can. The new housing should not be built until the necessary fast internet capacity is in place.	
Rep No. 232		**Response:** The development will increase the amount of publicly accessible recreational space available. For example the existing spaces at Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth Meadows will be kept and new spaces including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.1	Losing precious recreational space and additional residents will put a strain on the facilities available.	
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** Noted. The final SPD will be a material consideration as part of the Local development Framework in the determination of planning applications affecting the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.2	We welcome the first 3 sentences in this paragraph which recognise important high quality green/blue features and that they should be designed into the development. We strongly urge developers to be held to this intention	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 42a		**Response:** Larks Hill or Priory Field will not be built upon but retained and enhanced as specified in paragraphs 2.5, 4.23, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and Development Principle W5. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.2	Larks Hill will be destroyed and it is used by many people in the area and contains important wildlife species.	
Rep No. 111a		
7.2	Larks Hill and Priory Field may be lost even though they are areas of recreation and habitats.	
Rep No. 208a		
7.2	Object to building on Larks Hill as it appears on the map. It is crucial to the character of the area and is supported by the Councils's website explaining that it is important in leisure, visual, biodiversity and other recreational uses.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The dual use of SANGS and other open space would not be compatible with the Council's strategy for providing SANGS to double count provision with passive open space. This is consistent with the existing and emerging replacement Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. **Action:** No changes required.
7.2 and 7.8	The dual use approach of recreation facilities is welcomed. This should be extended to the provision of SANGs and passive open space.	
Rep No. 90a		**Response:** For clarification the these pitches are known as Priory Field and the SPD already confirms they will remain as stated in paragraphs 2.5, 7.6, 7.11 and Development Principle W5. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.2	It is unclear if the current pitches opposite Warfield Road and Priory Lane will remain.	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** The detail of any improvements are a matter for negotiation at the more detailed stages during the preparation of planning applications. The memorial ground
7.6	What improvements are envisaged to Westmorland Park?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Where would a Village Green be sited surely the Memorial Ground fulfils this need.	does/could serve this purpose but an additional green could be provided within the housing parcels **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 15		**Response:** Point 2 - there are improvements which can be made to existing open spaces such as providing or extending changing facilities. Therefore no extra provision is required. Such improvements should be agreed with the Council. Point 4 - This text is agreed and changes should be made accordingly. Point 6 - This text is not agreed in this paragraph, because similar text should amend paragraph 8.12. **Action:** Amend point 4 of 7.6 to read as *The provision of allotment site* **or Allotment sites** *in accordance with Paragraph 7.19.* Amend the last sentence of paragraph 8.12 (now 8.13) to read as **Nearby, but not at the Community Hub**~~*multi-functional centre*~~**site, a teenage shelter**~~*/It should also include a nearby kickabout/*~~*basketball/skateboard area* **should be provided within the Active Open Space of Public Value and away from residences.**
7.6	Point 2 – No Active OSPV enhancements can be provided at Warfield Memorial Ground, Priory Field and Westmorland Park, thus making a further requirement in the development. Point 4 should read '**The provision of allotment site *or sites* in accordance with Paragraph 7.18**' Point 6 should read '**The provision of a teenage area should be sought within a new or other Active OSPV not at the community centre site**.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response**: Noted.
7.6	It is welcomed that active open space provision can be by enhancing existing provision.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The 10.16 hectare figure was based upon the council's standard which is 2 ha per 1000 persons based upon 2,200 dwellings. However it is recognised that should the development be slightly over or under 2,200 dwellings that the requirement could go up or down respectively. Therefore, for clarification reference should also be made to the Council's standard for provision.
7.6	A detailed justification for the 10.16 hectare figure is not provided in the SPD. It should be deleted and a reference to compliance with open space standard be inserted.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: Amend the 1st and 2nd sentences of paragraph 7.6 to read as *There is a relatively low provision of sports pitches in the area which the development will* **help redress** ~~*contribute towards*~~*. Development will provide* ~~*10.16 hectares of*~~ *active open space of public value* **to a standard of 2 hectares per 1000 people (which would amount to 10.16 hectares based upon 2,200 dwellings and 2.31 persons per dwelling)** *for community, school and general recreational needs and/or enhance existing provision* **if possible.**
Rep No. 140		**Response:** The Blue Mountain site is being considered through the Site Allocations DPD. Unfortunately, there will be the loss of some fields and countryside. There will be an increase in accessible open space because the existing Larks Hill and Garth Meadows will remain and addition open space areas will be provided. The SPD will requirement that the impact of the construction will be minimised in accordance with paragraph 10.5 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.6	You say you are encourage open spaces but you are removing Blue Mountain Golf Course and the existing natural landscape which enables people to walk out their front doors onto it especially if the area becomes a building site for 10 - 15 years!	
Rep No. 89a		**Response:** The development will retain existing accessible open space areas and provide new open space and play areas. For example it will provide 2 new river parks and open up part of Cabbage Hill as an accessible open space. Full detail of all the requirements are in Chapter 7 Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.7	Objection because we don't have enough parks or play areas	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** The 11.69 hectare figure was based upon the council's standard which is 2.3 ha per 1000 persons based upon

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
7.8	The 11.69 hectare figure is not justified in the SPD and the SPD should refer to adopted standards.	2,200 dwellings. However it is recognised that should the development be slightly over or under 2,200 dwellings that the requirement could go up or down respectively. Therefore, for clarification reference should also be made to the Council's standard for provision. **Action:** Amend the 1st sentence of paragraph 7.8 to read as *The development will provide (through land and works) 1~~1.69 hectares of~~ passive OSPV* **to a standard of 2.3 hectares per 1000 people (which would amount to 11.69 hectares based upon 2,200 dwellings and 2.31 persons per dwelling)** *for informal recreation such as walking, picnics, cycling and for its biodiversity and visual amenity.*
Rep No. 15		**Response:** This is noted and the Council will seek to discuss obtain any permission in writing from both the Parish Council and the Trust. The Trust have confirmed that they are willing to discuss improvements and therefore additional text should be added to the SPD to clarify. **Action:** Amend the second bullet point of paragraph 7.6 to read as *The enhancement of the nearby existing sporting facilities for example, the Warfield Memorial Ground* **(subject to partnership working and agreement with the Warfield Memorial Park Trustees)**, *Priory Fields and Westmorland Park.*
7.11	Permission to improve Warfield Memorial Park is needed from the Trust.	
Rep No. 12		**Response:** All trees all the existing bridleway at Avery Lane will be assessed and retained. There will also be an assessment of all trees alongside the bridleway which runs between Old Priory Lane and Jigs Lane North (called Hedge Lane). The Council will seek to retain
7.12	The mature trees such as oaks along the Bridleway which should be kept which should also be covered by a Tree Preservation Order.	

<table>
<tr><th>Para</th><th>Summary of Issues raised</th><th>Officer Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>most if not all these trees except where breakthroughs may be required. It may be appropriate to confirm a permanent or temporary TPO to ensure long term protection.

Action: Add new sentences to paragraph 7.15 (now 7.16) which read as <u>No trees should be felled until a detailed tree survey has been submitted to and agreed by the Council. The Council will investigate the further need for individual or groups of existing trees which may warrant TPOs or other protection.</u></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 15</td><td rowspan="10">Response: This is agreed and these will largely remain although it may be necessary to make pedestrian/cycleway connections across Quelm Lane and Avery Lane at points to be agreed following assessment and surveys. Additional text will be added to the Warfield SPD to clarify these points. There will be the loss of some fields and countryside. The development will provide a comprehensive network of footpaths and leisure routes as described in the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft (e.g. Paragraphs 7.10 - 7.14). The bridleway network will be retained (e.g. Hedge Lane and Avery Lane and enhanced (e.g. along Strawberry Hill.

Action: Amend the first two bullet points of paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) to read as:

• ~~A~~ <u>Hedge Lane</u> Bridleway between Old Priory Lane and Maize Lane ~~(also known as HedgeLane)~~ (Warfield BR 26) <u>There may be a need to provide at least one access point across Hedge Lane for vehicle access. This should be at a point to be agreed and</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>7.12</td><td>Existing bridleways and byways in Quelm Lane, Avery Lane and Hedge Lane must be retained as green corridors and are ignored on the Concept Plan.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 36</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.12</td><td>Quelm Lane and Avery Lane are byways and havens for wildlife, they should be kept in tact</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 124a</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.12</td><td>Object to the loss of countryside, footpaths and bridleways.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Rep No. 166a, 167a, 168a</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.12</td><td>Object because there is a need to protect ancient byways</td></tr>
</table>

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		which is not sensitive in terms of its existing planting. • **Avery Lane which runs**~~Running~~ from Watersplash Lane northwards to the Three Legged Cross Junction (Warfield BW 8) **which may include access routes across it at less sensitive parts**. **Avery Lane will remain as an informal byway leisure route. Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane.**
Rep No. 218		**Response:** Avery Lane will remain as a leisure bridleway. It is also agreed for extra choice that a leisure route is provided on either side of the proposed Cut River Park Text should be provided to clarify this. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.11 (now 7.12) which reads as **The north to south connections should also connect with east to west connections, for example, The Cut River Park should run from the Three Legged Cross to Framptons Bridge.**
7.12	The Warfield BW8 should be re-routed along the Cut. There are already proposals to extend the BR26 to the east of the A3095 and sit should be further extended to Cabbage Hill with a suitable crossing of the B3034 (Forest Road) to connect to NBR24 Hazlewood Lane.	
Rep No 36		**Response:** Prior to approving any detailed schemes affecting the site there is a necessity to provide a range of surveys and assessments including that for trees. The development will seek to create as many hedgerows as possible following assessment and survey. Furthermore, additional new hedgerows will be planted, for example following historic patterns on Cabbage Hill as stated in paragraph 7.15 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.13	As many hedgerows should be kept as possible as they criss cross the area, add character and contain a large variety of wildlife and are natural borders.	
Rep No. 11		
7.15	There are protected trees under TPO's which could be destroyed if development goes ahead.	
Rep No. 12		**Response:** Trees not only make a defining contribution to the character of Warfield but also provide a valuable

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
7.15	The woodland belt of Oaks and Cooper Beeches abutting Delphine Cottage and neighbouring properties should be protected and enhanced to protect their wildlife and visual amenity and to act as a buffer between existing and new development. Tree Preservation Orders should be considered at this location. There are also a number of trees in back gardens next to this wooded area which give the impression of larger woodland.	habitat for biodiversity. A development proposal will therefore need to be accompanied by a comprehensive tree survey, where any loss of trees proposed will need to be strongly justified. Otherwise the Council will seek the retention and protection of trees whose value outweighs the benefits of development; particularly in this area where a degree of sensitive buffering will be required for the boundary where new development abuts existing settlements **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 38, 39		**Response:** It is agreed that planting should be of high quality and mature where appropriate as required by the SPD. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
7.15	We welcome the commitment to preserving trees and hedgerows. New planting should be in keeping with natural species in the area. Along the existing boundaries of properties should be planted with mature trees.	
Rep Nos. 82a, 84a, 88a		**Response:** The Council will require that as much of existing biodiversity will be protected. Where some habitats will be lost there will be a need to mitigate. Full survey, and assessment of biodversity is required to properly ascertain what elements should remain and what mitigation should be provided. Examples are that existing Local Wildlife Sites should be retained and that new hedgerows should be planted in Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.17	There is significant wildlife in this area which will be destroyed.	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** 50 full sized plots is considered to be sufficient to serve the new development. Under Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations development should provide the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities to meet its own needs and not to remedy existing
7.18	50 allotments is not sufficient. There is a waiting list of 90 plus. New allotments ought to be half plots.	
Rep No. 15		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
7.18	Allotments are welcomed; however, there is an outstanding waiting list for existing residents and provision must take this into account. If the same level of demand comes from the new development, a minimum of 200 allotments will be required. A greater proportion of Active OSPV will need to be allocated for allotments. Several smaller allotment sites are likely to be more sustainable than a single site.	deficiencies. It is the responsibility of Warfield Parish Council to ensure their waiting list is fully met. It is agreed that the plots could be divided into half plots. It is agreed that the full plots could be divided into half plots and the text will be amended to confirm this. The siting of the allotments are a matter for the detailed stage of preparing planning applications. The communal orchard will be retained and possibly enhanced as part of the requirement to enhance existing open space areas. It is a good idea to link allotments to schools although this is not a matter for the SPD, it is a consideration for officers to discuss. **Action:** Amend the last two sentences of paragraph 7.18 (now 7.19) to read as *Warfield Parish Council has expressed the desire to manage ~~a site is~~***one or more are***provided. Therefore, as part of the Active OSPV requirement associated with this development, an allotment site* **or sites***for 50***full** *plots* **(or 100 half plots)***will be provided as part of the development with water infrastructure and a parking area.*
Rep No. 24a		
7.18	50 allotments is not nearly enough as it would not serve current need. It should be 200 plots especially if the parts of the development are 50 dph meaning no back gardens.	
Rep No 36.		
7.18	The proposed provision of 50 allotments should be > by 50%. The communal fruit orchard should protected and expanded for the benefit of residents & wildlife. The bottom of Cabbage Hill could have some community allotments. The line of site to these allotments could be blocked by the existing tree line of Quelm Lane. Also if a school was built then these allotments could help educate children about the food chain. There are also sustainability issues that surround the designing of allotments.	
Rep No. 40		
7.18	50 plots of what size? This is not enough given Winkfield has over 80 plots and a long waiting list. We suggest 200 plots.	
Rep No. 122		
7.18	The fields should be converted to allotments because the demand continues to rise. The fields around the	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	communal orchards would be suitable. 50 allotment plots are not enough considering the size of gardens.	
Rep No. 140		**Response:** This is not a matter for the Warfield SPD. The Borough Council Countryside Services and Warfield Parish Council should be contacted separately by the person making the response regarding this issue. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.18	Allotments should be available now.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** It is agreed that green roofs can with other green infrastructure measures be important to compensating the loss of green land. Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft makes provision for green infrastructure and paragraph 7.20 make sit clear that green roofs should be incorporated where appropriate on the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.20	Any loss of green space or waste land can be compensated by green roofs	
Rep No. 36		Response: The drainage ditch may be retained as part of the requirement to incorporate Sustainable Drainage systems (SUDs) within the development as required by paragraph 7.23 (now 7.24) of the Warfield SPD. However for clarification additional text should be included in the SPD. Action: Add additional sentences to paragraph 7.23 (now 7.24) which reads as **Consideration should be given to retaining/enhancing existing drainage ditches across the site to contribute as part of the SuDS provision. The detailed overland surface water flow routes should be identified at the detailed planning stage and, as a consequence, it may be necessary to adjust green corridor routes in some parts of the site to accommodate the flow routes.**
7.20	The drainage ditch running along Priory Lane to a flood capture area is in the area designated for development. Where will the water go?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 122		**Response:** There will be areas for wildlife and habitat to thrive including existing to be retained open space, new green corridors and new hedgerow planting on Cabbage Hill. Thorough assessment are required and appropriate measures and mitigation measures will be implemented as a result of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.20	Provision of wildlife tunnels and bird/bat nesting boxes will never make up for loss of the space wildlife needs.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is agreed and inherent in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.23	SUDs can take up land which may effect space for development. However SUDs may be incorporated in green spaces and provide a host of sustainable benefits such as amenity and biodiversity.	
Rep No 32		**Response:** The types of SuDs listed in paragraph 8.22 (now 8.25) should clarified as example and additional text as suggested should be included. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.22 (now 8.25) to read as *The scheme should incorporate the use of Sustainable ~~Urban~~ Drainage Systems (SuDS) approaches* **in line with Development Principle W5**. **SuDS should be designed in accordance with Environment Agency and Construction Industry Research Information Association guidance and chosen to address wider sustainability issues by providing water quality, amenity, and biodiversity benefits as appropriate**. *These ~~will need to be~~* **could include** *non-infiltration S~~U~~**u***DS, and an allowance for surface* **water** *storage in balancing ponds should be made. Other S~~U~~**u***DS methods such as smaller sub-catchment ponds, permeable pavements and swales may also be used. Applicants are advised to engage with the* **Council and** *Environment Agency early in the application process.*
7.23	Paragraph 7.23 is a direct contradiction to paragraph 8.22. Rather than listing specific SUDS devices is should state that **SUDS should be selected in accordance to CIRIA guidance and chosen to address wider sustainability issues by providing water quality, amenity, and biodiversity benefits as appropriate**. The provision to enhance and create new ponds is good.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** This is agreed, the level of detail should be commensurate with there the application covers. The SPD has been revised (see action to other similar response) sets out the requirements which are not over and above that expected at the masterplanning stage **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW5	Development Principle W5 is generally acceptable, however the requirement for landscape and visual assessments and green infrastructure plans at the masterplanning stage needs to reflect a single application will be unlikely. The scope of the technical work needs to be at an appropriate level and detail to reflect the broad sequence at Appendix 3.	
Rep No. 145a		**Response:** This is agreed, Larks Hill will not be built upon but retained and enhanced as specified in paragraphs 2.5, 4.23, 7.6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 and Development Principle W5. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW5	Larks Hill needs to be preserved as it has an abundance of wildlife and used by grazing cattle.	
Rep No. 114a		**Response:** The existing designated dog walking areas (known as SANGs) at Larks Hill and Garth Meadow will be retained. Additional open spaces for dog walkers (new SANGs) will also be provided with the development. New SANG provision will also be required at a standard of 8 ha per 1000 people as required by Development Principle W6. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.25	Object because the dog walking areas will be gone.	
Rep No. 119a		
7.25	Objection because the area is designated as SANG.	
Rep No. 146a		
7.25	This land is supposed to be a SANG not a building site.	
Rep No. 148a		
7.25	Where will dog walkers go?	
Rep No. 130a		
DPW6	This proposal includes two parks that will be built upon leaving nowhere to walk dogs	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 30		**Response:** This is agreed and Development Principle W6 makes it clear that the site should provide a bespoke SANGs solution in line with the Council's standards for provision. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.27	2,200 houses means 5,500 people which means 44 hectares of SANG will be required.	
Rep No. 102a		
7.27	The SANG ratio needs to be maintained	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** Development Principle W6 makes it clear that the site should provide a bespoke SANGs solution in line with the Council's standards for provision. Cabbage Hill is much larger than 11.69 hectares. The preferred solution is that Cabbage Hill provides the SANG but there may be alternative solutions which include a combination of on-site (part of Cabbage Hill) and off site SANGs. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.29	The area set aside for SANGS does not appear to be large enough to support 5,500 people. 44 hectares of SANG is required but Cabbage Hill is 11.69 ha's (I think) and with the existing Cut Cluster it does not appear to add up to 44 ha's How is it being met and why not lower the density?	
Rep No. 14		**Response:** This is agreed and Natural England will be included in all necessary discussion on alternative provision and will be a consultee during the production of the Appropriate Assessment of the bespoke SANGS solution irrespective of whether it is on-site, off-site or a combination of both. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.29	NE should be included in discussing, considering and agreeing alternative mitigation packages.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Support is noted.
7.29	BS support this guidance. The development of BS's land will facilitate the early delivery of SANGs.	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is not agreed that the level of development at the site should be linked to any increased housing allocation as a result of the South East Plan. It is inherent that Cabbage Hill is the preferred solution for the SANGs, however for clarification it is agreed that additional text should be added.
7.29	If it is concluded that that no other land is required to meet housing requirements set out in the South East Plan then Cabbage Hill should clearly be identified as the preferred location for SANG provision.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Paragraph 7.29 should make it clear that Cabbage Hill is the preferred SANGs solution.	**Action:** Amend the second sentence in paragraph 7.29 (now 7.30) to read as *Unless an alternative scheme is agreed with the Counci*l **and Natural England**, *the new SANGS will consist of Cabbage Hill* **<u>including Long Copse</u>** **<u>(the preferred solution)</u>**,**the Cut River Park, Land at Manor Farm and Bull Brook River Park**, *as shown***on the Concept Plan***in Figure 4.*
Rep No. 53		
7.32	Paragraph 7.32 should make it clear that Cabbage Hill is the preferred SANGs solution.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Noted. However, the in perpetuity requirement is a consistent approach that is agreed with Natural England and all the SPA affected local authorities. The definition of in perpetuity is 125 years which is in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD Consultation Draft which is being consulted upon in September 2011. Comments on this issue should be made on this SPD rather than the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.30	BS reserve their position on the "maintained in perpetuity" provision until the cost of the SANG maintenance in perpetuity provision and the other commuted costs are established.	
Rep No. 54		**Response:** The role of the SPD is to guide developers and set a mechanism for them to work together towards the common aim of achieving comprehensive development across the site. The SPD cannot demand that land values are equalised although it is recognised that developers will need to hold constructive dialogue with each other as a matter of course. Additional text should be considered. **Action:** Add a new sentence following the first sentence of paragraph 7.30 (now 7.31) which reads as: **<u>Although equalisation is a matter between developers the Council will consider a facilitation role in bringing the SANGS forward. For example, anySANGS provided by a developer which is in excess of the SANGS</u>**
7.30	Paragraph 7.30 does not make any reference to the role of land owner and a mechanism for acquisition of land and the equalisation of land values. Persimmon Homes owns a significant part of Cabbage hill that would be required to provide the necessary SANGs but has no other interest. Persimmon are willing to work constructively with the Council and developers to ensure that the sang is delivered as planned but these arrangements need to be clarified.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		<u>requirement for their quantum of development, could be used to provide mitigation for other developments on this site subject to financial and legal agreement.</u>
Rep No. 47		**Response:** It is reasonable to conclude that this part of the site could be developed as part of the first phase of development as reflected in the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.31	The legitimate expectation that SANG must be in place before the occupation of dwellings supports the early development of the BS land.	
Rep No. 133a		**Response:** The Council will ensure that the SANGS will be maintained by provisions in a legal agreement which require a commuted sum for the on-going maintenance to be provided. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.31	How will the Council ensure the SANGS will be maintained?	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** It is considered that landowners/developers should together discuss key infrastructure and open space provision across the site. A stand alone SANG of 1.6 hectares will not pass an Appropriate Assessment because the minimum size is 2 hectares. Furthermore, a comprehensive SANG solution is required. The Council will be proactive in delivery a solution which includes all or part of Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	85 dwellings on Maple Green might be occupied by 200 people which generate a need for 1.6 hectares of SANG which can be accommodate on-site. Therefore the site would not depend on larger SANGs. We query the timing for provision of SANG in one location at Cabbage Hill.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response**: The Council has signed a joint legal agreement with the other SPA affected authorities on 14 June 2011. This has introduced a requirement for SAMM contributions as a material consideration in determining planning applications. A SAMM contribution is not double counting as because the existing access management requirement is superseded by the contribution. Therefore, the text as proposed is
DPW6	The first bullet point refers to a minimum level of SANG provision at 8 ha per 1000 persons where there is no justification. Amend bullet point 1 to read as: **<u>Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to be provided within the site.</u>**	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	The provision of an access management and monitoring contribution is double charging and should not be included. Delete the second sentence of the 3rd paragraph as follows: ~~*"A contribution towards delivering strategic access management and monitoring measures across the SPA in perpetuity will also be required"*~~ A clear and transparent mechanism for SANG delivery should be identified. The Borough Council should play an active role in implementing the process.	justified and will not be deleted. It is agreed that the SPD should include a clear and transparent mechanism for SANG delivery. Additional text should be provided. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No 42a		**Response:** This is agreed and a necessary requirement of a functional SANG. This is detailed in Chapter 7 Green Infrastructure. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	Would wish to see good footpath connections and parking facilities provided in association with the SANG to improve its attractiveness and effectiveness.	
Rep No. 49		**Response:** This is disagreed because it is clear that large developments provide a bespoke SANG solution in line with the Council's Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	Amend DPW6 to reflect that small scale urban extensions can make contributions to mitigate their impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) in accordance with the Council's emerging SPA SPD.	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is inherent that Cabbage Hill is the preferred solution for the SANGs, however for clarification it is agreed that additional text should be added to paragraph 7.29 rather than Development Principle W6. Action: Amend the first bullet point in DPW6 to read as ***A minimum area of 8 hectare per 1000 persons to be provided*** ~~***at***~~**<u>on suitable land which could include</u>** ***Cabbage Hill*** **(including Long Copse), the Cut River Park, Land at Manor Farm and Bull Brook River Park as *shown on the Concept Plan.***
DPW6	DP W6 should make it clear that Cabbage Hill is the preferred SANGs solution.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 113a		**Response:** The provision of measures in accordance with Development Principle W6 will ensure that the integrity of the SPA is not harmed alone by the development or in combination with others. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	The development will greatly affect the 3 species of ground nesting birds on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** The adoption of the Core Strategy means that the EN10 designation is to be revised in due course. The need for a SANG is because of the development. Therefore, the development will need to provide its own bespoke SANGs in line with Development Principle W6. The development will not lose any accessible open space but instead increase the amount available. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	Cabbage Hill designated as EN10 is supposed to be SANG and is supposed to be protected from people making a profit by destroying the environment. The proposal will lose 44 hectares of much needed green space which we have a duty to protect.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		**Response:** The preferred location is Cabbage Hill but an alternative solution will be acceptable including some off-site provision in accordance with Development Principle W6. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	2,200 houses requires 44 hectares of SANG where will this be provided?	
Rep No 194a		**Response:** The proposed development is not taking away SANGS because Larks Hill and Garth Meadows will be retained. The development will need to provide its own bespoke SANGS in line with Development Principle W6. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW6	The proposed development is taking away SANG - will there be enough?	
Rep No. 225		**Response:** This is agreed in that the land may not be accessible SANGS or public open space. However it could form part of the passive open space of public value in visual terms. The Council
DPW6	It is inappropriate to include the lower strips of land fronting Binfield Road as SANGS land. This land is characterised by existing development including	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	dwellings and relates closely to Binfield Road. It has a much weaker visual and functional relationship with the main parts of Cabbage Hill. Given the existence and proximity of residential properties, curtilages, and Binfield Road, it is not appropriate to allocate this as POS or SANGS. Development would not have a harmful affect on the woodland character Cabbage Hill or key long distance views. This should not affect the overall balance between developable areas and the available SANGS mitigation.	considers that it is inappropriate to build on the western side of Cabbage Hill and it has never been the intention to do so. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 19a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 29a		**Response:** The Council will require that as much of existing biodiversity will be protected. Where some habitats will be lost there will be a need to mitigate. Full survey, and assessment of biodiversity is required to properly ascertain what elements should remain and what mitigation should be provided. Examples are that existing Local Wildlife Sites should be retained and that new hedgerows should be planted in Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.33	KWEGC hopes that the rich biodiversity of the area will be properly protected	
Rep No. 114a		**Response:** There will be a loss of countryside because of development needs. However there will not be a loss of accessible recreational areas because existing areas such as Larks Hill be be kept and new areas such as Cabbage Hill and two new river parks will be provided as part of the development. Development Principle W7 states that development will consider and enhance important biodiversity features and habitat. It goes on to require new habitats and linkages between these to existing habitats. Planning applications must be supported by: up-to-date surveys and assessments; the provision of mitigation,
7.33	Object because the countryside walking and wildlife areas will be diminished. Once the green land is gone it will never be regained.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		compensation and new benefits; details of works to be carried out; and proposals for education people. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 124a		**Response:** Initial surveys have been carried out to support the Core Strategy DPD and the preparation of the Warfield SPD. Further detailed ecological studies are/will need to be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the SPD and its development principles including Development Principle W7. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.33	Object because of the loss of habitat including Great Crested Newts. Has an ecological study been carried out?	
Rep No. 127a		**Response:** There will be the loss of some fields and countryside. The development will provide substantial open space and green areas. Development Principle W7 states that development will consider and enhance important biodiversity features and habitat. It goes on to require new habitats and linkages between these to existing habitats. Planning applications must be supported by: up-to-date surveys and assessments; the provision of mitigation, compensation and new benefits; details of works to be carried out; and proposals for education people. Additional text regarding the protection and planting of trees should be added to the SPD. **Action:** Add additional sentences to paragraph 7.16 which read as **Trees make a defining contribution to the character of Warfield, providing a valuable habitat for biodiversity and adding value to development. As such, development proposals will need to be accompanied by a comprehensive tree survey undertaken by a competent arboriculture professional that**
7.33	It will result in the destruction of acres of wildlife habitat	
Rep No. 148a		
7.33	Where will the wildlife go? What about the loss of trees?	
Rep No. 165a		
7.33	Building on green areas for wildlife and nature is not supporting the Council's priorities in the Sustainable Communities Plan. Every day I see wildlife and horses which will end as a result of development.	
Rep No. 181a		
7.33	We are concern about the environments of other countries but are unable to protect our own environment. We have lots of wildlife in our immediate environs and all will be destroyed by the ever increasing march of urbanisation. We need to stand up and fight for our beliefs and beautiful countryside	
Rep No. 186a, 190a, 201a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
7.33	The development will have an adverse impact/destroy wildlife habitat	**accords with BS 5837: 2005. The Council will investigate the further need for individual or groups of existing trees which may warrant TPOs or other protection.**
Rep No. 193a		
7.33	If we are not careful we will lose all the wildlife in the area.	
Rep No. 113a		
7.33	Warfield and Binfield will no longer be semi rural. When Whitegrove was built the owl, bat and deer population went into decline. Water voles, bats badgers and doormice will be greatly affected.	
Rep No. 176a		
7.33	The existing wildlife should not be put under threat by houses	
Rep No. 166a, 167a, 168a		
7.33	Object because of unacceptable/adverse impact on wildlife, flora and fauna.	
Rep No. 169a		
7.33	Warfield is semi rural and has maintained its countryside feel despite the horrendous degree of development at Harvest Ride, Qulem Park and Lawrence Hill. The area is rich with wildlife including deer, badgers and foxes.	
Rep No. 207a		
7.33	What will the impact be on local nature and wildlife?	
Rep No. 211a		
7.33	The paddocks south of Warfield Street are also a habitat for wildlife that are an intrinsic part of the village set in rural countryside.	
Rep No. 229		
7.33	The land is an important ecological habitat	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 4		
7.35	It's an area of great beauty with abundant wildlife which will be lost forever.	
Rep No. 157a		
7.35	Habitat will be destroyed	
Rep No. 158a		
7.35	It is unfair to chase wildlife and foxes away and the area in Spring makes me feel close to nature	
Rep No. 234		**Response:** Currently Cabbage Hill is not fully accessible to anyone other than the land owners except for visual amenity. The development will enable a large proportion of the hill to come forward as accessible open space thereby providing the opportunity for creating a fantastic recreational asset for the area. Long Copse is currently a Local Wildlife Site and will remain as so when the development is completed. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.33	It will be impossible to bring horses safely to the development to the west side of Cabbage Hill and that the area will change in terms of its abundant wild life such as Deer, Foxes, rare Kites and Brown Buzzards	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** This is agreed and further text on how this might be achieved should be added to paragraph 7.34. Development Principle W7 already makes provision for maintaining and improving conditions for biodiversity. Coupled with changes to paragraph 7.34 (now 7.37) there is no need to make additions to DPW7 as a consequence. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.34 (now 7.37) which reads as: **Any development proposals must be sensitive to preserving the newt population including providing sufficient foraging areas and migration routes from pond to pond. The habitat creation should tale**
7.34 and DPW7	The newt survey report (Ref WL17) shows the presence of newts. Any development proposals must be sensitive to preserving the newt population including sufficient foraging areas and migration routes from pond to pond. How will this be taken account of? Ensure the newts needs are fully provided for and the development is sensitive to their needs.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		precedence over recreational amenity where the presence of Great Crested Newts are found.
Rep No. 12		**Response:** This is agreed and text in the SPD should be added to make this clear. **Action:** Add an additional sentence to Paragraph 7.17 (now 7.18) which reads as: **The woodland south of Warfield Street and related wildlife corridors should be, where appropriate, protected and enhanced for their wildlife value.**
Paragraph 7.35	This woodland is also habitat for foxes, rabbits, deer, birds and others. There are deer runs north to west of Old Priory Lane that needs to be considered in detailed planning	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** This point is agreed and the Warfield SPD places a requirement for bat surveys across the site in paragraph 7.35. A bat survey will be a requirement of securing any planning permission and the Council will ensure this is carried out appropriately. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.35 and DPW7	A bat survey should be carried out on any farming buildings to be demolished including those on Maize Lane. Who is responsible for ensuring a bat survey is done? If bats are present this must be taken into account because buildings cannot be demolished if bats are roosting there	
Rep No. 153a		**Response:** Traffic will flow along the routes which will be designed to take it such as Harvest Ride and the new link road. There will be the loss of some fields and countryside. The development will provide substantial open space and green areas. Development Principle W7 states that development will consider and enhance important biodiversity features and habitat. It goes on to require new habitats and linkages between these to existing habitats. Planning applications must be supported by: up-to-date surveys and assessments; the provision of mitigation, compensation and new benefits; details of works to be carried out; and proposals for education people. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
7.37	Traffic will be pushed along Forest road. Green land will be filled up. Wildlife will more likely be caught under the wheels of traffic. You should create enough pockets of greenery/shrub land for wildlife to escape/breath.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 63a		**Response:** The omission of including Brickwork Meadows as a LWS is a mistake and will be rectified by including text in the final version of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the third sentence of paragraph 7.17 (now 7.18) to read as *measures will also be expected to ensure the current Local Wildlife Sites of Long Copse*, **Brickwork Meadows** *and Beggars Roost are maintained.* Amend the first sentence of paragraph 7.40 (now 7.43) to read as *Local Wildlife Sites such as Long Copse*, **Brickwork Meadows** *and Beggars Roost will need to be buffered and linked with the green infrastructure of the site.*
7.40	We oppose a layout of development that would result in the loss or deterioration of a Local Wildlife Site. It appears that part of Brickwork Meadows Local Wildlife Site will be lost to housing. The scheme should be designed to protect, buffer and enhance such sites.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted. Development Principle W7 is generic and does not mention specific measures. However, the suggested text should be added in the SPD. **Action:** Amend Paragraph 7.40 (now 7.43) by adding a new sentence which reads as: **Buffer zones adjacent to watercourses forming a continuous line of habitat are required adjacent to The Cut and The Bull Brook..**
DPW7	We welcome all of the supporting text which accords with PPS9 and the current South East Plan Policy on Green Infrastructure etc. This principle should include the use of buffer zones adjacent to watercourses and a continuous line of habitat to be provided adjacent to The Cut and The Bull Brook.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** There should be enough land for development whilst also protecting important ecological habitats. The Council expects good planning of the site incorporating as much of the existing ecological features as possible. It would be wrong in planning terms to plan solely for the market demands of individual sites owners rather than comprehensively across the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW7	It should be made clear that the biodiversity of a particular part of the scheme shall not prevent the planned development from proceeding. Amend DPW7 by adding an additional sentence which reads as: **Subject to appropriate mitigation measures sites which have important ecological habitats shall not be precluded from development.**	

8 Responses to 'Social and Physical Infrastructure'

Table 8

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The Council has reviewed capacities in the School Places Plan. Existing schools are or will be oversubscribed. The existing schools do not have the room to expand or provide temporary accommodation hence the need to provide new primary schools within the site. Therefore, all residential elements of the development must contribute towards the construction of necessary on-site primary schools. One of the primary schools must be provided early in the development with the other to follow. The development of the site has to be comprehensive and the council is clear on this matter. It is unacceptable for individual piecemeal sites to come forward. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	The BFC school places plan shows a surplus of 15 spaces in North Bracknell although some schools were over-subscribed. There are 3 places at Warfield primary and Whitegrove is projected to have an intake of 52 against an admission figure of 60. However, both Whitegrove and Warfield are projected to be oversubscribed by 23 and 42 places during 2011-2015. BFB does not have a five year housing supply and the 85 dwellings are urgently needed, this has to be balanced against temporary pressure on local schools. The development could make a financial contribution to provide a temporary classroom at Whitegrove primary subject to space.	
Rep No. 35a		**Response:** The development will make the necessary provision for schooling at all levels as set out in Development Principle W8. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	If school provision is proportionate to the number and type of dwellings then no concerns should arise.	
Rep No. 106a		
8.1	There are not enough places in current schools.	
Rep No.114a		
8.1	Object because local primary schools are at capacity	
Rep No. 144a, 215a		
8.1	Object because of the pressure on schools	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 117		
8.1	Schooling is already insufficient in Warfield as my 3 year old child cannot get into the local nursery school. The main primary school has a 2 year waiting list due to high demand for places. How can the schools cope with 2,200 dwellings when they cannot cope now – they won't.	
Rep No. 121a		
8.1	The schools will not be provided as there will not be enough pupils to cover primary, junior and secondary education. This will mean the children will suffer in over subscribed classes	
Rep Nos. 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		
8.1	We are already concerned about getting our child/children into our local school?	
Rep Nos. 152a, 156a		**Response:** The provision of a new secondary school is a strategic issue which relates to more than one site. The school at Jennett's Park is being built. The development will make the necessary provision for schooling at all levels as set out in Development Principle W8. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	There is no secondary school planned and I reflect on the lack of a school at Jennet's Park which was promised.	
Rep No. 157a		**Response:** This is disagreed and evidence shows there is a need for primary and secondary schools. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	We do not need any more schools	
Rep No. 179a		**Response:** This is disagreed because the development will provide 2 new 2-form entry primary school which meets the projected need. The development will also contribute to secondary school and other school provisions.
8.1	The development will not address the shortfalls in school numbers even with a couple of schools	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 222		**Response:** The secondary school is proposed to be in Binfield because it is considered to be a good location and will serve Binfield, the Warfield development and other areas which will be formed up in determining actual catchment areas. The remainder of the comments are related to the SADPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	Its interesting that the plan is to build 2200 houses in one area of Warfield and then funnel all that traffic down to another area increasing demand on the busy road system at that time in the morning. I can quite understand there would be a requirement for additional schools in the area if you must build that number of houses but turning a green field site into several schools and 400 houses and a football ground does not seem ideal. It also seems a small place in which to build all these facilities if you really do want good facilities and pitches plus leaving that boundary between Bracknell and Binfield.	
Rep No. 223		**Response**: The Warfield development will place the demand for about 1/3rd of the places in the new secondary school. There is a real opportunity to deliver a high quality secondary school site in Binfield and the Council are seeking its deliver in a timely manner. Development at Warfield will be required to pay its fair share towards its delivery. It is not as easy to simply move housing in exchange for a secondary school as other factors such as viability, location and costs need to be factored in. The Council has taken a view that the preferred location for thew school is in Binfield and all efforts are being made to ensure this is a robust and deliverable option. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.1	Given most of the development is in Warfield why is the new secondary school not placed in Warfield as well? Having the school in Binfield will create a huge number of east west journeys in the future. Move some of the Warfield housing to Binfield and have the school in the middle. Also how do 800 primary school places translate in to 300 secondary school places? Is there that much underutilisation in the rest of the Borough's schools?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 86a		**Response:** The development will provide 2 new primary schools and a contribution towards a new secondary school in line with Development Principle W8 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.2 – 8.10	Existing primary and secondary schools are over subscribed	
Rep No. 89a		
8.2 – 8.10	Objection because we don't have enough schools	
Rep No 137a		
8.2	Question the need for 3 primary schools.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The Local Education Authority have confirmed there is no spare capacity and that existing schools are not capable of expansion. The development places a need for 2 new two form entry primary schools and financial contributions towards a new secondary school and special needs education as stated in Development Principle W8. Officers have and will continue to work closely with the Local Education Authority in regards to capacity issues. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.3	The evidence base for 2 (2 form entry) primary schools has not been explained or justified. The Council's School Places Plan (2010-15) does not look beyond 2015 in detail and post 2015 is when most development will be delivered.	
Rep No. 47		
8.3	To provide flexibility to respond to changing school rolls more flexible wording to deliver two primary schools on site is required or to enable alternative provision either through additional primary school capacity off site or using existing primary school capacity.	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** Two primary schools are required because the level of housing is not to be reduced. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
8.3	Provide only 1 primary school in line with reduced housing.	
Rep No. 62		**Response:** The provision of schools will be to serve the development. It is logical to build one of the schools early and one later although this is subject to negotiation and phasing. It is a matter for the local education authority to designate appropriate catchment areas notwithstanding the comments above.
8.3	Want to be assured that the schools only take pupils from new area and not from existing schools. We are not convinced that the volume of housing proposed is sufficient for 2 primary schools. Of the two schools one should be built first and filled before the other. We would likely to	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	be consulted in a timely manner on any changes to primary school catchment areas.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** This is agreed and the Concept Plan has been revised. **Action:** Amend Concept Plan to include a primary school next to the local centre.
8.5	A primary school should be located next to the neighbourhood centre which would have access to Priory Fields and shops which would benefit from morning and afternoon business.	
Rep No. 54		
8.5	A primary school should be located next to the neighbourhood centre	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Flexibility is needed but there is also need to take a long term view for the site rather than solely reacting to current market demands. Therefore, the development should have the correct planning solution which may mean higher densities/apartments in certain parts of the site. **Action:** An amended Concept Plan and supporting text has been made in the final version of the Warfield SPD.
8.7	A flexible approach to the mix of development is needed and should be committed to in the plan because the market for apartments is challenging.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The developers will build the new primary schools but will be required to contribute on a financial basis to secondary school provision as set out in Development Principle W8. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.7	Paragraph 8.7 is predicated on the basis that the developer builds the schools. Given the site will not be delivered by a single planning application an alternative option should be that developers provide land and financial contributions to the Local Education Authority.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** This is agreed and the Council will justify the infrastructure and amenities it seeks either in the SPD or through subsequent evidence. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.8	The evidence base must be made available to justify contributions	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 5		**Response:** The formal allocation of both The Blue Mountain and Warfield sites will be through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD). The SADPD along with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan propose a comprehensive set of sites and infrastructure provision, including the Secondary School to meet the Borough's needs. There is a clearly identified need for a new secondary school in the Borough arising from the existing population as well as from the planned development. No suitable alternative sites for a secondary school have been identified and Blue Mountain is considered the most suitable available site. The development of Warfield, and other sites in the north of the Borough, will be phased with the introduction of additional secondary school accommodation with Blue Mountain as the first choice, though there may need to be provision at an alternative location prior to the delivery of Blue Mountain. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.9 and 8.10	Concern that secondary education provision is linked to the promise of a secondary school on the Blue Mountain site. The Blue Mountain site may not even be available for this school. It is inappropriate to make the provision of services in one area or parish dependent on another area or parish when they are in different consultation processes.	
Rep No. 13		
8.10	It is inappropriate to include a secondary school at Blue Mountain when planning for Warfield when Blue Mountain is not adopted. If it does not go ahead where does this leave the secondary school proposal?	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The primary and secondary school places are projected by the local education authority based on up-to-date information. Equally there is no basis for the seemingly arbitrary numbers put forward in this representation. The most deliverable site for the secondary school has been identified at Blue Mountain in Binfield which will be in a good location to serve Binfield and Warfield. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.9	It is not clear how 800 primary school places translates to 300 secondary school places. The SPD grossly underestimates the requirement for secondary education which should be at least 750 places. There is a strong case for the provision of a secondary school within the Warfield SPD site which could be sited on Cabbage Hill.	
Rep No. 15a		**Response:** The timing of the new secondary school is important and the Council is undertaking important work regarding costs and implementation.
8.9	The secondary school must be delivered first as Garth Hill is oversubscribed. The proposed school at Blue Mountain	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	appears to be delivered in too late a time frame to support Amen Corner and Warfield.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 34		**Response:** Garth Hill School was built to meet existing demand. It is already a very large school (9 forms of entry) and is projected to be full. The development generates a need for a contribution towards secondary school provision as required by Development Principle W8. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.9	Garth Hill College will increase its capacity to there will be no problems for Maple Green.	
Rep No. 34		
8.9 and 8.10	Bloor are not clear as to why a new secondary school is required when Garth Hill College will increase its capacity in 2011. Garth Hill is only about 1.6 km away which is a feasible distance for walking and cycling, whereas Blue Mountain is 3.5km away. The SPD needs to justify the need for for secondary provision. If justified, a tariff must be in the SPD.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Noted.
8.9 and 8.10	It is noted that costings and apportionment are not available. We will comment when it is made available.	
Rep No. 90a		**Response:** This is agreed and the development will provide a contribution towards a new secondary school and special needs education in line with Development Principle W8 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.9 – 8.11	The local secondary and special needs school are over subscribed	
Rep No 137a		
8.9	Question the lack of provision for additional secondary school places.	
Rep Nos 166a, 167a, 168a		
8.9	Object because of the lack of secondary schooling and Garth is over subscribed	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** This is not agreed because the Council wants to see comprehensive development across the whole site in accordance with the SPD. However, the
8.10	The WSPD acknowledges that interim arrangements can be made prior to the development of the new secondary	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	school to allow some development to proceed at Warfield. The sentence should be redrafted to recognise that there may be surplus capacity in other infrastructure areas sufficient to allow initial phases of development to proceed in advance of new infrastructure provision.	Council will be required to demonstrate that there is capacity or otherwise at the detailed planning stage. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 21		**Response:** The provision of facilities in new schools are a matter for the local education authority. The SPD would not oppose such a facility being provided if deemed necessary. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
DPW8	One of the schools should include a theatre which would improve a child's creativity, reading skills, commitment, dedication, responsibility, self-esteem and public speaking skills. The theatre could also be available for local groups.	
Rep No. 40		**Response:** The precious development delivered 2 one-form entry schools in association with a larger development (over 4000 dwellings). This development will provide 2 two-form entry schools for 2,200 dwellings which is enough to meet the demands generated by the development based on up-to-date and robust evidence of pupil generation from new housing. There may be the need for temporary accommodation until the schools are up and running as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
DPW8	WPC do not believe that 2 primary schools are enough given past experience from the Whitegrove development. Some Warfield children travel to schools in Winkfield which are already over subscribed. WPC are concerned that the school on Blue Mountain will not be delivered soon enough. Where will the children go to school in the meantime?	
Rep No. 34		See response to paragraphs 8.9 and 8.10
DPW8	Please see the comments and requested changes in paragraph 8.9 and 8.10.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** There is a need for on-site provision of 2 primary schools. Therefore, arrangements need to be made between developers who provide the land for the schools/build them and developers who will reimburse them in part. It is appropriate for a financial contribution in-lieu of secondary school provision and for Special Educational Needs.
DPW8	In line with comments on Paragraph 8.7 DPW8 should be amended to provide the option to provide financial contributions for all education provision.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The SPD will contain as much of the costs as possible where they are know. Otherwise, costs will be made available as soon as studies or relating evidence is completed. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
DPW8	The costs if these requirements should be quantified and proportioned to be paid out of the development land values estimated and included in the SPD as a viability appraisal.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** This is agreed and text to the SPD should clarify this. **Action:** Amend the last sentence of paragraph 8.12 (now 8.13) to read as **Nearby, but not at the Community Hub**~~*multi-functional centre*~~**site, a teenage shelter**~~*/It should also include a nearby kickabout/*~~*basketball/skateboard area* **should be provided within the Active Open Space of Public Value and away from residences.**
8.12	The kick-about / basketball / skateboard area be relocated to a suitable Active OSPV not near to residential areas.	
Rep No. 90a		**Response:** The development will provide necessary facilities in a neighbourhood centre such as shops, a unit which could be a dentists and other uses and a community hub. There is a large supermarket and petrol station nearby,doctors surgery, two community centres, pubs and a library nearby. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.12	Facilities such as play groups, kids groups, food shops, post offices, doctors, petrol stations play areas are non existent in the area	
Rep No. 40		**Response**: The neighbourhood centre will contain a new community hub which will have a range of facilities such as meeting rooms and a hall as specified in Development Principle W7 of the Warfield SPD. There has been no identified need for spiritual amenities. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.12	The on-site centre should include a community hall because there is insufficient space for local groups to use. We note there is no provision for spiritual amenities.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 21		**Response:** The multi-use centre will not contain a theatre but its hall could be used for such activities as it will need to be flexible for a range of activities. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW9	The neighbourhood centre could include a performance space with stage and changing rooms which would benefit the new community. If a theatre is not to be included in a school a youth theatre could be established here.	
Rep No. 34		**Response**: The development will need to make contributions to a range of infrastructure and facilities such as the new centre, schools, open space, SPA mitigation and so on. Facilities in the new centre will also be used by people form development on the eastern side such as the new multi-functional centre and therefore it is appropriate for the development to make a contribution towards its provision. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW9	We question whether the centre to be developed on the western part of the Warfield Development area should be contributed to by the development on the eastern part, because the latter will be served by the existing Centre. If justified, a tariff must be in the SPD.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The Council has undertaken a strategic viability assessment of the developments in the SADPD including Warfield. This shows that based on the assumptions for infrastructure costs (as in the IDP schedule) that the development is viable. Developers will be expected to submit individual viability assessments which concord or otherwise with the required infrastructure provision for the site. The Council may commission work at the Developers cost to review and verify such assessment. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
DPW9	The costs if these requirements should be quantified and proportioned to be paid out of the development land values estimated and included in the SPD as a viability appraisal.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** It is agreed that the secondary school to be provided at Blue Mountain (see the SADPD) should be considered for provided indoor sports facilities. This issue will be explored in the process to provide the secondary school.
DPW9	The site should include an on-site sports facility. There are no indoor sports facilities in North Bracknell. Could not the facilities at the proposed secondary school be enhanced to provide this amenity?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 104a		**Response:** There is no evidence that there will be an increase in fly tipping and it is not a valid planning consideration. The Council provide a good quality service which collects bins on a weekly basis albeit landfill one week and recycling bins the next. The Council has taken a long term vision of waste recycling and collection. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.15	There will be even more fly tipping.	
Rep No. 117		
8.15	With poor bin collections and an increase in waste the Council will not be able to cope.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Underground facilities are easier to manage and maintain and are better visually than over ground bins. The Council has secured such provision elsewhere. However, changes are required for greater flexibility. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.15 (now 8.16) to read as *All uses on the site should make* **adequate** *provision for bin storage including, where appropriate, communal areas. The Council will expect a good quality of design in such facilities.* Amend paragraph 8.16 (now 8.17) to read as *In addition,* **either two underground waste recycling facilities, or equivalent overground facilities (based on a 1:2 underground – overground ratio)** ~~*two site*~~*s should be provided* **on an area of hardstanding** *within the scheme***;** *each consisting of* ~~*an underground recycling facility with*~~ *three containers for glass recycling, a litter bin alongside and* ~~*an area of hard standing for*~~ *a charity textile bank.* **Facilities should be easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport.**
8.16	The rationale and justification for the "*underground"* recycling facilities is required.	
Rep No 140		**Response:** Council policy on waste collection is not a matter for the Warfield SPD to resolve.
8.16	This is a major issue of concern because the borough encourages compost bins	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	which encourages rats. We have had to get rid of ours and kill 3 rats in our backgarden. Need to look at what neighbouring councils are doing e.g. Collections of compost caddies.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 60		**Response:** Noted
DPW10	DPW10 is supported	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The Council has consulted with the relevant health providers in respect to this site during the production of the Core Strategy DPD, Warfield SPD and this SAPDPD. They have indicated that health provision should be provided in the new health space associated with the town centre. However the potential provision of a dentist should be included in the text. Further, should a doctors surgery be subsequently required text should be included in the SPD to accommodate this. The provision of a hospital is a matter for the relevant health authority and the Government and not provided by developer contributions. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.15 (now 4.16) which reads as **<u>Whilst a Doctor's Surgery has not been identified following consultation with the relevant health authority at the time of the SPD, a surgery may be provided in the neighbourhood centre should the need for one be subsequently identified.</u>**
8.17	We support the proposal to provide units for doctor and dentist facilities in the new neighbourhood centre.	
Rep No. 40		
8.17	There is not enough capacity in the medical centres in Binfield, Warfield and Winkfield. This is a major omission. The residents cannot be expect to travel to the Bracknell Healthspace if it is provided.	
Rep No. 80		
8.17	The PCT does not wish stand alone GP surgeries in any new neighbourhood centre. Section 106 contributions are required to enhance and improve capacity at existing GP surgeries, and the planned Bracknell Health Space.	
Rep No. 80a		
8.17	The PCT notes that specific reference is made to requirements in the Warfield SPD. There are no specific health care requirements other than to ensure there is good public transport access to the proposed Health Space.	
Rep No. 86a		
8.17	Local surgeries are at capacity	
Rep No. 89a		
8.17	Objection because we don't have enough hospitals	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 90a		
8.17	Local surgeries are at capacity	
Rep No. 94a		
8.17	What provision is made for local doctor surgeries?	
Rep No. 106a		
8.17	The doctors will not be able to cope.	
Rep No. 117		
8.17	The area is already struggling with healtchcare facilities with only one surgery and no NHS dentists and the local hospital has been closing down. The healthcare providers will not be able to cope with the new development.	
Rep No. 137a		
8.17	The plans do not show provision for an additional heath centre and general practices. Current provision stretched with practices reluctant to take on new services. Increased demand will also be placed on Berks East Community Services such as district nursing and health visitors.	
Rep No. 144a		
8.17	Another 5,500 people will increase pressure on surgeries, hospitals which are already facing cuts	
Rep No. 154a		
8.17	What are the plans for heath provision?	
Rep Nos. 177a, 178a		
8.17	An additional 4,400 people will place further strain on the local NHS	
Rep No. 189a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
8.17	We need a hospital which should be more of a priority than building homes.	
Rep No. 113		
8.17	There will be no doctors and the local Whitegrove surgery will not cope.	
Rep No. 223		
8.17	This implies that residents will need to travel some way to go to their doctor. Should not facilities be provided in the development itself?	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** The Police are a statutory consultee who have been consulted at each and every stage of the Core Strategy DPD, SADPD and Warfield SPD. They have not indicated at any time that they will not be able to cope with extra patrolling. Therefore, this is a matter for the police force to resolve. However, the development can provide for accommodation for the police if necessary, for example a police point in the multi-use centre. Text should be added to the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add new paragraphs 8.20 and 8.21 which read as **In order to maintain effective policing levels in the Warfield area and respond to the needs of a growing population, the need for a police point has been identified. This should be provided as part of the multi-functional Community Hub (see Development Principle W9) to act as a satellite operational base for officers and personnel from Bracknell Police Station.** **In order to maintain effective policing levels in the Warfield area and respond to the needs of a growing population, the need for a police point has been identified. This should be provided as part of the multi-functional Community Hub (see**
8.17	Policing is poor in the area and I have experienced lots of crime. This will get must worse with more housing especially social housing.	
Rep No.s. 177a, 178a		
8.18	If cuts hit the Thames Valley Police force in Bracknell how will a service be provided to the public when they are already over stretched?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		<u>Development Principle W9) to act as a satellite operational base for officers and personnel from Bracknell Police Station.</u> **<u>Additionally, Thames Valley Police request developers to notify them of proposed works and dates for laying ducting along highways in order to assess opportunities to 'double-up' and lay Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cabling.</u>**
Rep No. 64		**Response:** Support is noted.
8.19 to 8.30	The section on flooding and utilities is supported.	
Rep No. 113		**Response:** Most of the land falls outside any flood zones. The development will need to demonstrate that appropriate and necessary drainage is put in place and that flood risk is minimised. Paragraph 8.22 of the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft specifies that a flood risk assessment must be carried out. Paragraphs 7.24 and 8.25 specify that sustainable drainage systems will also be required. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
8.19	Since Quelm Park was built the water table has risen significantly where fields that never used to waterlog now do. Water levels have also risen in The Cut. More houses will aggravate the problem with less land to allow natural drainage. Soakaways are unlikely to be feasible.	
Rep No. 105a		
8.20	The land is flood plain and the large number of houses will reduce natural drainage, creating faster run off and more severe flooding.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is agreed for the reasoning set out in the response. Therefore the text should be amended. **Action:** Amend the 1st sentence of paragraph 8.20 (now 8.21)to read as *A***<u>robust</u>** *Flood Risk Assessment ~~will be required for the site~~***<u>must accompany development proposals.</u>**
8.20	Please remove the word **<u>annual</u>** from the phase 'annual *volumes of runoff*' because mitigation for surface water runoff volumes is required up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change event.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** Noted.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
8.20	A preliminary report to Maple Green (appendix C of the rep) shows no initial drainage problems	
Rep No. 57a		**Response:** The Concept Plan has been revisited to reflect the extent of the flood zones in the area and to provide a reasonable contribution to the Bullbrook River Park. **Action:** The Concept Plan has been amended.
8.20	Grove Gardens has not flooded since the current owners have been in residence (since the mid 1970's). Some land falls within the flood plain but some shown on the Concept Plan as undevelopable is outside. Amend the Concept plan to include more developable land.	
Rep No. 12		**Response:** The development will need to demonstrate that it mitigates any drainage/flooding impacts it will cause. However, for clarification additions to text in the SPD should be made. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.19 (now 8.21) which reads as T*here is a need to consider the impacts ~~and needs of flood risk services and utilities~~* **on utility infrastructure and mitigation required to meet the needs of development. Development will need to provide necessary drainage across the site which should not exacerbate existing problems on or off-site.** Amend Development Principle W 11 to read as **Appropriate Flood Management and Utility Infrastructure**~~**Adequate *potable water, foul water, electricity and gas supply* must be provided to serve each *of the* phases *of development.***~~ **Where necessary, applications shall be accompanied by a flood risk assessment demonstrating that the proposal will not increase flood risk both on and off site.** ***The development should*deliver appropriate drainage provision across the site and*incorporate the use of* SU~~u~~DS *appropriate for the specific characteristics of the site.***
8.20	Nearby this location there is waterlogging and water runs into a dip in the road.	
Rep No. 147a		
8.20	The area is on or borders flood plain which jeopardises development and increase pressure and likelihood of flooding surrounding areas.	
Rep No. 165a		
8.20	Has the increased flood risk been considered. Warfield is boggy and suffers from retaining water which will get worse.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
8.20	Object because there is flood risk from additional polluted run off	
Rep No. 194a		
8.20	Concern about potential issues with flooding	
Rep No. 197a		
8.20	Part of the area is prone to flooding and development will exacerbate this further.	
Rep No. 202a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
8.20	Land on the slopes above and below Harvest Ride are prone to waterlogging and there will be increased run-off from built up areas. Even if upgraded the Cut and balance ponds will have variable effect.	
Rep No. 208a		**Response:** The river corridor designation is a landscape designation and not necessarily prone to flooding. Areas prone to flooding will not be developed for example, the flood zones will form the river park areas for The Cut and The Bull Brook. Measures to mitigate drainage and flooding area required as specified in the Warfield SPD such as in Development Principle W11. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.20	How can flooding not increase and is the land not part of the river corridor designated land?	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted.
8.24	Cabbage Hill is at risk of being cut off during a flood event on the Cut. We are pleased with the approach of designing the road crossing to only be cut off during an '*exceptional flood event*'. The Council must be satisfied that the above measures are possible or an appropriate alternative is provided to ensure that development here will be sustainable	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This issue is now irrelevant because the area will now be deigned to include access points from Harvest Ride as well as across the Cut. Therefore, text should be revised to say that the area should not be cut off even in exceptional flood events. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.24 (now 8.27) to read as *Consideration will have to be given to ensure that the area to the western part of the developed area* will *~~only become~~***not be** *cut off* ***even*** *in an exceptional flood events.*
8.24	Pleased that Cabbage Hill road link should be designed to only be cut off in an '*exceptional flood event'*. The SPD needs to define this.	
Rep No. 32		
8.25	Pleased with the proposal to design the Cabbage Hill essential infrastructure in such a way to ensure that occupants retain these services when the area is cut off. The Council must determine what these essential services are and any alternatives.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The functional flood plain (may flood once in every 100 years which may cut off access to any new road bridge across The Cut. Some dwellings may have access from the Bridge which may mean they are cut off during the rare event that the bridge is inaccessible. Therefore, the Council would like to ensure contingency measures just in case. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.25	What does this mean? Is it predicted that the area in between may flood?	
Rep No.32		**Response:** It is agreed that the text should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.26 (now 8.29) to read as *Green infrastructure, suitable buffer zones to water courses, deculverting and SU~~u~~DS should be incorporated into site design to mitigate flood risk from surface runoff* **river flooding.**
8.26	Pleased with the promotion of space along side all watercourses, the removal of existing culverts and the use of SUDS and green infrastructure to manage flood risk. Please amend paragraph 8.26 to include **'river flooding'**. Welcome the inclusion of these methods in Policy W11 or Policy W7.	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** Ensuring that appropriate waste treatment infrastructure is in place to meet demand from development is a matter to be dealt with between the developer and Thames Water, outside of the planning process as specified in paragraph 8.27 (now 8.29) of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.27	The ability of any water course to cope with treated effluent relies on dilution which increases the risk of hypoxia, which can harm fish and marine life. The Hazlewood Lane sewage treatment plant is already contributing a high proportion of the flow to The Cut, particularly during dry weather. Preventive measures could include the addition of tertiary treatment or establishing a bog habitat to direct the discharge.	
Rep No. 40		**Response:** It is the statutory duty for the water treatment company to ensure that effective provision is made for. This may or may not require improvements as necessary. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
8.27	Thames Water confirming that there should be foul sewer capacity is not good enough. They need to confirm that capacity will be available. WPC is very concerned about the impact of 2,200 new dwellings without major new improvements to the system.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 64		**Response:** Thames Water have indicated that improvements will be required. Developers will be required to undertake an impact study to gauge the precise nature of these upgrades. This will require early engagement between the utility provider and the developer, outside of the planning process, to ensure appropriate infrastructure funding is in place and is delivered on-time. Therefore the SPD should be amended for clarification. The title of this paragraph should also be amended to be consistent with the IDP. **Action:** Amend the title to read as ~~***Foul Drainage***~~ **Waste Water**. Add additional sentences to paragraph 8.27 (now 8.30) which read as: **Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure. Developers should liaise with Thames Water early to ensure waste water infrastructure is adequate and delivered in a timely manner.**
8.27	The development is likely to be treated at the Bracknell Sewage Treatment Works (STW) which is the most likely STW to treat drainage from new growth. The level of growth from Warfield and other sites could require upgrades in the future. It is necessary to undertake investigations into the level of development in the SADPD. This will take 12 weeks to complete. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade it will take up to a 3 year lead in time. Amend Paragraph 8.27 to read as: **Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.** The timescales for delivery local upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years and new resources can take 7 – 10 years. It is vital that drainage strategies are produced is support of development which identify any constraints and where , when, and whom will be providing the upgrades ahead of occupation. Water and sewerage undertakers have powers to prevent connections to distribution networks ahead of infrastructure upgrades.	
Rep No. 113		
8.27	The upgrade to the pumping station will take time and money.	
Rep No. 40		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
8.29	Stating there should be capacity is not good enough. It should be confirmed that there will be capacity.	
Rep No 58		**Response:** The development will need to make provision for water supply in accordance with paragraph 8.28. However further clarification should be provided in the text to explain the water supply requirements. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.28 (now 8.31) to read as *South East Water have allowed for planned growth in the Borough. A combination of off site works* **to upgrade local** ~~*and*~~ *infrastructure and connection works* ~~*would*~~**will** *be required.* A**dditionally, in order to reduce the impact on local water resources, developers will be required to deliver new homes with a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/capita/day.**
8.28 and Appendix 2	Bracknell Forest is located in an area of severe water supply stress with a consumption higher than the national average. The proposals by South East Water will not increase capacity but usage which will exacerbate the water stress situation. The Warfield and other developments will increase the risk of water shortages. These shortages will be more severe in extended periods of dry weather. This is a very serious issue which will have devastating effects unless robust proposals are identified before any of the planned developments in the Borough.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** It is not considered necessary to include the provisions of contingency flooding measures in DPW11 because this is a general requirement in the development as specified in paragraphs 8.22 to 8.29 as amended. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW11	Amend DPW11 to include measures mentioned in comments to 8.24 -8.26.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The text in the Warfield SPD ensures that flood risk should be mitigated, however, further clarification should be made to Development Principle W11 on this issue. A constraints map showing flood zones is available on request. **Action:** Add the following sentence to Development Principle W11 which reads as **Where necessary, applications shall be accompanied by a flood risk**
DPW11	The 1:100 year + 10% flooding risk events should be shown on a constraints plan. The locations of all main services should be shown on a Utilities plan. Amend DPW11 by adding the following sentence:	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	All planning applications shall demonstrate via a flood risk assessment that they do not increase flood risk within the scheme.	**assessment demonstrating that the proposal will not increase flood risk both on and off site.**
Rep No. 64		**Response:** Support is noted.
DPW11	Development Principle W11 is supported.	

9 Responses to 'Transport and Accessibility Infrastructure'

Table 9

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 36		**Response:** The proposed changes to the network are detailed in the Warfield SPD and a map showing these will be provided. These changes relate mainly to junctions rather than new roads. However, the new streets to be provided will be detailed at the planning application stage. **Action:** Add a Site Analysis - Existing Movement Plan.
9.1	The traffic model for this development must be carefully thought out. It would be helpful if residents could see the next stage of planning with existing roads displayed with an overlay of the proposed network.	
Rep No. 42a		**Response:** The development is required to ,mitigate its traffic impact in during and after constriction. The Council has assessed the impact of the Warfield site with all developments including those in Wokingham Borough in its work relating. This includes assessing improvements to the network such as junctions and roads and also modes such as buses, walking and cycling in Warfield. The aim of these improvements, which will be funded by the developer, is to limit the impact on the network and demonstrate that it does not worsen the situation. The development will be required to implement all necessary works in accordance with Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. Furthermore, measures for Warfield and other sites are included in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Submission Version of the SADPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	Object because the traffic generated by this development will be awful both during construction and after and will result is a threefold increase in houses and cars.	
Rep No. 113		
9.1	The roads can barely cope now let alone with at least an extra 4,400 cars	
Rep No. 114a		
9.1	Object because the local transport network is already chaotic and busy.	
Rep No. 143a		
9.1	The infrastructure will not cope with the extra traffic	
Rep No. 144a		
9.1	Increased traffic will create noise and pollution and urbanise the area Transport infrastructure will be affected and there may be a need for more public transport	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 148a		
9.1	The area suffers from traffic congestion	
Rep No. 149a		
9.1	Little consideration has been given to infrastructure and the roads are becoming busier and snarled up with traffic.	
Rep No. 156a		
9.1	I do not see any evidence that transport infrastructure will be able to support will be able to support 2,200 houses and the wider development in the Northern Arc. Junction 10 is already too busy due to the sheer weight of traffic. The plans for development will gridlock between Blue Mountain and Whitegrove.	
Rep No. 157a		
9.1	We do not need any more traffic on our roads in Warfield	
Rep No. 179a		
9.1	The traffic problems will get worse	
Rep No. 186a		
9.1	The road network will not cope and create additional pollution	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
9.1	Object because local roads cannot cope with thousands of extra cars	
Rep No 182		
9.1	There will be a significant increase in road congestion and likelihood of road danger despite the reference to slowing Harvest Ride	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The rationale is that the Warfield SPD is part of a wider project in terms of assessing the overall road

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.2	Some of these roundabouts are a long way from the development (Such as the station roundabout) What is the rationale for using money on improving these that was meant to mitigate the affect of traffic in the Warfield and North Bracknell area?	network and improving it in a comprehensive manner. The testing of developments such as Warfield demonstrates that the impact is not always felt in the immediate area but further along the Boroughs strategic network where the additional trips force the junction over capacity. The development of the Boroughs Transport Model has allowed us to look at the wider impact of such developments and then test possible improvements. All developments will be required to contribute towards the overall network with some more to certain junction than others according to their respective impact. However, the apportionment of contributions/works is a matter for negotiation. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 109a		**Response:** Roads such as Harvest Ride will feature additional junctions and formal safe crossing points to help the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. This will bring the actual speed of the road down to its official speed limit and act as traffic calming features. Furthermore, where appropriate, designing development closer to the road will be which is effective in making drivers consider their speed. The development will include buffers and noise barriers were appropriate. A requirement to slow Harvest Ride is specified in Paragraph 4.17 of the Warfield SPD. Other requirements in the SPD will contribute to safety on other roads within or near to the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	What is the plan to manage the significant additional traffic which compound existing issues of speed, noise and pedestrian safety?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 121a		**Response:** The development with other developments in the SADPD will provide transport improvements across the borough which together will mitigate the impact each development causes in terms of congestion and this includes modifications to Twin Bridges. All developments and measures have been modelled which therefore support the improvements in the Warfield SPD. As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	The existing roads are already congested in the morning and will be saturated by the new development. The document talks about improvements to the local road network beyond Warfield which shows the impact of the development. The new roundabout on the A329 has lead to further congestion at Twin Bridges which causes an increase in motorists jumping red lights. Siting traffic cameras here would pay for all our Councils taxes. This junction must be on the UK top most dangerous roads. Many other roads should have their speeds downgraded and are maintained poorly and an extra 4,400 cars will further erode road conditions. I applaud your efforts to down grade the speed limit to 20mph and provide plenty of area for cyclists and pedestrians but in these current times people will only use these at weekends as they will work all hours trying to earn a living. Most people work away from the area and the current bus services runs at the wrong time to the wrong places and will probably close as there are not enough people to make it viable. Buses need to run to Windsor, Maidenhead, the Meadows and the Oracle. Buses do run to these areas but you have to make a connection in Bracknell to do so. There is no bus service to the train station in the morning from Warfield which would take some vehicles off the roads but this takes planning and funding which won't happen in these austere times.	
Rep No. 124a		**Response:** The development with other developments in the SADPD will provided transport improvements across the borough which together will mitigate the impact each development causes in terms of congestion. All developments and measures have been modelled which therefore support the
9.1	2,200 homes will place undue stress on local infrastructure. The roads in the village are already overcrowded with traffic speeding.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		improvements in the Warfield SPD. One of the objectives of the Warfield SPD is to slow traffic speeds for example, roads such as Harvest Ride will feature additional junctions and formal safe crossing points to help the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. This will bring the actual speed of the road down to its official speed limit and act as traffic calming features. Furthermore, where appropriate, designing development closer to the road will be which is effective in making drivers consider their speed. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No 140, 140a,		**Response:** High speed rail link are a strategic matter for central government. However, Cross Rail will run to Berkshire and the Council will look to improve public transport services to and from here when it becomes live. Therefore, this is no a matter for the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	Many need cars work which is not nearby or easily linked to. Need to look at a high speed rail link to London and routes to Windsor etc.	
Rep No 144a, 177a, 178a		**Response:** As a result of the development there will be a significant increase in the numbers of vehicles. However, the Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	Object because of traffic - it will result in an extra 4,400 cars in Warfield	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 151a		**Response:** Roads such as Harvest Ride will feature additional junctions and formal safe crossing points to help the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. This will bring the actual speed of the road down to its official speed limit and act as traffic calming features. Furthermore, where appropriate, designing development closer to the road will be which is effective in making drivers consider their speed. The development will include buffers and noise barriers were appropriate. A requirement to slow Harvest Ride is specified in Paragraph 4.17 of the Warfield SPD. Other requirements in the SPD will contribute to safety on other roads within or near to the site. The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	The development will result in a significant increase in cars and Harvest Ride has become a rat run to and from Bracknell causing speed and safety issues. Adding 2,200 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the roads safety, noise and pollution levels.	
Rep Nos, 152a, 156a		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	The plan seeks to reduce the need to travel to make it easier to travel to Bracknell than to the motorway. Which is an admission of planning for insufficient infrastructure. I travel via the A329M for work.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 187a		**Response:** As a result of the development there will be a significant increase in the numbers of vehicles. However the Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	There will be considerably more traffic on Harvest Ride	
Rep No. 188a		
9.1	Object because of increased traffic	
Rep No. 189a		
9.1	The roads and amenities cannot cope.	
Rep No. 191a		**Response:** As a result of the development there will be a significant increase in the numbers of vehicles. However, the Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. The development will also be required to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and provide suitable on-site renewable energy generation in compliance with the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	The traffic in Quelm Park is already bad and development will ruin the environment	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 194a		**Response**: The Council recognises that speeding is a problem and therefore requires measures to be implemented to slow Harvest Ride (see paragraph 4.17). The new link road will balance traffic along it and the existing route through Newell Green. The new schools will be required to provide effective drop off/pick up places as well as being well located to the housing with excellent pedestrian and cycle routes. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	The additional cars will increase the level of traffic significantly. Speeding is already a problem on Harvest Ride and pushing more cars along it will make it more dangerous. Building the new link road will increase traffic along Harvest Ride, how will it cope? Two additional primary schools will also increase traffic flow around the area. It is unrealistic to think that you can limit the numbers being dropped off by their parents on the way to work?	
Rep No. 193a		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	2,200 houses will cause traffic madness on Forest Road and all the other country roads	
Rep No. 210a		**Response:** Roads such as Harvest Ride will feature additional junctions and formal safe crossing points to help the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. This will bring the actual speed of the road down to its official speed limit and act as traffic calming features. Furthermore, where appropriate, designing development closer to the road will be which is effective in making drivers consider their speed. The development will include buffers and noise barriers were appropriate. A requirement to slow Harvest Ride is specified in Paragraph 4.17 of the
9.1	Since we bought our house Harvest Ride opened up which causes us problems with its speeding cars and traffic noise at night. It is increasingly difficult to get around.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Warfield SPD. Other requirements in the SPD will contribute to safety on other roads within or near to the site. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 212a		**Response:** The Council is looking at the issue of traffic and transport on a comprehensive scale through effective modelling. This modelling has assessed the impact of all developments including those in Wokingham Borough. This includes assessing improvements to the network such as junctions and roads and also modes such as buses, walking and cycling in Warfield. The aim of these improvements, which will be funded by the developer, is to limit the impact on the network and demonstrate that it does not worsen the situation. The development will be required to implement all necessary works in accordance with Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.1	2,200 houses will cause a massive impact and the increased traffic and impact on amenities does not seem to have been addressed. Your proposals seem to focus on getting to Bracknell easier and to discourage the car which is not an option for many people. You are missing the bigger picture or perhaps do not want to acknowledge it?	
Rep No. 231		**Response:** As a result of the development there will be a significant increase in the numbers of vehicles. However the Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. The modelling takes account of the site, others sites in the SADPD and in sites in Wokingham Borough. There will be a careful design of new localised roads
9.1	Traffic is unbearable at times, more homes will increase congestion, clog up the streets and make them more dangerous for children and add to pollution.	
Rep No. 35a		
9.3	RBWM are concerned at the lack of transport modelling support the allocation of Warfield and it is unsound at the moment on this basis.	
Rep No. 4		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.3	2,000 houses will also cause road congestion in an area which is already too busy.	within the development including where they join the existing network to ensure they are safe and do not cause capacity issues. Other requirements in the SPD will contribute to safety on the roads within or near to the site. The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. Maintaining the condition of the Boroughs highway network is part of the Transport Asset Management Plan in line with Local Transport Plan 3. This maintenance strategy will seek to improve the condition of the network in line with customer demands, within budgetary constraints and to affordable levels of service. New additions to the public highway will be adopted with a contribution (commuted sum) for its future maintenance. The Warfield SPD clearly sets out a requirement to slow traffic speeds e.g. on Harvest Ride. The Council has a duty to ensure its transport network is safe but for clarification purposes additional text should also be added to the SPD in respect to safety around the new schools. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 83a		
9.3	The current road system will not cope with the extra traffic and maintenance costs	
Rep. Nos. 86a, 90a, 110a		
9.3	The roads are/will be clogged up at peak times	
Rep No. 106a		
9.3	The infrastructure will not be able to cope as the roads are jammed at rush hour. The roads are in a poor state which should be solved first.	
Rep No. 111a		
9.3	The increase in traffic will be too much with the road between Harvest Ride, Newell Green and Newport Drive already being congested at peak times	
Rep No 137a		
9.3	The current roads are congested and more traffic will increase the risk of injury and accidents for the increasing number of children.	
Rep Nos. 166a, 167a, 168a		
9.3	Object because there will be an increase in traffic which will jam up Quelm Park	
Rep No. 170a		
9.3	Objection because the development will increase congestion	
Rep No. 173a		
9.3	How can the infrastructure cope with increased traffic?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 190a		
9.3	The increase in congestion is unacceptable	
Rep No. 202a		
9.3	There will be 4000 additional vehicles at peak times. Speed is an issue on Harvest Ride, Temple way, Warfield Road (A3095) and Binfield Road B3018. Congestion is a problem at peak times which make exiting from adjoining residential roads difficult, the development will make this worse.	
Rep Nos. 205a, 206a, 207a, 209a		
9.3	How will the already saturated road network cope with 2,200 houses during the morning and evening rush hours?	
Rep No. 229		
9.3	The development will lead to overcrowding on the roads	
Rep Nos. 177a, 178a		**Response:** The development at Warfield will provide the necessary transport measures to ensure that the site is not detrimental to the existing network. The Council's policy is to encourage choice and the opportunity to use alternative modes to the car. Warfield will for example provide new cycleways, pedestrian footpaths and public transport provision. All transport related measures are detailed in Chapter 9 Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.2	Object because access to Warfield can only be achieved via three main routes. B3022 Winkfield Rd heavily congested particularly due to proximity to Lego Land	
Rep No. 9		**Response:** Noted. The latest transport modelling work has been sent to the HA for comment.
9.3	The HA notes that work is underway using the Council's transport model in respect to the SADPD. It is noted that a model was developed to test	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	development for the Core Strategy DPD and that it is being revised in terms of technical specification and to account for changes in development location and scale.	
Rep No. 36		**Response:** The development will be required to make provision for on and off-street parking in accordance with guidance such as the Parking Standards SPD and the Streetscene SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.3	Concerns about increase in on street parking resulting from additional 3000+ cars. Consider the provision of wider pavements.	
Rep No. 11		**Response:** Noted
9.3	We would like to see the results of transport modelling asap.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The full modelling work is comprehensive and includes all sites in the SADPD and in Wokingham Borough. It includes the Warfield SPD site this context. The Council look forward to receiving further modelling from the Consortium also. The infrastructure requirements will be robust but there is a need to ensure flexibility for reasonable and acceptable variations. The SPD states in paragraph 9.3 that the Council will continue to work with interested parties to ensure that transport infrastructure is appropriate to the development which implies flexibility. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.3 and Appendix 2	It is noted that transport modelling work is on-going. Therefore the related measures in Appendix to should only be seen as indicative at this stage. The Consortium are undertaking modelling work which will be shared and should be considered in the final SPD.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The full modelling work is comprehensive and includes all sites in the SADPD and in Wokingham Borough. It includes the Warfield SPD site this context. The Council are not modelling individual sites. Developers are welcome to purchase the model to carry out their own independent modelling.
9.3	If the traffic modelling shows an independent but complementary development can preceded within the capacity of the road system then such development should be supported.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 79		**Response:** The Council is modelling its level of development including along the A322 and the M3. As Surrey County Council are well aware the traffic impacts from Surrey are greater than those coming from Bracknell Forest. Therefore it is essential that Surrey CC take account and mitigate the impact caused from vehicles which have an origin in Surrey. Nonetheless the Council welcomes a close working relationship with Surrey CC in terms of assessing cross boundary issues. The Warfield SPD already references the strategic road network in paragraph 9.26, therefore not necessary to include this recommended text. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.3	Given the potential impacts on Surrey roads please add a new sentence to the document which reads as: **Surrey County Council is concerned about the potential impact on the A322 in the vicinity of Bagshot (A30), and Lightwater (M3). Transport modelling will need to account for the impact of development on the Strategic Road Network in these locations and may have to provide mitigation**	
Rep No. 89a		**Response:** The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD set out all transport requirements to mitigate the traffic impacts of the development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required..
9.3	Mores homes will mean more congestion and pollution	
Rep No. 147a		
9.3	The road network will not be able to cope. What are the UK and EU traffic pollution limits within any given area.	
Rep No. 164a		
9.3	An estimated 4,400 extra cars will increase noise and pollution on Harvest Ride.	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** Traffic calming measures are proven in slowing traffic to safe speeds. The Council has undertaken

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.3	Traffic is increasing in the area and we have had to endure speed humps, and sets of traffic lights. The transport system will not be able cope.	extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 157a		**Response:** The need for an improved pedestrian and cycle network is one of the Council's transport priorities**.** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development as required by the Warfield SPD, there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
9.4	We do not need any more cycle paths	
Rep No. 9		**Response:** Noted. Draft modelling reports have been passed to the HA for comment. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.5	The HA request to be kept informed of the status of detailed modelling and are available to provide comments on this work at any time.	
Rep No. 78		**Response:** It cannot be confirmed that Watersplash Lane is to be a dead end. This largely depends on whether or not the houses fronting Watersplash Lane are developed as well as surrounding fields. It may be that if all the dwellings remain the lane is not suitable as an access road. Furthermore, it may be that an access road comes through land
9.6	Please confirm that Watersplash Lane will remain a dead end and not an access road?	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		south of Watersplash Lane in the fields adjacent to Larks Hill. Further detail on this will be provided during the detail application stage of development. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 13		**Response:** The need for improved public transport is one of the Council's transport priorities**.** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development as required by the Warfield SPD, there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
9.7	There needs to be a direct bus route going straight to Bracknell station (or Martins Heron) every half hour at peak times. Watersplash Lane should not be a major link road into West End as it detracts from Larks Hill. South West Trains ought to provide adequate parking at Martins Heron station. Are there sufficient parking spaces at Bracknell station to support the new community?	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The Council will review the bus strategy for this and other areas as necessary and there will be a need for flexibility to deliver viable and deliverable public transport is provided to and from the site. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
9.7	The use of the Consortium's proposed bus strategy is supported. This will need to be refined during the preparation of the final SPD and applications on the basis of relevant modelling and masterplanning.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** This is agreed because the intension is to ensure effective public transport whilst recognising other requirements of the development. **Action:** In the 3rd bullet point in paragraph 9.7 (now 9.8) replace *maximise* with **promote**
9.7	The reference to maximising opportunities if taken literally is not credible or justified and the word “promote” should be substituted for “maximise”.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** Noted.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.7	Clustering development along principal bus routes will increase viability of services.	
Rep No. 151a		**Response:** Increased population in the area will increase the number of passengers using local bus services, which in turn will increase the viability of bus services, making increased frequency / hours of operation a more realistic prospect. This may be aided in the short term by developer funding to enable improved bus services to be in place from the early stages of the development rather than an 'add on' at a late stage. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.7	The bus service is totally inadequate for commuting to work forcing most people to have at least one car.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The financial contributions will be based on the necessary requirements of the development taking account of matters such as viability. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW12	The financial contributions should be quantified based of viability of the scheme.	
Rep No. 12		**Response:** Any sustainable transport improvements related to the site will be subject to Safety Audit before implementation. Therefore, the exact locations of footpaths including if considered in the vicinity of Blakes Cottage will be considered at the detail planning application stage. **Action:** Add text to the 4th bullet point of paragraph 9.11 (now 9.12) which reads as **(at locations from the site to be agreed which will pass a technical road safety auditing process).**
9.9	A connecting path to Warfield Street next to Blakes Cottage should not be provided because it is unsafe due to the bend in the road.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** Improving sustainable transport links is a key objective when delivering development in Warfield and all possible routes will be investigated.

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.9	Maple Green could link to the existing route on the east of the Bull Brook linking to the north side of County Lane. It could also link to new routes in the wider SA9 area.	**Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 36		**Response:** The specification and width of pavements will need to accord with the Council's standards for provision and , where appropriate, the Streetscene SPD. In planning for the new schools there will be a need to ensure adequate drop off/pick up provision. The SPD should include additional text to make this clear. The Warfield SPD clearly sets out a requirement to slow traffic speeds e.g. on Harvest Ride. The Council has a duty to ensure its transport network is safe but for clarification purposes additional text should be added to the SPD in respect to safety around the new schools also. **Action:** Add a new sentience to paragraph 8.6 which reads as **<u>Suitable provision for dropping off/picking up children by car should be made. The roads around schools should also be designed to slow traffic and to maximise road safety.</u>**
9.9	The pavements should be made wider especially near schools because they will inevitably be a refuge for parked cars.	
Rep No. 144a		
9.9	There will be road safety issues for children	
Rep No. 117		**Response:** Maintaining the condition of the Boroughs highway network is part of the Transport Asset Management Plan in line with Local Transport Plan 3. This maintenance strategy will seek to improve the condition of the network in line with customer demands, within budgetary constraints and to affordable levels of service. New additions to the public highway will be adopted with a contribution (commuted sum) for its future maintenance. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.9	The roads and paths are in a poor condition and the Council will not be able to cope with the extra development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 15		**Response:** This aim is agreed as it is the intention to do so. For clarification additional text should be added to the SPD. **Action:** Add an additional sentence to paragraph 7.11 (now 7.12) which reads as **<u>The north to south connections should also connect with east to west connections, for example, The Cut River Park should run from the Three Legged Cross to Framptons Bridge</u>**
9.11	The proposal is commendable; however it should exploit the full length of The Cut corridor from Three Legged Cross to Frampton's Bridge. This would provide a popular recreational route. There should be increased access to the network of lanes to the north.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** This is agreed because the intension is to ensure effective travel planning whilst recognising other requirements of the development. **Action:** In the 1st sentence of paragraph 9.12 (now 9.13) replace *maximise* with **<u>promote</u>**
9.12	The term "promote" should be substituted for "maximise".	
Rep Nos, 43, 44		**Response:** There will be active dialogue with developers to ensure bus services are effectively provided in new development including necessary subsidy as a matter for negotiation. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW12	The financial bus contributions in DP12 should be on the basis of an agreed assessment of costs and revenues.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DP12, Paragraph 9.11 and Appendix 2	Integrating the site into the pedestrian and cycle network is supported with improvements to some key corridors. The final measures, costs and contributions, as required by DPW12 should be based on actual schemes necessary for this development.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The Concept Plan will not show all the routes because it is not known the routes within specific development parcels. This is a matter for detailed planning. However, existing routes off the site but serving it and some key routes in the site should also be shown. **Action:** Add key route the the Concept Plan and add a proposed Movement and add a Site Analysis - Existing Movement plan to the SPD
DPW13	The main cycle and pedestrian route should be shown on the Concept Plan.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW13 and W15	DP W15 requires development proposals to be supported by detailed traffic modelling and mitigation measures. Bloor have appointed consultants to advise on transportation and infrastructure for Maple Green. They will assess to what degree the measures referred to in paragraphs 9.9-9.24 are justified. The concern is that any attempt to achieve a comprehensive solution and agreement would protract the commencement of the development. Any justifiable investment must be the subject of realistic costs and incorporated within a tariff.	
Rep No. 222		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car which includes cycle routes and cycle parking.
DPW13	There needs to be secure managed location for bikes in Bracknell. Plenty of people don't cycle because they don't want find the bike has gone. The same applies to supermarkets or any location. For most of the year the residents will use theirs cars and there will be 3000+ cars. There are already a lot of houses around warfield with 2-3 cars. This plan just ends up with a whole load more in one single area.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Any new development will be subject to Council Policy on Travel Planning which requires implementation and monitoring of Travel Plans from new development. The Council will implement this policy on a phase by phase basis but the wording should ensure that Council policy is met. Therefore the text should be amended. Action: Amend the first sentence of DPW14 to read as ***The development should be supported by ~~an overarchinga~~ Travel Plan* <u>or set of Travel Plans in line with the blocks in Appendix 3</u>*, School Travel Plans and a Construction Travel Plan.***
DPW14	An obligation to secure consensus agreement by all the landowners will delay delivery. Amend the first sentence of DPW14 to read as: *The* <u>**phases of**</u> *development should be supported by ~~an overarching~~ a Travel Plan, School Travel Plan and Construction Travel Plan.*	
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The development will be required to make provision for on and off-street parking in accordance with guidance such as the Parking Standards SPD and the Streetscene SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.14	Parking provision needs to be appropriate for all homes, insufficient parking is a significant cause of neighbour disputes.	
Rep No. 83a		
9.14	Cars will be parked all over the streets which will make it look unsightly	
Rep No. 197a		
9.14	The development will cause a huge amount of additional traffic causing congestion and parking problems. Many houses have 2+ cars and parking provision is usually insufficient leaving new developments to look like car parks.	
Rep No. 223		
DPW14	Adequate off street parking needs to be provided at the ratio of about 1 car per 1.2 adults. This ensures that the	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	streetscape is not compromised by proper parking.	
Rep No. 90a		
9.14	Surrounding shops already do not have enough parking	**Response:** Existing shops have enough parking. As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development, there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 34		**Response:** It is fundamentally wrong to assume that small incremental sites would not be a problem on the road network. The Council has been clear that a comprehensive approach to development is required in Core Strategy DPD Policy CS5. The Council is carrying forward this in its transport modelling and associated measures. The Council will resist individual applications across the site where they do not demonstrate compatibility with the policy and guidance framework. The SPD has been revised to set out how the site should be delivered in Chapter 11 of the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.15	Maple Green can be accessed from Jigs Lane North and does not have to wait for roads associated with the SA9 development. The preliminary report (appendix C to the rep) does not show any in principle problem in accommodating 85 dwellings on the local road network.	
Rep No. 85a, 103a		**Response:** Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft clearly sets out improvements to the network in terms of junctions, roads, pedestrian and cycleway and public transport. The Council has undertaken extensive
9.15	There are no proposals to improve the transport network and the development will only be detrimental to the existing system	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 105a		**Response:** The Council does not envisage the volume of traffic using Osborne Lane increasing due to the lack of development north of Forest Road. Therefore, there is no destination or origin to generate additional traffic. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.15	Osborne Lane is a single lane and there is concern over the volume of traffic and how it would be managed.	
Rep No. 200a		
9.22	Please comment on the effect of traffic on Osbourne Lane?	
Rep Nos. 26, 26i, 27, 28, 29, 46, 54 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 224		**Response:** The favoured route of the link road is between the Three Legged Cross and the Quelm Lane Roundabout. A route parallel to Avery Lane can ensure that the most direct route possible is provided. A route west of The Cut would not necessarily fulfil the function of the current A3095 and would also encourage more traffic along Forest Road. It is agreed that there should be access from Harvest Ride to the development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill. However, it is a sound planning rationale to connect the development as much as possible and therefore a vehicular bridge across the Cut will achieve this. Access should be provided from Harvest Ride also and the Concept Plan should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
Figure 3 and 9.16	The volume of traffic on the link road has been seriously under estimated. The new spine road should act as an extension to the A3095. It should be resisted to the west of The Cut leaving an adequate Green Buffer zone with the houses on West End Lane. It should join Harvest Ride approximately where Park Farm has its gates. This will: • maximise space for housing east of The Cut. • Eliminate the need for a road bridge across The Cut. • Help preserve the character of West End Lane including making it into a cul-de-sac. • Provide access to development on the southern and south eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill and east of the new road. • Provide an efficient route into Bracknell freeing Newell Green	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	from a high volume of traffic and making the local centre greener for residents.	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** Objection noted. The new link road will include crossing points and junctions making Larks Hill accessible to Cabbage Hill especially via the east to west greenway. Careful boundary treatment of the new link road will ensure that Larks Hill is not ruined. The two existing roads do not cause any impact on Larks Hill. The road will not run through Avery Lane. Avery Lane will remain and text should be add to the SPD for clarification. The new kink road will not be in the flood plain. The improvements to the 3-legged cross junction are a matter for detailed design at the planning application stage. The developers will pay for such improvements. It is agreed that underpasses should be provided at points along the new link road to allow the free passage for wildlife. **Action:** Amend the second bullet point in paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) to read as: **Avery Lane which runs** ~~*Running*~~ *from Watersplash Lane northwards to the Three Legged Cross Junction (Warfield BW 8)* **which may include access routes across it at less sensitive parts**. **Avery Lane will remain as an informal byway leisure route. Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane.** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.18 (now 4.19) which reads as **Wildlife tunnels under the road should be provided at agreed locations.**
9.16	Concern over the new link road because: • It will cut Larks Hill from Cabbage Hill. • It will ruin the character of Larks Hill making it hemmed in by 3 busy roads. • It will impact on Avery :Lane, it is not clear whether it will run parallel or through Avery Lane. • It appears to be in the flood zone which may cause flooding problems. What improvements are being made and who pays for improvements at the dangerous 3-legged cross junction. Any road should provide adequate underpasses for wildlife. Recommend that the link is not built.	
Rep No. 11		**Response:** The development will provide a range of measures including junction improvements, pedestrian and
9.19 and 9.20	Installing signals at some junctions will simply not be enough.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		cycle measures and public transport provision as set out in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 40		**Response:** Schemes will be triggered by housing completions and their impact on the highway network. At present that level of detail regarding the development coming forward is unknown. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.19 and 9.20	The current highways infrastructure struggles and often fails to cope with the current level of usage. Additional traffic will grind the system to a halt. Whilst the development will provide new roads what is being planned for the main arterial routes? The lists in paragraphs 9.19 and 9.20 seem to be wish lists. WPC wish to know which junctions are to be started first. It is imperative that road/junction improvements are started well before the development commences.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.19, 9.20 and Appendix 2	Any works of financial contributions to junctions will need to be reviewed following the detailed modelling from the Council and consortium.	
Rep Nos 47		**Response:** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is currently being finalised but developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The
9.19 and 9.20	BS are carrying out detailed transport modelling work with preliminary results demonstrating that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on all of the parts of the highway network referred to in paragraphs 9.19	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	and 9.20. Four of the fifteen junctions identified in the WSPD will require improvement. BS would welcome the opportunity to meet to discuss the results of this modelling work with a view to securing agreement on the scope of off site highway works. The final WSPD should set out a justifiable and agreed list of off site highway improvements and/or financial contributions.	level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 84a		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
9.22	Concerns about impact of greater traffic volumes along Forest Road, Harvest Ride, Hatchet Lane, Lovell Lane and at Manor Bridge, Binfield, which is single lane.	
Rep No. 8		**Response:** This is agreed because Abbey Place is not suitable or capable of being upgraded in transport terms to serve as a main access to the development. However, It may be suitable for pedestrian and cycle access. The access strategy in the SPD makes it very clear that access should come from Harvest Ride and shown on the Proposed Movement Concept Plan **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.22	Abbey Place should not be an access road for the new development because it would be disastrous for residents and many of their properties are too close to the existing road.	
Rep Nos. 84a		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.22	Forest Road will not cope with the extra traffic	included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. The access strategy in the SPD makes it very clear that access should come from Harvest Ride and shown on the Proposed Movement Concept Plan **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 212a		**Response:** Developers will be encouraged to limit access to the site from Forest Road and Warfield Street and the construction of a new North/South link road will reduce the pressure already experienced on Newell Green. The access strategy in the SPD makes it very clear that access should come from Harvest Ride and shown on the Proposed Movement Concept Plan. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.22	How are you going to achieve what you say in paragraph 9.22 when 2,200 dwellings will encourage more traffic?	
Rep No. 9		**Response**: Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD already promotes alternatives to the private car. However, the Council is, and will continue to be engaged with the Highways Agency during the production of the Warfield SPD. The Council has provided the HA with its latest transport modelling work for comment. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.23	Junction 10 of the M4 and Junction 3 of the M3 and their associated link is are currently operating at near to capacity and experience congestion at peak hours. Any increase in traffic on these is a concern to the HA. The HA looks to BFC's LDF to promote strategies, policies and land allocations which support alternatives to the private car. An appropriate evidence base is key to the HA's understanding of how development will affect our network. The	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	development poses a risk to the operation of the SRN. We await the evidence base for comment.	
Rep No. 11		**Response:** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.23	The Highways Agency has raised concern about Junction 10 of the M4 3 miles away. What will the impact be on the local road network which will not be able to sustain a development of this size especially with development at Blue Mountain also.	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW13 and W15	DP W15 requires development proposals to be supported by detailed traffic modelling and mitigation measures. Bloor have appointed consultants to advise on transportation and infrastructure for Maple Green. They will assess to what degree the measures referred to in paragraphs 9.9-9.24 are justified. The concern is that any attempt to achieve a comprehensive solution and agreement would protract the commencement of the development. Any justifiable investment must be the subject of realistic costs and incorporated within a tariff.	
Rep No. 113		**Response:** The Council do not think that cycling is the only solution. As it clearly states in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD, the development will provide a number of measures including road improvement, junction improvements, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With these measures
9.23	The HA have concerns and it is naive to expect people to cycle to work. It will be the local community who end up paying for a large proportion of the road improvements.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. The development will pay for all necessary improvements via works in kind or financial contributions in lieu of provision. **Action:** No changes required.
Rep No. 223		**Response:** The development will pay for all necessary improvements via works in kind or financial contributions in lieu of provision. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
9.23	Is this not just fishing for a share of the transport pot?	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DPW15	All highways works need to be costed based on viability. In addition, a mechanism for the delivery of the proposed highways systems needs to be included. Replace the first 2 sentences of DPW15 to read as: **P<u>lanning applications will need to be supported by traffic modelling which either confirms that there is sufficient highway capacity or if not what measures are needed to enable the proposed development to proceed. Dependent on the traffic modelling it is envisaged that the following improvements are likely to be required to enable the whole site to be developed in accordance with the masterplan.</u>**	
Rep No. 11		**Response:** The Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the
9.24	We would like to see an independent and rigorous transport assessment as soon as possible with the results circulated to objectors well in advance of any planning decisions.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		increased number of vehicles. The modelling takes account of the site, others sites in the SADPD and in sites in Wokingham Borough. All work will be available for for comment before any planning applications are decided. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.

10 Responses to 'Site Investigation and Pollution Remediation'

Table 10

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 12		**Response:** The pond and general area need to be investigated for the need to mitigate any gas contamination. This is generally a requirement across the site as stated in paragraph 10.1. However for clarification, further text should be added. **Action:** Amend the second sentence of paragraph 10.1 to read as: *It will be necessary to carry out investigation works to confirm, or whether there is any contaminated land* **such as former brick pits or historic landfill areas.**
10.1	The pond east of Fox Covert and north of the bridleway is a former brick pit which is very deep and there is an old Victorian land fill nearby. There will likely be the need for gas mitigation which should be further justification for a buffer s to Warfield Street.	
Rep No. 14		**Response:** Noted.
10.2	NE agrees early consideration of a detailed study of mineral deposits. Once an area is designated as a SANG, it will be very difficult to decide to mine for deposits without securing an alternatively located SANG.	
Rep No. 11		**Response:** The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. The development will also be required to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and provide suitable on-site renewable energy generation in compliance with the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
10.3	The new development will cause increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Harvest Ride is already a very busy and noisy road and the proposal will make this worse.	
Rep No. 104a, 143a, 175a, 177a, 178a, 182		
10.3	Object because there will be increases in/unacceptable noise and pollution levels	
Rep No. 131a		
10.3	Object because it will result in increased traffic, overcrowding and pollution	
Rep No. 170a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
10.3	Objection because it is not compliant with EU pollution codes	
Rep No. 190a		
10.3	There will be an adverse impact on health and well being due to noise, pollution and CO2 emissions.	
Rep No. 194a		**Response:** This development with others will support the regeneration of Bracknell Town Centre. The intention is for more journeys to go towards the town centre rather than elsewhere. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
10.3	The development means more cars travelling to Reading for shopping and more traffic and pollution.	
Rep No 202a		**Response:** There will be substantial benefits from the site which will enhance quality of life such as more accessible open space, community facilities and other infrastructure improvements. The development will mitigate any consequential nose and pollution impacts. The development will also ensure that the roads are as safe as possible with measures such as crossing points, calming measures and design features. All of which are required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
10.3	The increase in traffic will be dangerous, noisy and lower the quality of life for existing residents.	
Rep No. 210a		
10.3	The development will overcrowd our roads and increase noise and pollution	
Rep No. 226		
10.3	This road is already busy - why make it worse by introducing so much more housing.	**Response:** The Council have assessed the impact of all developments including those in Wokingham Borough. This includes assessing improvements to the network such as junctions and roads and also modes such as buses, walking and cycling in Warfield. The aim of these improvements, which will be funded by the developer, is to limit the impact on the network and demonstrate that it does not worsen the situation. The development will be required to

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		implement all necessary works in accordance with Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 8		**Response:** The development will be built out in phases to be agreed by the Council rather than in one large continuous phase. Paragraph 10.5 and Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD requires the development to minimise its impact in terms of disturbance in the construction phases. The Council will seek to implement this through e.g. agreeing plant storage compounds, hours of operation, agreed routes to transport materials/waste and measures to clean roads/vehicles. These measures will be secured via planning conditions attached to any planning permissions granted. However, further text is required to clarify the need for agreed construction traffic routes. **Action:** Amend paragraph 10.5 to read as *The development phases will need to be considerate ~~as possible so as to~~* **<u>of local residents by</u>** *minimis***<u>ing</u>***noise, dirt and traffic disruptions. The developers will be expected to work with the Council on developing a plan setting out the construction phases, plantstorage,* **<u>construction traffic routes</u>** *and how they will limit the level of disturbance.*
10.5	Builders would use Abbey Place as a parking area and access for heavy vehicles making life intolerable for residents.	
Rep No. 16a, 30, 104a, 111a, 125a, 133a, 134a, 136a, 142a, 143a, 144a, 157a,164a, 183a, 188a, 210a		
10.5	Object because it is unacceptable to be living near a building site for the next 9-12+ years. This will be inconvenient/unbearable for existing residents and new purchasers.	
Rep No. 90a		
10.5	There will be immense disruption caused by construction traffic	
Rep No. 109a		
10.5	How will pollution, noise, safety be controlled during several years of construction?	
Rep No. 126a		
10.5	We face retirement by coming face to face with building lorries and noise	
Rep No. 159a		
10.5	This site will be a building site for 9-12 years until 2024 which massively effects Warfield residents lives devaluing property hugely.	
Rep No. 212a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
10.5	We are waiting for a new town centre but are rewarded by the area being destructed and turned into a building site for many years.	
Rep No. 192a		**Response:** The government recommends building on brownfield sites but it recognises that some greenfield sites are required too. The Council's preferred strategy for development comprises both brownfield (e.g. Bracknell town centre, Staff College and Crowthorne Business Estate) and greenfield (e.g. Warfield and Jennetts Park). This issue was examined during the production of the Core Strategy DPD where it was conclude that the Council's strategy including development at Warfield was sound in all ways. The Council has consulted many times in the process and published all information on the website (see www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/corestrategy). The development will be built out in phases to be agreed by the Council rather than in one large hit. Paragraph 10.5 and Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD require the development to minimise its impact in terms of disturbance in the construction phases. The Council will seek to implement this through e.g. agreeing plant storage compounds, hours of operation, agreed routes to transport materials/waste and measures to clean roads/vehicles. These measures will be secured via planning conditions attached to any planning permissions granted. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
10.5	Convince me that creating a building site on green field land for 10-15 years is right, justified, reasonable and transparent?	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Support is noted.
DPW16	We welcome its inclusion.	

11 Reponses to 'Delivery'

Table 11

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 32		**Response:** The development must provide the necessary assessments in line with the Warfield SPD and other planning policy and legislative requirements. **Action:** Add a sentence to paragraph 11.1 which reads as **<u>All relevant assessments will be expected to support planning applications in accordance with this SPD, relevant guidance and legislative requirements.</u>**
11.1	At minimum, a Phase 1 ecological impact assessment should be provided at outline stage backed up by appropriate surveys. Also, where contamination is suspected to be present, a phase 1 desk top study for land contamination should also accompany any planning application in accordance with PPS23.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** EIA Screening will be carried out on all formal planning submissions to determine whether or not a full EIA is require. The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (1999) set out schedules and associated thresholds that the individual proposals would be assessed against in-order to determine whether EIA is required. It is not possible to say that all residential developments will not require EIA as it depends on the nature and scale of development that can differ on a case by case basis. The Council has undertaken viability assessment of this site (and others in the SADPD). The results are included throughout the SPD and in the IDP. The Council has undertaken a strategic viability assessment of the developments in the SADPD including Warfield. This shows that based on the assumptions for infrastructure costs (as in the IDP schedule) that the development is viable. Developers will be expected to submit individual viability assessments which concord or otherwise with the required infrastructure provision for the site. The Council may commission work at the Developers cost to review and verify such assessment.
11.1	It should be possible to state if an Environmental Impact Assessment is required. As it is a residential proposals it should be possible to state that no EIA is required. The viability assessment should be included in this chapter.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** The text in the SPD should make it clear what information is expected at the relevant stage in the process. Therefore additional text should be added for the clarification. **Action:** Add extra sentences to paragraph 11.2 which read as**A Design and Access Statement (DAS) will accompany the outline planning application(s). In addition to a DAS, a design code for each character area will be required to be submitted to, and approved by, the Planning Authority prior to the submission of any Reserved Matters application(s) in that character area. This is to ensure that the character areas are clearly defined and a clear design approach is established for each area. All Reserved Matters applications will then be required to implement the approved Design and Access Statements and Design Codes.**
11.2	A Design Code is too detailed to be a requirement at the outline application stage. The outline stage should set the broad parameters within development will take place and Design Codes drawn up.	
Reps No. 47		**Response:** It is agreed that there needs to be more flexibility to bring forward the single through more than a single application. A mechanism for equalising s106 and other costs is sensible. Taking each recommendation in turn: 1. The infrastructure provision has been updated in the Warfield SPD. A revised Concept Plan also has been included. 2. This has been undertaken in the revised IDP.
11.2	The absence of a commitment to bring this land forward for development in accordance with a specific timetable means that the submission of a single planning application is unworkable. An alternative way to develop comprehensively is in an incremental way, through a number of discrete planning applications, which overcomes the constraints posed by landownership.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	This alternative approach is based upon a number of smaller parcels which can come forward in accordance with the comprehensive Concept Plan established in the WSPD. Advantages include: • It enables smaller groups of land owners to deliver • will enable a design approach to be taken which is locally distinctive and which responds to the specific issues • It will enable different elements of the site to come forward at different times • It will facilitate the delivery at the earliest opportunity This requires a mechanism capable of equalising the costs of the S106 and infrastructure package which could operate in the following way: 1. The WSPD provides additional detail as to the capacity, infrastructure and their distribution. The WSPD Concept Plan needs to provide sufficient detail to make it possible to quantify the land uses and infrastructure located on each land ownership. 2. A fully justified and costed S106 and infrastructure package to be set out within the Infrastructure Development Plan. 3. This will mean that as individual planning applications come forward, it will be possible to accurately calculate the cost of infrastructure which physically needs to be provided on each phase for that phase to be developed independently. The final WSPD will need to permit an adjustment to the level of contribution required where the actual on site costs	3. Developers can, by working together, groups sites together to deliver comprehensively across the site provided there is a set of agreed masterplans to work to. The Council will however make it clear that individual small sites will not be accepted except where the Council agrees they can come forward on an independent basis. The Council has undertaken an analysis of all the sites in terms of comprehensive delivery and sets out the rationale for grouping them together or otherwise for the purposes of planning applications. The final SPD allows for flexibility in costs either downwards or upwards depending on the actual costs at the time of delivery. **Action:** Amend paragraph 11.3 to read as: **The Council would consider detailed masterplans prepared for blocks of development described below and shown in Appendix 3. These masterplans should fit together to ensure that they can deliver a comprehensive development across the site in accordance with policy and guidance. Applications should adhere to the agreed masterplans** ~~As set out earlier, the Council will expect any planning application for this site to reflect the need for longer term comprehensive development of this site~~. Add new paragraphs 11.5 and 11.6 which read as **The Council has assessed the individual sites comprising the development area and considers it to be sound planning to group the sites together to provide comprehensive development. The suggested blocks as shown in Appendix 3 are:** • **Central Block 1** • **Western Block 2** • **Eastern Block 3** • **Manor Farm Block 4** • **Cabbage Hill A**

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	of delivering infrastructure for a particular phase are higher than would have been the case if the site was developed as a single site and costs were equalised. This approach has operated successfully at West Horsham and BS welcomes the opportunity to work closely with BFC and key stakeholders in the preparation of the final WSPD.	**Therefore, the site could be masterplanned broadly in line with these blocks as shown in Appendix 3. The Council advocates planning applications to be submitted in accordance with the masterplan areas. However, provided the masterplans are approved, there may be circumstances where some site or individual development could come forward independently because of their relationship/location to the main development and subject to the requirements of the SPD. These are:** • **Land at Watersplash Lane which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Land at The Splash and West End Stables which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Cohesive groups of sites within Eastern Block 3 provided major infrastructure subject to the provision of satisfactory primary school provision being put in place.** • **Land at Manor Farm (see paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47).**

12 Responses to 'Appendices'

Table 12

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 34		**Response:** There is a need to provide more flexibility in the SPD in respect to allowing more than one application on the site. This flexibility has been clarified throughout the SPD where a series of applications which contribute towards comprehensiveness will be acceptable. Therefore, additional text should be included in the SPD. Further, a revised trajectory has been compiled and incorporated in Appendix 1 of the final version of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the 3rd sentence of paragraph 1.1 to read as: ***It is envisaged*** *that the new neighbourhood will start to be delivered on site~~, once all the appropriate planning permissions have been approved,~~ in ~~2012~~***2014/15,** *providing 2,200 dwellings, with an estimated projection completion date of ~~2020/21~~***2025/26.Amend the trajectory in Appendix 1** Amend the trajectory in Appendix 1.
1.1 and Appendix 1	Bloor are the prospective developers of the Maple Green site. The SADPD states the site will be delivered from 2014 and The WSPD says from 2012/13. This needs clarification. Bloor support delivery from 2012/13 including Maple Green but only if the WSPD is more flexible.	
Rep No. 53		
1.1 and Appendix 1	The housing trajectory for the development is inconsistent with the SADPD. It is unlikely that an early start as stated in the consultation draft will be achieved because: • The SPD is unlikely to be adopted before the end of 2011; • No applications (outline or reserved matters) have been submitted or approved yet; • Significant infrastructure needs to be put in place; • Land ownership issues affecting land not controlled by the consortium. The timetable needs to be clarified.	
Rep No. 53		
Appendix 1	The inconsistency between the housing trajectory in the SADPD and Appendix 1 needs to be addressed. Persimmons is not confident that completions would start in 2012/13 and that if all relevant landowners do not cooperate to enable a single outline application then some parcels may be delayed which will disrupt completion rates.	
Rep No. 53a		

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Appendix 1	The housing trajectory for the development is inconsistent with the SADPD. It is unlikely that an early start as stated in the consultation draft will be achieved because: • The SPD is unlikely to be adopted before the end of 2011; • No applications (outline or reserved matters) have been submitted or approved yet; • Significant infrastructure needs to be put in place; • Land ownership issues affecting land not controlled by the consortium. The timetable needs to be clarified.	
Rep No. 53b		**Response**: The trajectory has been revised to be consistent with that in the SADPD Draft Submission version. The proposed land at Peacock Lane is being considered in the SADPD. **Action:** Amend Appendix 1.
Appendix 1	The inconsistency between the housing trajectory in the SADPD and Appendix 1 needs to be addressed. If the SPD trajectory is to be followed Persimmons is not confident that completions would start so early because: • The SPD is unlikely to be adopted before the end of 2011 • No applications have been submitted and approval is also needed for reserved matters. • Significant infrastructure is required and their costs equalised • There are land ownership issues affecting land not controlled by the consortium. The Council should provide contingency by allocating additional land for housing including that at Peacock Lane.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 55		**Response:** The trajectory for delivery has been made consistent with the SADPD Draft Submission version. The Council expects comprehensive development and that developer should work together to ensure this is delivered in accordance with the Warfield SPD. The Council has reviewed comments made by individual landowners and developers through out the SPD process and consider it to be sound and logical planning to group sites together where appropriate to support a revised Chapter 11 and Appendix 3.There is the scope for some of the sites to come forward separately subject to providing necessary infrastructure on-site at appropriating timings. Revised text in the SPD clarifies these circumstances for each site. T **Action:** Amend Appendix 1. **Action:** Amend paragraph 11.3 to read as: **<u>The Council would consider detailed masterplans prepared for blocks of development described below and shown in Appendix 3. These masterplans should fit together to ensure that they can deliver a comprehensive development across the site in accordance with policy and guidance. Applications should adhere to the agreed masterplans</u>** ~~As set out earlier, the Council will expect any planning application for this site to reflect the need for longer term comprehensive development of this site~~. Add new paragraphs 11.5 and 11.6 which read as **<u>The Council has assessed the individual sites comprising the development area and considers it to be sound planning to group the sites together to provide comprehensive development. The suggested blocks as shown in Appendix 3 are:</u>** • **<u>Central Block 1</u>** • **<u>Western Block 2</u>** • **<u>Eastern Block 3</u>**
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan. The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the main development such as Manor Farm. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	
Rep No. 56		
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan. The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the main development such as Newell Green Farm and Sumanga Farm. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	
Rep No. 57		
3.6 and Appendix 1	Concern that the anticipated delivery in paragraph 3.6 and Appendix 1 starting in 2012 will be delayed by the requirement for a detailed masterplan. The Warfield area is made up of multiple ownerships which may be delays in getting agreements between parties. It is clear that there are some parts that can come forward separately from the	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	main development such as Grove Gardens. The land is in a single ownership and subject to agreeing the extent of the developable and floodable area can come forward without detriment to the objectives and development principles of the SPD.	• **Manor Farm Block 4** • **Cabbage Hill A** **Therefore, the site could be masterplanned broadly in line with these blocks as shown in Appendix 3. The Council advocates planning applications to be submitted in accordance with the masterplan areas. However, provided the masterplans are approved, there may be circumstances where some site or individual development could come forward independently because of their relationship/location to the main development and subject to the requirements of the SPD. These are:** • **Land at Watersplash Lane which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Land at The Splash and West End Stables which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Cohesive groups of sites within Eastern Block 3 provided major infrastructure subject to the provision of satisfactory primary school provision being put in place.** • **Land at Manor Farm (see paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47).**
Rep No. 60		
Appendix 1	If 100 dwellings are to be delivered in 2012-13 the SPD needs to be clarified so that development can proceed in an incremental way subject to an overall masterplan.	
Rep No. 61		**Response:** The housing trajectory in Appendix 1 has been revised to reflect the SADPD Draft Submission version. **Action:** Amend Appendix 1.
Appendix 1	The proposed housing completions rates are unrealistic because: • There are a significant number of landowners involved which will take time to get agreements on infrastructure provision. • Significant work on infrastructure needs to be carried out before	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	development can be provided. E.g. the need for secondary school provision. It is recommended that more realistic rates of delivery are included with the implications that the development starts later in the plan period and continues beyond.	
Rep No. 223		**Response:** There is an element of flexibility within the Warfield SPD. If there are fundamental changes required it will need to be demonstrated that the changes are material considerations that would outweigh the SPD in this respect. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 1	Will the plan be amended to enable it to react to future changes in requirements?	
Rep No.s 7a part i and part ii,		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools, new roads, community facilities, open spaces and a neighbourhood centre. All are detailed in the Warfield SPD. It is likely that infrastructure provision will be secured via s106 agreements and other highways agreements. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 2	What additional infrastructure will there be? Will the development be included in a s278 agreement or will areas remain private. How will the Borough be able to look after new infrastructure given the harsh winter last year. Where will the new road link into the existing roads? Will existing infrastructure be able to cope?	
Rep No. 9		**Response:** Noted.
Appendix 2	The HA note that M4 J10 is noted as an issue and await the evidence base to support the SADPD and recommend mitigation measure for M4 j10 are formally identified in the SPD.	
Rep No. 13		**Response:** This text is an error because the north or north Bracknell option has been discarded as an option for development. The Appendix should be revised to clarify this.
Appendix 2	I was concerned by the mention of 'future development in area (north of N Bracknell).	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		Action: Amend paragraph 2 in respect to public transport to read as *Future Bus access - Direct Links to and from Town Centre and linking into the wider area ~~(existing) and also the future development in area (north of N Bracknell etc)~~* **and other relevant developments**;....
Rep No. 15		**Response:** The Warfield Parish Office is required by text in the SPD, however, for clarification the IDP will be amended to include the requirement for an office for Warfield Parish Council within the Community Hub. Primary Education - the wording in the infrastructure schedule has been amended to reflect the requirement for two on-site Primary Schools. Strategic Road Network (SRN) - the SRN section refers specifically to the road network managed by the Highways Agency, therefore reference to the new north-south link road, linking the Quelm Park roundabout and the Three Legged Cross junction, has been included under the 'Local Road Network' section of the Warfield SPD infrastructure schedule. **Action:** Amend the IDP to include text to read as *In-kind provision or land and financial contributions towards a multi-functional community hub, located near new neighbourhood centre - accommodating a community centre, youth centre, early years nursery & children's centre,* **parish council office,***police point and community café, with appropriate car parking*. Amend the IDP to reflect the revised IDP in the Draft Submission Version of SADPD which refers to 2 primary schools and includes the link road.
Appendix 2	• Community Centres – a Parish Council office has not been included. • Primary Education Infrastructure required – point 2 should state schools not school. • Strategic Road Network – A3095 link road has not been included.	
Rep No. 24a		**Response:** 50 full sized plots is considered to be sufficient to serve the new development. Under Circular 05/05

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Appendix 2	We agree that more allotments are needed in the north but 50 plots is woefully too small. 200 are required. Council's have a duty to provide allotments	Planning Obligations development should provide the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities to meet its own needs and not to remedy existing deficiencies. **Action:**No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This is agreed and the text should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Amend the relevant title in Appendix 2 to read as **Flood Management.** Amend the title to paragraph 8.21 (now 8.22) to read as *Flood~~ing~~***Management***and Utili~~ties~~***y Infrastructure.**
Appendix 2	Please change the name from '*flood defence'* to '**flood management measures'** because the term Flood Defence is misleading.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted.
Appendix 2	Pleased to see that green infrastructure, buffer zones for watercourses, de-culverting of watercourses and SUDS measures have all been listed	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** Noted - amendments will be made for clarifications. **Action**: Amend the IDP where appropriate, to replace *SFRA* with **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)**.
Appendix 2	Please change the term '*SFRA'* to FRA. SFRA stand for Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and these are at borough level. Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) are the site specific document.	
Rep No. 32		**Response:** This may be a printing error if the table was printed straight from a PC. The hard copies and version online do include the complete table. The final version will be correct and visible. **Action:** Check the final version and amend if necessary.
Appendix 2	Cannot see the entire table as the last column of the table is off the page	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities in accordance with the Warfield SPD which currently is through s106 agreements. However, depending on the
Appendix 2	The provision of infrastructure and facilities has to be addressed in the context of 5 years housing land supply.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	Infrastructures must be justified and apportioned across the site. Even if all landowners and developers agree to make one outline the s106 agreement would take years to negotiate. The only realistic approach is to for the Council to: a. identify exactly what infrastructure and facilities are fully justified; b. calculate their realistic costs as an overall package; c. apportion these costs each type of dwelling needs to make to the overall package. This tariff needs to be in the SPD and can be attached to each permission.	timing of applications it may be that some of the infrastructure required to support the Warfield SPD site is delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be a tariff that is developed in a similar way to the process referred to in the representation. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		See Response and Action under paragraph 9.3
9.3 and Appendix 2	It is noted that transport modelling work is on-going. Therefore the related measures in Appendix to should only be seen as indicative at this stage. The Consortium are undertaking modelling work which will be shared and should be considered in the final SPD.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
DP12, Paragraph 9.11 and Appendix 2	Integrating the site into the pedestrian and cycle network is supported with improvements to some key corridors. The final measures, costs and contributions, as required by DPW12 should be based on actual schemes necessary for this development.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Developers will be required to contribute in-kind and/or financially towards the implementation of the

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
9.19, 9.20 and Appendix 2	Any works of financial contributions to junctions will need to be reviewed following the detailed modelling from the Council and consortium.	highway-capacity related improvement works identified by BFC and towards other local transport improvements for 'soft modes' etc. The level of contribution will reflect the net number of additional trips arising from the proposed development relative to all trips arising from the planned and windfall developments. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Various studies have been undertaken to produce a robust evidence base that underpins the draft submission IDP, including for transport and education requirements/costings. This information is available on request. Bracknell Forest's LID SPD set's out the Council's approach for seeking Public Art, Biodiversity mitigation will be sought either in-kind or through off-site contributions towards Open Space of Public Value and the Fire & Rescue service have as yet to make specific and justified requirements for developer contributions. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 2	It is recognised that the Infrastructure Development plan is at an early stage and will need to be firmed up taking account of technical studies relating to transport. A full justification/evidence base is required for education facilities. Justification is also required for other services such as public art, fire and rescue, and biodiversity. Further comments will be made when the Council provides further information on the IDP.	
Rep No. 47		**Response:** Extensive work has fed into the SADPD IDP draft submission version. As a result, it contains more up-to-date and accurate information on infrastructure requirements and costing. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 2	Further analysis and technical work is being undertaken in relation to the IDP. The IDP will need to be refined to take account of this work.	
Rep No. 48		**Response:** The IDP contains costs and apportionment where known and will be updated when more information emerges. It is beyond the IDP's remit to provide information on the viability of providing listed infrastructure. A separate viability study was conducted for proposed development sites which
Appendix 2	Additional information of costs are required for many items. The IDP needs to be update to to provide information on viability and how costs will be apportioned.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		formed part of the evidence base behind the SADPD, which factored in indicative infrastructure costs. Some infrastructure elements will be provided by a CIL tariff which will be viability tested, whilst other elements will be delivered through financial or land negotiation. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Rep No. 48, 52		**Response:** It is accepted that there will be a significant cost attached to providing necessary infrastructure to support development. For viability reasons, not all infrastructure will be delivered. However, in respect of waste water infrastructure, this will be a statutory requirement. In respect of the Code for Sustainable Homes, dwellings will be required to meet either local planning policy, unless viability justifies otherwise, or, as a minimum, to the building regulation standard at the time of applying for planning permission. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 2	The IDP says that a District Energy Scheme, the development should exceed building regulations relation to the Sustainable Code for Homes and and upgrade to the North Bracknell Sewage Pumping Station. All require additional finance which may be difficult to support given the range of other infrastructure requirements.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The SPD will give as much information as possible on infrastructure requirements. However, the detail of many of the requirements is a matter for negotiation and dialogue at the planning applications stages. There is no legal mechanism to set a local tariff at this stage as the development will likely be granted permission prior to the adoption of a CIL tariff. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.1 and Appendix 2	The SPD should quantify the financial burden to fall on development for infrastructure provision as a prerequisite to ensure the proposal is viable. The total costs in Appendix 2 should be shown as a tariff for each development hectare.	
Rep No. 60		**Response:** The Council has consistently asked the development industry to work together on a comprehensive basis. The Council has and remains willing to work with the industry to ensure that
Appendix 2	The amount of development permissible before various infrastructure is required needs to be assessed so that	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	development can be phased. The total cost of the infrastructure stated needs to be estimated, quantified and sub divided between the proposed development either on a price per dwelling or hectare basis.	comprehensive development is delivered including all necessary associated infrastructure, services and facilities. Action: No changes to the SPD required.
Rep Nos. 55, 56, 57		**Response:** The IDP schedule should be revised to reflects the revised text in the SPD and the SADPD Draft Submission version of the IDP. It shows the level and detail of requirements that are currently known. **Action:** Amend IDP.
Appendix 2	There is insufficient information in the Infrastructure Development Plan. The SPD should provide clear figures based on the number of dwellings, or bedrooms and floor area for non residential development. Unless this is resolved quickly then development which could come forward easily will not do so.	
Rep No. 58		**Response:** The development will need to make provision for water supply in accordance with paragraph 8.28. However further clarification should be provided in the text to explain the water supply requirements. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.28 (now renumbered as 8.31) to read as *South East Water have allowed for planned growth in the Borough. A combination of off site works* **to upgrade local** ~~*and*~~ *infrastructure and connection works* ~~*would*~~**will** *be required.* **Additionally, in order to reduce the impact on local water resources, developers will be required to deliver new homes with a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/capita/day.**
8.28 and Appendix 2	Bracknell Forest is located in an area of severe water supply stress with a consumption higher than the national average. The proposals by South East Water will not increase capacity but usage which will exacerbate the water stress situation. The Warfield and other developments will increase the risk of water shortages. These shortages will be more severe in extended periods of dry weather. This is a very serious issue which will have devastating effects unless robust proposals are identified before any of the planned developments in the Borough.	
Rep Nos. 89a, 92a		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools, new roads, community facilities, open spaces and a neighbourhood centre. All are detailed in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
6.4 and Appendix 2	The infrastructure cannot cope with this many homes	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Rep No. 95a		**Response:** The development will provide the necessary infrastructure and services it needs. For example, it will provide two primary schools, new roads, community facilities, open spaces and a neighbourhood centre. There will be substantial contributions towards a new secondary school to be built in Binfield. All are detailed in the Warfield SPD. The SPD also supports appropriate proposals for housing for older people. The PCT has been consulted but has declined the need for a new health centre on the site but would rather focus on access to the forthcoming new healthspace in Bracknell town centre. It is not the Government's strategy to provide a large hospital in Bracknell. Instead a new healthspace is planned for Bracknell Town Centre and a new cancer unit is already in place. The PCT has been consulted but has declined the need for a new health centre on the site but would rather focus on access to the forthcoming new healthspace. However, should a doctors wish to locate in the centre, it is likely the Council would support it. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. Text should also be added to enable a pharmacy and dentists should they want to locate there. **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.15 to read as: T*ypical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5***such as as shops, pharmacy, café and a dentist surgery**. *Provision should also be made for a multi-purpose centre for local community activities, such as Parish related administration, meetings,***police,** *youth and children's provision.* **Whilst a Doctors has not been identified following consultation with the relevant health authority at the time of the SPD, a surgery may be provided**
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area cannot sustain further housing estates what about the provision of schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals etc.?	
Rep No. 96a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure is already under strain such as daily traffic jams, overs subscribed schools, no hospital and poor care for the elderly.	
Rep No. 97a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure cannot cope such as roads, schools, hospital and retail.	
Rep No. 99a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	New development will cause strain on infrastructure and amenities such as schools, shops, doctor's roads etc.	
Rep No. 101a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	With new houses our amenities will become even more clogged up such as doctors, library and supermarket. In the face of public spending cuts can our GPs, hospitals, schools cope with the influx of new residents	
Rep No. 173a		
6.4 and Appendix 2	The area's infrastructure cannot cope such as schools, doctors and supermarket	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		in the neighbourhood centre should the need for one be subsequently identified.
Rep No. 18		**Response:** Support is noted.
Appendix 3	Support the sequence set out in Implementation and Sequence Plan	
Rep No. 34		**Response:** The proposed sequencing in Appendix 3 recognises that there is fragmented ownership on the eastern edge of the site and that there are a number of infrastructure provisions in other parts of the site that will need to be delivered in an early and timely manner such as primary school, SANGS and the link road. Therefore it is realistic to expect other parts of the site to come forward sooner giving opportunity to provide infrastructure on the ground and to allow time for the separate developers/landowners and their representatives to work together to deliver a cohesive and comprehensive development in accordance with the requirements of the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 3	The proposed phasing set out in Figure 5 fails to recognise the sustainability of the south east corner of the site.	
Rep No. 34		
Appendix 3	Bloor object to the phasing diagram and request it is amended to reflect the sustainability of the Maple Green Site within its first phase.	
Rep No. 48, 52		
Appendix 3	Amend to include the eastern end of the site in the first or second phase of development. The document (para.4.22) acknowledges that the eastern end would be served by the exiting centre which makes it logical to begin development in this location.	
Rep Nos. 43, 44		**Response:** Noted. Additional text should be added to clarify the circumstances for bringing forward sites in the development. **Action:** Add additional text.
Appendix 3	The broad sequence is generally supported. It must not be applied rigidly e.g the failure of smaller landholdings in sequence 1 should not hold up proposals for sustainable development within sequence 2 or 3 and vice versa.	
Rep No. 53		**Response:** It is agreed that the SANGS delivery should be commensurate with phasing of development as required by paragraph 7.32 of the Warfield SPD. It is agreed that a scenario for delivering larger parcels of development with SANGS and then allowing smaller
Appendix 3	If a single outline application is deliverable that the sequence seems logical. The supporting text which highlights the need for SANG to come forward in advance but proportional to	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
	development areas is supported. Notwithstanding, consideration should be given to a scenario where consortium land comes forward first but then other parcels come forward on a piecemeal basis.	parcels to follow subject to satisfactory arrangements and an appropriate assessment. **Action:** Add a sentence to paragraph 7.31 which reads as: **Although equalisation is a matter between developers the Council will consider a facilitation role in bringing the SANGS forward. For example, any SANGS provided by a developer which is in excess of the SANGS requirement for their quantum of development, could be used to provide mitigation for other developments on this site subject to financial and legal agreement.**
Rep No. 55		**Response:** Following analysis of this site, Manor Farm has been included as a separate block and character area. However it is not agreed that the site is not dependant on infrastructure provision from the remainder of the site, because it may require SANGS (if land on Manor Farm is not suitable) and/or primary school provision. **Action:** Add new paragraphs 11.5 and 11.6 which read as **The Council has assessed the individual sites comprising the development area and considers it to be sound planning to group the sites together to provide comprehensive development. The suggested blocks as shown in Appendix 3 are:** • **Central Block 1** • **Western Block 2** • **Eastern Block 3** • **Manor Farm Block 4** • **Cabbage Hill A** **Therefore, the site could be masterplanned broadly in line with these blocks as shown in Appendix 3. The Council advocates planning**
Appendix 3	Objection to the proposed phasing in Appendix 3. Manor Farm is in a sustainable location and can be accessed from Binfield Road. The site will not be dependant on infrastructure provision necessary to bring forward the rest of the major part of the Warfield development. It can therefore be developed independently from the rest of the Warfield Development. It could be developed in 2012/13 and help meet the SPD provisions for the SANG and The Cut River Park provision. It would also provide an early injection of infrastructure contributions to allow other Warfield development to proceed.	

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
		applications to be submitted in accordance with the masterplan areas. However, provided the masterplans are approved, there may be circumstances where some site or individual development could come forward independently because of their relationship/location to the main development and subject to the requirements of the SPD. These are: • **Land at Watersplash Lane which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Land at The Splash and West End Stables which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Cohesive groups of sites within Eastern Block 3 provided major infrastructure subject to the provision of satisfactory primary school provision being put in place.** • **Land at Manor Farm (see paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47).**
Rep No. 56		**Response:** The Council disagrees that this site could be a rounding off site and does not advocate piecemeal development across the site. There are some circumstances where smaller sites may comes forward as detailed above in the Action to Rep 55, however in the instance of this site it needs to be masterplanned as part of Central Block 1. **Action:** See proposed amendments as shown above in Rep 55 above.
Appendix 3	The site should come forward early because it will act as a rounding off site to Newell Green taking account of this settlements character and grain. The site can be developed in advance of the wider SPD area which would assist in meeting the Council's housing trajectory and help pump prime infrastructure projects relating to the main Warfield development.	
Rep No. 57		**Response:** The Council disagrees that this site could be independently developed and does not advocate

Para	Summary of Issues raised	Officer Response
Appendix 3	Objection to the proposed phasing in Appendix 3. Grove Gardens is not identified in the Phasing Plan, however it should be able to come forward independently from the main Warfield development. Grove Gardens is in single ownership and if it is to contribute to wider objectives if the Warfield SPD its development opportunities need to be maximised especially if there is no mechanism to compensate land owners for the provision of land for non developable uses. The site is in a single ownership and subject to identifying the extent of developable land could come forward in 2012/13 meeting the Council's 5 year supply and contributing to the provision of The Bull Brook River Park.	piecemeal development across the site. There are some circumstances where smaller sites may comes forward as detailed above in the Action to Rep 55, however in the instance of this site it needs to be masterplanned as part of Eastern Block 4. **Action:** See proposed amendments as shown above in Rep 55 above.
Rep No. 60		**Response:** Noted
Appendix 3	There is a logic in developing the site in a phased manner from the centre outwards.	
Rep No. 122		**Response:** Area 1 is suitable for development. The development will: - retain existing publicly accessible open spaces; - provide new publicaly accessible open spaces; and, - enhance the public rights of way network. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 3	Area 1 should be should not be built on. The area used by dog walkers and ramblers, provides a much needed sanctuary of open space and a natural boundary between Bracknell & Warfield	
Rep No. 228		**Response:** The development will be required to provide new infrastructure early within the development, for example a new school because the is little to no existing capacity. Letting development go ahead which does not physically provide needed infrastructure will result in unsustainable development being built. **Action:** No changes to the SPD required.
Appendix 3	I cannot understand the logic of sequencing the development from the centre where the greatest amount of new infrastructure is needed. The sequencing should be from the south heading north so that new homes can be created off the existing infrastructure.	

Section 3: Summary of responses to Detailed Concept Plan consultation Nov 2011

Specific Consultee Responses

.1 The following summarises the key issues and the Council's response to comments received by Statutory Consultees, including Warfield Parish Council and also local amenity groups:

Table 13 Statutory Consultee Responses

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Coal Authority	
No Comments.	**Response:** Noted.
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)	
The Committee of the Campaign to Protect Rural England Bracknell and Ascot District hoped that the development would stop at W est End Lane in order to protect as much of the landscape and countryside feature of Cabbage Hill as possible. If this is not possible the Committee trusts that the development would be sensitive to its location as part of an Area of Local Landscape Importance and intrude as little as possible into the views of the countryside.	**Response:** The Concept Plan has been revised to include some development of the eastern and southern slopes of Cabbage Hill. The Warfield SPD also prescribes that development must be designed sensitively within the hill and to protect key views to and from the hill. **Action:** Amend the (former) first sentence of paragraph 4.32 (now 4.24) to read as *Development should* **be designed sensitively to respect the landscape character of Cabbage Hill and***front onto areas of open space and SANG where appropriate.*
Environment Agency (EA)	
There are two main river watercourses with the development area which represent both a constraint and an opportunity for enhancement through development.	**Response:** Noted. The text in the SPD relating to the creation of the two river parks ensure that the river environmental constraints are recognised and managed and that there are opportunities to improve the watercourses through careful management. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required
The Detailed Concept Plan recognises the flood risk constraint along The Cut and Bull Brook as highlighted by our Flood Zones. (The EA are currently undertaking detailed hydraulic modelling of The Cut; if this work has been completed when the Master plan for the development is being undertaken, then	**Response:** Noted. Additional text on the SPD is required as a result. **Action:** Amend the forth bullet point in paragraph 7.38 (now 7.41) which reads as *River and adjacent habitats* **(detailed hydraulic modelling of the Cut is underway**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
the more detailed modelling should be used to inform the layout).	**by the Environment Agency. The results of which may inform the detailed planning of the development and river park in this area).**
The Concept Plan allows buffer strips to either side of the watercourses to maintain green corridor and avoid developing in fluvial (river) flood risk areas. In addition there are also areas at risk of flooding from surface water runoff. The Bracknell Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) identifies these areas and should be used as an evidence document when master planning the development.	**Response:** These comments are agreed. The development has to mitigate potential floodrisk through for example, the areas of the river parks and the need to provide SUDS within the development as prescribed paragraphs 7.23 and 8.20 to 8.23 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required
Where watercourse crossings are proposed, structures should be to be clear spanning bridges with suitable design freeboards above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood level.	**Response:** This comment is similar to that made by the EA during the last consultation. This is agreed and text has already been included in the SPD. **Action:** See Section 2 of this statement.
Surface water runoff from impermeable surfaces will need to be designed into the development at an early stage in the planning process. The geology in this area is largely impermeable so infiltration of surface water is unlikely to be suitable as the main means of disposing of surface water. Sustainable Drainage (SUDs) features should be incorporated within the development. These could be located in green areas/public open space and incorporated into Green Infrastucture.	**Response:** This is agreed and SUDS are requirements of the development as prescribed in paragraphs 7.24, 8.25 and 8.26 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Pleased to see that the plan includes provision of Green Infrastructure, spaces for wildlife and River Parks. Bird nesting and roosting sites should be incorporated where possible, including the provision of at roosts. Careful consideration of the type of lighting along the river edge must be given (as this corridor provides important habitat for the terrestrial life-stages of many aquatic insects e.g. Dragonflies).	**Response:** Noted. Additional text should be added regarding the provision of lighting along the river edges. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 4.25 (now 4.39) to read as **Careful consideration should be given to not lighting the river edges so that the river habitats are not harmed by light pollution**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The Warfield development site is wholly on London Clay and poses no evident risk to groundwater resources. Being on clay will mean that surface water infiltration to ground will not be possible.	**Response:** Noted and text should be added to the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add a sentence to paragraph 7.23 (now 7.24) to read as **The site comprises London Clay which means that surface water infiltration will generally not be possible.**
For any development the applicant should liaise with Thames Water as early as possible to ensure that waste water infrastructure (including sewage treatments works and the sewer network) is adequate for the size of the proposed development and any new infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner.	**Response:** Comments agreed and additional text should be added to the SPD. **Action:** Add an additional sentence to paragraph 8.27 (now 8.30) which reads as **Developers should liaise with Thames Water early to ensure waste water infrastructure is adequate and delivered in a timely manner.**
Highways Agency	
No comments to add to those already made on earlier consultations.	**Response:** Noted.
Natural England	
Concerned that the conceptual plan makes no reference to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs). Avoidance and mitigation measures relating to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, will be required for this planning proposal, as line with the South East Plan Policy NRM6, the Bracknell Forest Core Strategy, and the draft Bracknell Forest Thames Basin Heaths Supplementary Planning Document.	**Response:** The SPD make provision for SANGs in Development Principle W6 and its accompanying paragraphs. It is not certain exactly where the SANGs will be in the site at this stage but for clarification the Concept plan key should be amended to read as SANGs/OSPV. **Action:** Amend the key relating to the Concept Plan to read as SANGS/ Passive Open Space of Public Value rather than Natural Green Spaces
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	
Raised concerns regarding lack of transport modelling, and impact of increased traffic movements impact upon the Royal Borough's road network.	**Response:** This response is a repeat of RBWM's comments on the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. See relevant response/action in Section 2.
Surrey County Council	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
As this consultation focuses on how the proposed new development at Warfield might look, we have no further comments to add to our previous comment on the SPD that, given the potential impact on Surrey roads we would wish to see the following wording included in the proposed section on Highway Access and Improvements: "Surrey County Council is concerned about the potential impact on the A322 in the vicinity of Bagshot (A30), and Lightwater (M3). Transport modelling will need to account for the impact of development on the Strategic Road Network in these locations and may have to provide mitigation."	**Response:**This response is a repeat of comments made on the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft. See relevant response/action in Section 2.
Theatres Trust	
No comments	**Response:** Noted.
Warfield Parish Council	
Continue to maintain that the area of land is insufficient to accommodate the proposed scale of development and it will destroy the semi-rural character and identity of Warfield. Conflict with PPS1 and saved Local Plan policies regarding the protection of Cabbage Hill.	**Response:** The site can contain 2,200 dwellings and maintain a semi rural character through providing significant semi natural greenspaces such as at Cabbage Hill and the two new river parks. Other natural green areas will be maintained such as Larks Hill and Garth Meadows. By incentivising the landowner of cabbage Hill to provide land for the development will result in a significant area of Cabbage Hill being converted from intensive agricultural use to a country park. It will provide opportunities to plant trees and bring back new hedgerows. Core Strategy Policy CS5 was proved to be sound against national and other policies and is a higher order and more recent policy to the saved local plan policies. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Land parcels a,b,c,d,e,f - as in previous representations objective is to preserve Cabbage Hill as an area of local landscape importance and that it should remain undeveloped. Consider that there should be	**Response:** The SPD must be consistent to the Core Strategy and in particular, Policy CS5 for comprehensive development. To achieve this Cabbage Hill should be included in the development. It is not possible to simply

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
no development on parcels a, b and c. Would not oppose development east of the current building line in West End Lane nor to partial development of eastern section of parcel f.	say that Cabbage Hill remains as is in terms of its area and that it should then be converted into public open space. It is therefore good planning to ensure that the area can accommodate development (on its lower southern and eastern slopes) which will also provide an incentive to the landowner to allow the vast majority of the the eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill to be converted into public open space in the form of a SANG. The eastern slopes are very long and gradual which means that with careful design in line with the text in the SPD, that views into the hill could be protected. On reviewing the southern slopes it was considered that development could be accommodated provided that is sensitive in its design etc. There is also an opportunity to improve the landscape and biodiversity value of Cabbage Hill by converting it into a country park because currently it is intensively farmed. Substantial plating of trees, hedgerows and and meadow will achieve this. The Concept Plan has been amended as a result of comments detailed elsewhere in this Statement to ensure there is no development behind the main line of housing on West End Lane. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Would prefer the primary school PS2 to be located in parcel g.	**Response:** This is agreed and the Concept Plan will be amended to show the primary school in parcel g which is east of The Cut. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
Land parcels g,h and j - Development of these parcels is contrary to saved Local Plan Policy EN14. If development were to take place, vehicular access should not be allowed to the periphery of the river corridor and houses in parcels g and j, d and e should front on to the river.	**Response:** The designation affecting these areas is the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designation relating to Policy EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN14 designation on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. However, this designations will remain until the extent of the built up area has been

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	clarified. The designations whilst remaining a material consideration will have less weight since the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD. However, they will be removed/revised through the DPD process in due course. Vehicle access will only be allowed beyond the river park except where a new road access and bridge is located across The Cut as specified in the Warfield SPD. It is agreed that development in parcels g, j, d and e should front onto the river park as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Land parcels k,m,n,p,ff - Preferred location for the neighbourhood centre would be parcel n as nearer to the primary school PS1. If needed parcel n could be enlarged and ff reduced. Land parcel p should also be included within the site of PS1. Consider that the proposed density of parcel m is too high bearing in mind the location adjacent to Larks Hill and an historic farmhouse.	**Response:** It is agreed that parcel n is the preferred location of the neighbourhood centre as shown on the revised Concept Plan. It is appropriate to have some frontage development along Old Priory Lane (parcel p). Both within parcel n and ff there is a need to ensure that the existing character of the cottages that will not be redeveloped along Newell Green is respected. This will mean lower density dwellings at this point. Therefore, there is no need to alter the densities of these parcels. Text in the SPD should be amended however to clarify this. In regards to parcel m, it is possible to have medium densities next to open space areas provided they are designed in an appropriate manner. Should not all the properties on Watersplash Lane not be available for redevelopment then it will be necessary to stop up the lane ant an agreed point. Alternative access is appropriate at a point on Newell Green near the new neighbourhood centre and then joining to Watersplash Lane at an agreed point. Changes should be made to the Concept plan and SPD. **Action:** Amend the Concept plan. Add a new paragraph 4.28 which reads as: **The junction between Watersplash Lane and Newell Green road is unsuitable to take significant numbers of additional traffic from new development in the vicinity. Therefore, a**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	new access road should be designed to the south of the existing housing on Watersplash Lane as detailed on the Concept Plan.The intention is to redevelop as much of the land in and around Watersplash Lane as possible. However, should some of the existing dwellings not come forward for redevelopment, it will be necessary to retain access the eastern end of Watersplash Lane for the existing dwellings as a small cul-de-sac accessing Newell Green as they do currently. A minimal number of additional new units on the north edge of the lane could front onto the lane and use this existing access. However, access would not be allowed here for the remaining development parcels which would use the new access and junction on Newell Green.
Land parcels q,r,s,t,u - Development of these parcels would be contrary to the Ecological Survey (2009) and would adversely affect the habitat and population of Great Crested Newts. Areas of parcels q,r,s,t and u should be reduced accordingly.	**Response:** The Concept Plan should be redrawn where necessary to ensure that there is sufficient habitat for amphibians (including Great crested Newts) and show additional ponds which will have the potential to sustain increased amphibians even if they do not currently contain any. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add a new sentences to paragraph 7.34 (now 7.37) which reads as **Relevant ponds within the development should be enhanced and include necessary buffer areas for amphibians and other wildlife. Green corridors should be designed to allow movements between ponds including where necessary, crossings under roads and footpaths. Any development proposals must be sensitive to preserving the newt population including providing sufficient foraging areas and migration routes from pond to pond. The habitat creation should take precedence over recreational amenity where the presence of Great Crested Newts are found.**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Land parcels v, w, x and y - Parcel w could be medium density rather than low and the densities of parcels x and y could be increased to over 40 due to location.	**Response:** When proposing new development areas, it is important to assess the context and character of an area, including the surrounding settlements, landscape characteristics, ecology in the area etc.. The SPD now defines the character areas of the site more clearly and an assessment of the potential capacity of each area has been undertaken. As a result, it is considered appropriate to retain areas v and w as low density areas. Area x is expected to deliver a density slightly in excess of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph). Area y is already identified as a higher density area. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Land parcels z, aa, bb - the density of parcel z should be reduced and parcels z and bb become one area of lower density development. The country registered nature reserve in parcel aa should be retained.	**Response:** It is the intention of retained the local wildlife site in parcel aa as the Consultation Draft SPD made clear. The Concept Plan should be revised to clarify this. It is considered in line with current urban design principles and best practice to place the higher density elements of the site around the existing neighbourhood centre of Whitegrove. Area z sits immediately opposite the neighbourhood centre. Apartments in this location will help to enclose and define the space around the County Lane roundabout more effectively and give a sense of arrival, signifying a focal point for the area and the mixed uses currently provided in the centre. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan
Specific concerns relating to roads and access in particular concerns regarding: 1. The use of Hedge End as a access road/bus route; 2. Screening between the new link road and Avery Lane;	**Response:** In respect of these concerns: 1. Hedge Lane will remain traffic free and an access road will be south or north of the bridleway. There may be a need to have some accesses across hedge lane however at an agreed and less sensitive point.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
3. Access to parcel c; 4. Access for parcels q, s and v should be off Jigs Lane North, Harvest Ride or County Lane; 5. Should consider making Maize Lane and Stawberry Hill one way routes; 6. Warfield Street should not carry any more traffic.	2. Additional wording to the SPD should be added to ensure that there will be significant screen planting to Avery Lane will be provided. 3. It is envisaged that Parcel c will be accessed from from parcels d and f. 4. It is agreed that access for parcels q, s and v will be from Jigs Lane North and this will be made clear in the SPD. 5. Maize Lane will be stopped up for vehicle traffic at a convenient location close to its Warfield Street access. Strawberry Hill will also be stopped up and there will be an improved 5 Ways Junction. 6. It is agreed that the development should be primarily access from Harvest Ride and not from Warfield Street The text in the SPD has been amended in accordance with similar response in this consultation highlight elsewhere in this statement. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan. Add a new sentence to the second bullet point of paragraph 7.13 which reads as **Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane.**
Specific comments relating to open spaces: Consider enlarging the open space parcels G9, 10, 12 and 14; No indication is given for the provision of allotments - these are essential; The provision of additional open space is needed; The provision of on-site SANG is essential. As much of Cabbage Hill as possible should be retained as open space. Parcel G1 should be increased to provide SANG and OSPV.	**Response:** Parcel G9 and G1o1 follow the relevant flood zone boundary. There is a need to maximise developable land in these areas as much as possible and they will be linked by a bridge to Westmorland Park. However, the Concept Plan should be revised to match the text in the SPD which protects the Beggars Roost Wildlife Heritage Site (i.e. expand G11 into part of parcel aa). Parcel G10 will be shown as housing or a pub (should it come forward for redevelopment) Parcel G12 will be linked the green corridor running from the newt pond in parcel s. Allotments are a necessary requirement and will need to be accommodated within the housing parcels as required by text (which has been revised following consideration of

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	comments made by the parish council on the SPD Consultation Draft SPD). The Concept Plan should show potential locations for the allotments. As stated earlier in this statement some development is required on the southern and eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill to allow a large part to come forward as OSPV/SANGS. There will need to be an element of SANGS provided on-site which will be the eastern side. The preferred solution also includes Long Copse and the western slopes. If this land does not fully available then this land could contribute to the passive open space of public value requirements. This would mean that the remainder of the SANGS will need to be provided elsewhere in the site or at an off-site location subject to passing an appropriate assessment. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to show the extent of the Beggars Roost LWS and exclude this from the housing development area. Provide a new Landscape Concept Plan in the SPD to show potential locations for allotments.
Recognise that an additional secondary school is essential and support the provision of the primary schools.	**Response:** Noted. The development will provide contributions towards the provision of the new school at Blue Mountain and additional text should emphasise the need to contribute towards pedestrian and cycle access to the new school also. **Action:** Add a new bullet point to paragraph 9.11 now 9.12) which reads as: • **Providing access to the proposed educational facilities on the Blue Mountain development.**

Local Amenity Groups

Table 14 Local Amenity Group Responses

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The Concept Plan shows part of Beggars Roost LWS within an area proposed for development contrary to the Warfield SPD. A layout that resulted in the loss or deterioration of a LWS would be opposed.	**Response:** the Concept Plan did not show the full extent of the existing LWS. This has been revised for clarification. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to show the extent of the Beggars Roost LWS and exclude this from the housing development area.
Other LWS's in the area should also be highlighted e.g. Brickwood Meadows and Big Wood.	**Response:** The Council has produced a Landscape Concept Plan which shows all three LWS areas within the site. Text in the Warfield SPD requires their protection. **Action:** Produce a Landscape Concept Plan.
Welcome retention of existing habitat immediately surrounding the Great Crested Newt breeding pond and linear strips extending to the surrounds. The buffer around the pond should be enhanced for GCN and additional key habitat retained.	**Response:** The Concept Plan has been revised to ensure that there is a sufficient buffer for great Crested Newts and additional habitat. Links to other ponds have also been provided on the Concept plan. Additional text to clarify this has also been added to the Warfield SPD. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add a new sentences to paragraph 7.34 (now 7.37) which reads as **Relevant ponds within the development should be enhanced and include necessary buffer areas for amphibians and other wildlife. Green corridors should be designed to allow movements between ponds including where necessary, crossings under roads and footpaths. Any development proposals must be sensitive to preserving the newt population including providing sufficient foraging areas and migration routes from pond to pond. The habitat creation should take precedence over recreational amenity where the presence of Great Crested Newts are found**
GCN assessments/surveys of ponds not covered by previous surveys should be undertaken.	**Response:** This is agreed and further is already required as prescribed by paragraph 7.35 of the Warfield SPD, however further clarification should be added to this paragraph.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the 6th bullet point of paragraph 7.35 (now 7.38) to read as ~~*An updated Great Crested Newt Survey*~~ **A reptile and amphibian survey including on additional ponds not subject of earlier survey work (April to October)**
Keep West End Green Campaign	
Consider that semi rural landscape around Warfield should be protected, in particular the area of significant landscape to the west of the proposed development comprising the valley of the River Cut, flanked by West End, Cabbage Hill and Larks Hill.	**Response:** The development provides an opportunity to enhance existing landscape areas such as converting a large part of Cabbage Hill into a country park from its current intensive agricultural use. There will need to be development on the southern and eastern slopes of the hill to allow the remainder to come forward as a country park. **Action:** No change to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Referred to comments made at an earlier submission in relation to quotes from the Borough's Landscape Analysis (Landscape Analysis of Gaps/Green Wedges) in relation to the area being a Green Wedge, and the importance of recreation, biodiversity and providing visual continuity of the whole area, and consider the Concept Plan is contrary to the Council's own documents.	
Acknowledge (reluctantly) that there will be some development in the area of Cabbage Hill/West End/Cut valley but consider that development should be restricted to the lower levels of the area to protect views, open space and existing settlement.	**Response:** As a result of representations from the residents, the Concept Plan has been revised to include more development of the southern slopes of the hill and reduce the amount to the west of West End Lane. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
There should be no no development west of the existing property boundaries along West End Lane, stretching from Forest Road The Stables and West End Farm (Plot c of Concept Plan).	**Response:** This is disagreed because there is development west of the lane and that following further visits to the area there is scope for some development west of the lane which follows an appropriate contour so as to minimise the visual impact of the development from the distance. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Development as shown on the Concept Plan is at a higher elevation than existing dwellings and would impact upon the privacy, desirability and properties value of existing properties.	**Response:** Development in the vicinity of existing properties will need to ensure that there are no issues of overlooking or that it is too overbearing. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Include a new Paragraph 4.34 of which the title and paragraph should read as: **West End Lane** **There are two components to the West End area, the existing West End Lane and issues that relate to existing residents and their properties, and new development which will sit around the existing lane.** Add a new paragraph 4.35 which reads as: **With regard to the existing lane and the existing homes, West End Lane should remain semi-rural in its character and should therefore not be paved or lit and remain unadopted. West End Lane will still provide access to the existing properties to the north but will be stopped up to vehicles at a point to be agreed with the Council and will not be an access to the new development. All new development in the vicinity should respect the amenity and privacy of existing dwellings and should be designed so that existing dwellings are not unacceptably overlooked. To achieve this there should not be any development to the west of (behind) the existing properties between West End Cottage and Shoshanna. In addition, a planted wooded buffer zone of at least 20 metres in width will be provided to the east of West End Lane. There should be no vehicular access across this buffer but there should be pedestrian and cycle access at a point to be agreed ~~point~~ south of the stopped up part of West End Lane to allow access to the Cut River Park and ~~the~~ Cabbage Hill Country Park. This also provides the opportunity to retain the existing Farm Shop which runs parallel to the east side of West End Lane from its entrance on Forest Road.**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Any large scale development deemed essential should be restricted to plots a, b and f (where they consider there is more room for housing along Harvest Ride towards the Binfield Road roundabout).	**Response:** It is agreed that there is scope for more development in these parcels and as a result of consultation and other matters such as the objective of the development to look southwards towards Bracknell, that there should not be development behind the majority of properties on West End lane. The Concept Plan and SPD text should be amended. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add additional texts in line with the Action described above.
Recommend that the new primary school is moved to the alternative site on Plot g*, as vehicle access to Plot d is very restricted. Plot d would lead to West End Lane being used by school traffic.	**Response:** This is agreed and the Concept Plan will be amended to show the primary school in parcel g which is east of The Cut. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
Pleased to see that West End Lane is indicated on the Concept Plan as being a cul de sac (stopped off at Old Farmhouse), however there are discrepancies which need to be clarified: • Page 6 of Concept Plan shows a road clearly marked which separates Plots g* & j; G3 & G4; and e & d east to west, and links lower West End Lane with the link road and could also provide a connection for any building work at West End Farm (Plot c). • Page 8 shows the west to east road at the bottom of the plan and does not link with West End Lane, and does not show a link that could be used to link with Plot c. • Concerned that if West End Lane forms part of a link it will become a major through road and would like assurances that the lane will not be used for traffic from any new development and is not intended for construction traffic.	**Response:** The Concept Plan and text in the SPD has been revised in accordance with the Council responses to earlier comments (see comments in this section above). West End Lane will be stopped up and new development behind West End Stables will be accessed from the link across the Cut or from a link to parcel f (at a point near the river park edge). This should be shown on the Concept Plan. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
To retain the rural character of West End Lane there should be no pavements or street lighting.	**Response:** This is agreed and text in the SPD will clarify this.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the Concept Plan and add an additional paragraphs in line with that above.
Rural character will be enhanced by existing hedgerows and establishing a woodland buffer (Plot G13). However, concerned that the green buffer should be properly instated with no breaks which may accommodate an east-west link road. Request the buffer is extended along West End Lane from the junction with Forest Road south beyond The Old Farmhouse.	**Response:** It is agreed that the existing rural character could be enhanced by providing a wooded buffer along West End Lane from its entrance to the Old farmhouse. It should be at least 20 metres wide and should include the existing Farm Shop. There should be no breaks to allow traffic access but there should be at least one break south of the stopped up part of West End lane to allow pedestrian and cycle access for residents eastwards toward the newly provided river park and westwards towards the Cabbage Hill country park. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add an additional text in line with that above**.**
Concerns in relation to the hight and building lines of proposed new buildings to the east of the green buffer, as these may become intrusive to properties in the Lane. Request that new houses are distanced from the Lane by rear gardens.	**Response:** Development in the vicinity of existing properties will need to ensure that there are no issues of overlooking or that it is too overbearing. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. It is appropriate that new dwellings on the eastern side of the buffer are designed to face the buffer to ensure that there is an active frontage to the buffer area which will enhance security of this area. **Action:** Include a new paragraph 4.34 of which is detailed in the actions above.
Limited information has been provided about the provision of roads and access to new housing - as no road could be (sensibly) constructed across the open space of cabbage Hill, and acceptable route needs to be found that does not compromise the status of West End Lane.	**Response:** This is agreed and the majority of development will be access from Harvest Ride with development east and west of West End Lane being accessed from a new vehicle bridge across the Cut. Harvest Ride has capacity to provide more traffic and more junctions along it will also slow the road down. The Concept Plan and SPD text should be amended for clarification.
The new road from Three Legged Cross to Harvest Ride is the only provision from the traffic from the 2,200 houses. No evidence	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
has been provided to demonstrate that highways issues have been considered such as peak traffic impact.	**Action:** Amend the Concept Plan. Add a new paragraph 9.20 which reads as **Harvest Ride will provide the majority of access points into the development listed at the following locations:** • **Two points in the stretch of road next to Garth Meadows;** • **From the QuelmPark Roundabout (for the new link road);** • **Newell Green roundabout** • **Old Priory Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point); and,** • **Maize Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point close to Warfield Street).**
Three Legged Cross is prone to flooding.	**Response:** A new junction at this point will need to demonstrate that is mitigates flood risk. Junction proposals will be subject to detailed flood risk assessment as required generally in the SPD. However further text should be added to the SPD to clarify this in respect to the Three Legged cross junction. **Action:** Add text to the second bullet point of paragraph 9.19 (now 9.21) which reads as: *junctions along the Forest Road (B3034) including at the 3 Legged Cross* **(which will require a detailed flood risk assessment and be designed to mitigate any identified flood risk).**
Concept Plan indicates Hedge Lane and Avery Lane to be used as a vehicle access/bus route which is contradictory to the pedestrian/cycle green way suggested in the text.	**Response:** Hedge Lane will remain traffic free and an access road will be south or north of the bridleway. There may be a need to have access across hedge lane however at an agreed and less sensitive point. The Concept plan should be revised and additional text in the SPD provided to clarify this. **Action:** amend the Concept Plan and amend the first bullet point of paragraph 7.12 (now 7.13) to read as ~~*A*~~ **Hedge Lane** *Bridleway between Old Priory Lane and Maize Lane* ~~*(also known as HedgeLane)*~~ *(Warfield BR 26).* **There may be**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	a need to provide at least one access point across Hedge Lane for vehicle access. This should be at a point to be agreed and which is not sensitive in terms of its existing planting.
Concept Plan indicates Avery Lane to be used as urban cycle track which would result in the lose of the green rural ambiance.	**Response:** The Detailed Concept Plan shows main pedestrian and cycle links and does not distinguish whether they are formal or formal routes. Avery Lane will remain as an informal leisure route and the Concept Plan and text in the SPD should be amended to clarify this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add a sentence to the second bullet point in paragraph 7.13 to read as **Avery Lane will remain as an informal byway leisure route. Enhanced planting will required where appropriate to screen the lane.**
Watersplash Lane/Maize Lane/Old Priory Lane will be converted in wider roads resulting is loss of hedgerows and rural character.	**Response:** Where there are loss of hedgerows due to road capacity improvements, it will be necessary to ensure that compensatory planting is provided as near as possible to the existing provision. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add an additional sentence to Paragraph 7.37 (now 7.40) which reads as **It may be necessary to remove some existing features such as trees or hedgerows. This should be kept to an absolute minimum and where such features are removed they must be compensated by replacement planting of a similar/higher quality as close as possible to the removed features.**
Impact upon existing wildlife through the scale of the proposed development. Green buffers should be provided around new buildings and ancient hedgerows should be preserved and improved.	**Response:** The development will be required to provide a network of green corridors throughout the site as required by paragraph 7.17 of the Warfield SPD. It is agreed that existing habitats including ancient hedgerows should be preserved and enhanced where possible. There may be the need for compensatory features in some parts of the site but overall there should be a net gain in

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	biodiversity and habitat features. Additional text to clarify this should be included in the SPD. **Action:** Add a new sentence to Development Principle W7 which reads as **The removal of existing biodiversity and habitat features should be minimised, but where it is unavoidable, there should be compensatory provision at an agreed location which is of an equal or higher quality to the features to be lost.**
Also some comments from individuals within the KWEGC in relation to it not seeming that previous comments made by KWEGC having been taken into consideration, and this not being in accordance with the Big Society and Localism.	**Response:** The responses made during the consultation on the SPD Consultation Draft were still being considered at time the additional consultation on the Detailed Concept plan was being undertaken. The Council's responses and actions in respect to the SPD demonstrate that the Council has listened in many areas and affected consequential changes to the SPD as a result. Where the Council has not made changes to the SPD as a result of comments made, the Council has explained its reasons why. This proves that the consultations have been undertaken which embraces the concept of localism. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Warfield Memorial Ground Trustees	
Do not support the principle of housing development and disappointed that they have not been directly involved in discussions regarding the provision of recreational space.	**Response:** The principle of housing on the site was established in the Core Strategy DPD which was subject to consultation, evidence, environmental appraisal and examination. The Consultation Draft SPD makes provision for enhancing existing recreational facilities including the memorial park. Additional text should be included in the SPD to ensure partnership working with the trustees to deliver such improvements.
Development will result in a significant increase in demand for the facilities provided at the Memorial Ground and therefore if this development goes ahead would welcome discussions to enhance this facility.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the second bullet point of paragraph 7.6 to read as: *The enhancement of the nearby existing sporting facilities for example, the Warfield Memorial Ground* **(subject to partnership working and agreement with the Warfield Memorial Park Trustees)**, *Priory Fields and Westmorland Park.*

Developer Responses

.1 The following summarises the key issues and the Council's response and actions to comments received by Developers and Landowners who have an interest in the site.

Table 15

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Hyde (Michael Williams Planning) in relation to land east and west of Cabbage Hill and south of Newell Green.	
The site including the garage/MOT/café and adjoining field does not need to wait for a new highway framework before coming forward and is likely to be subject to an early planning application.	**Response:** Noted.
Development along the southern flank of Cabbage Hill urbanises an attractive belt of open countryside. New housing should be consolidated on the east flank of Cabbage Hill.	**Response:** The Council consider that there is scope for some development on both the southern and eastern slopes of the hill. Housing which is designed in a sensitive manner will ensure the landscape value of the hill is not compromised whilst providing the opportunity site visit by officers it is considered that development on the southern side of the hill would not compromise the character of the hill because the longer views to the hill can be maintained with an element of development on both. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Land owned by the Hyde family at West End Lane should provide for a free standing housing development. A sterilising strip of landscaping along the east flank of West End Lane is not supported and the stables should not be absorbed into the area of new housing shown on the east flank of Cabbage Hill.	Response: There is a need to protect the setting of the listed Old Farmhouse where it faces West End Lane, a buffer strip will achieve this. Land to the rear of the Old Farmhouse is suitable for redevelopment. There is no planning rationale to bring this land forward as a free standing housing development other than land ownership issues. Therefore, it is advised that the owners of this land work in partnership with the main developer in the area (Berkeleys) to bring this land forward. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The centre proposed at Newell Green would be better located further to the west.	**Action:** Following consultation it was considered that the location of the neighbourhood centre should be in the centre of the development and near to existing facilities. The location off Newell Green is considered appropriate. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The residential curtilage at Grange Cottage will not be split to accommodate public open space.	**Response:** The Concept Plan will be revised to exclude this land. However, it should be noted that the development on land in the Hyde family ownership will need to provide open space/SANG land. The open space at Grange Cottage could provide this opportunity. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to exclude the Grange Cottage land.
There should be greater certainty about the location of the western primary school. The location should provide for it to be the centre of gravity to the western neighbourhoods and should provide ease of access especially by car.	**Response:** This is agreed and following consultation, the location of the western primary school will be in option 2 (of the Detailed Concept Plan) which is the site east of The Cut. The Concept Plan should be revised to accommodate this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include the school at the Option 2 location.
There is a lack of information as to how the road network will work in linking neighbourhoods effectively. The North/South/Three Legged Cross route would be better traversing the east flank of The Cut to give greater definition to the western neighbourhoods.	**Response:** The preferred route is the most direct and providing it alongside The Cut would compromise the objective to provide The Cut River Park. However, it is appropriate to link this road across The Cut to link some of the development on its western side. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The triangle of new housing between the Cut and West End lane and the alternative school site have not taken into account the limiting effect of overhead electricity cables.	**Response:** The development will not be hindered by existing power lines. The developers strategy will be to re-route them in accordance with an agreed development

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	layout (e.g. via new roads) either overhead or underground depending on negotiations with the utility company and the various other factors that may apply e.g. cost, timetable. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Souter (Paul Dickinson) in relation to land west of Cabbage Hill	
Density schedule on page 6 indicates 2,200 houses and open space totalling 72.04ha (excluding parks at G6, G7 & G8), with a SANG requirement of 40.64ha. This is misleading as not all of the 72.04ha would be suitable or appropriate for SANG. The total figure of POS/SANG or 136.96 appears incorrect. The open space and SANG figures should be clarified.	**Response:** SANGS will need to need provided to meet current standards for provision (including land at 8 hectares per 1000 persons). The preferred solution is for it to be all on site and at Cabbage Hill including the land subject of this responder. However, there is flexibility to provide some land off site also subject to passing an appropriate assessment. This will avoid ransom situations and ensure effective negotiations can take place. The development also has to provide open space of public value (OSPV) including a passive element. It may be that this land remains as passive OSPV. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concept Plan (page 4) shows a green notation along the north east side of Forest Road, south of Temple Way roundabout, this is not known on the key. The purpose of the notation should be clarified.	**Response:** It is agreed that this notation should be included on the Concept Plan as it shows the need for a planted frontage. Changes should be made the the Concept Plan to clarify this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include this notation as **new trees and planting**.
Concept Plan (page 4) shows the lower western slopes of Cabbage Hill as G1 open space/SANG, to be kept free from development. Topographical analysis shows the lower slopes are potentially suitable for development whilst the upper slopes should remain open. There is sufficient potential SANG to accommodate any consequent small increase in housing numbers.	**Response:** The development should be comprehensive providing 2,200 dwellings. The Council consider that development should be kept to the southern and eastern slopes for other reasons than just landscape matters such as the need to be as close to the new facilities and primary school as possible and to maintain a gap between

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Binfield and Warfield. It is not the preferred option to include development on the western side of the hill. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concept Plan (page 4) shows existing properties along the north east side of Forest Road, and are shown within the SPD boundary, but excluded from the G1 open space. The land includes buildings and extensive areas of garden & other curtilage land. The status of the excluded land should be clarified.	**Response:** It is considered that this land is excluded from the development in this scheme because the western side of the hill is not the preferred location for development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The SPD is not accompanied by a landscape/visual analysis of the area to properly guide the concept plan.	**Response:** Officers have reviewed the landscape and topography of the site mostly in the Cabbage Hill area. Developers will be expected to provide detailed analysis as part of their applications. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
JPC Strategic Planning (Philip Chichester) in relation to Long Copse	
Areas outside the site boundary should not be shown on the concepts plans, as this suggests a larger study area and is misleading.	**Response:** It is agreed that there is potential for confusion. However, it is necessary to show features beyond the site for context and to visualise text in the SPD such as the need to improve facilities on nearby parks. Changes to the Concept Plan should be made for clarification. **Action:** Include a Landscape Concept Plan.
Long Copse Wood should be identified as a 'Natural Green Space', and form part of the initial phase of SANG as the land is already established. Part of G1 (Long Copse Wood), G3, G4, G5, G9 and G11 should be prioritised as SANG in the initial phases of development (making up 14.55ha which would accommodate the first 400 units).	**Response:** Long Copse is suitable for open space either as part of the SANG solution or as Open Space of Public Value as detailed in the text in the SPD. Text in the SPD should be amended to clarify this. **Action:** Amend the second sentence of paragraph 7.29 (now 7.30) to read as *Unless an alternative scheme is agreed with the Council, the new SANGs will consist of*

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Cabbage Hill **including Long Copse (the preferred solution), the Cut River Park, Land at Manor Farm and Bull Brook River Park**, as shown **on the Concept Plan***as shown in Figure 3.*
Specific areas of SANG should be identified.	**Response:** The SPD make provision for SANGS in Development Principle W6 and its accompanying paragraphs. It is not certain exactly where the SANGS will be in the site at this stage but for clarification the Concept plan key should be amended to read as SANGS/OSPV. **Action:** Amend the key relating to the Concept Plan to read as SANGS/OSPV rather than Natural Green Spaces.
Existing areas of open space should be identified. Specific areas of playing field should be identifies to ensure that the most appropriate land areas are retained.	**Response:** Existing open space areas/playing fields are identified in the SPD but for clarification this should be visualised on the Concept Plan. **Action:** Include a Landscape Concept Plan.
Phasing of the open space and SANGS should be in line with delivering key pedestrian and cycle network.	**Response:** SANGS must be in place before development is occupied. This may be done in a phased manner commensurate with phasing of development. It is also reasonable that the SANGS are connected to development so there will be a need to ensure that pedestrian and cycle access is provided in a timely manner. Amendments to the text in the SPD should be made for clarification. **Action:** Add text to the first sentence of paragraph 7.32 which reads as *The SANGs must be in place before development can be occupied. Given the large amount of dwellings on this site it may be that the SANGs come forward in proportion to large elements of housing delivery* **including the provision of pedestrian and cycle access to and from the development.**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
An explanation as to why areas G6, G7 and G8 are excluded from the plan should be provided. Table on page 6 should identify the specific requirements and delivery of SANG and open space in line with the land parcels (Note: an updated table of that on page 6 was provided with the representation showing the SANG and open space requirement by land parcel).	**Response:** It is agreed that clarification should be provide in respect to this and other areas on the Concept Plan as necessary. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
A phasing table was also provided with the representation showing the phasing of housing together with open space and SANG. Assuming development starts in 2014 and first 5 years deliver 800 units, 24ha of open space and SANG will be required to comply with policy.	**Response:** It is agreed that the SANGS provision should be in line with housing provision to satisfy the Habitats Regulations as specified in paragraph 7.31 (now 7.32) of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There are three existing areas on the Concept Plan that could form appropriate SANG (marked up on plans provided with the representation).	**Response:** Reviewing the plan referred to in the response: 1. The Council's proposed densities are considered robust and appropriate; 2. it is not agreed that care home should be provided for reasons set out in the response to Kitewood (see below in this statement); The yellow school site is too small for the need (it should be 2.2 hectares); the neighbourhood centre area is agreed although it will also be on the other side of Newell Green; the green areas are already open space/SANGS. The development will need to provide SANGS in accordance with policy, guidance and Development Principle W6. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Council must commit to a mechanism for the long-term delivery of the development , i.e. will developers be required to deliver infrastructure, or will the infrastructure be delivered through contributions? (Concerned that this SPD does not follow the North Wokingham SPD in Wokingham, where the failure to identify a clear delivery mechanism by Wokingham Borough has lead to the break	**Response:** Infrastructure will be required through a number of ways such as contributions in lieu of provision or in kind provision. It will also be necessary for developers to equalise their costs so, for example, there is an incentive to bring forward other land uses such as open space. The Council has undertaken and exercise on viability in respect to the level of

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
of the consortium, with land assembly, equalisation and delivery of infrastructure now being part of the appeal planning issues). The Council should appoint a valuer to establish appropriate equalised land values.	development and the Infrastructure Development Plan. It is not the role of the Council to establish or negotiate equalisation and land values. This is a matter for developers and private agreements between themselves. However further text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add new sentences to paragraph 6.4 which read as **Developers will be expected to work in partnership and, where appropriate, equalise land values to deliver the full range of open space, SANGS and associated infrastructure and services. The Council will act in a coordinating role to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure on specific projects such as schools and open space/SANG provision.**
As numerous land owners are involved, common ground will need to be established between the consortium and individual land owners and the Council to ensure a holistic approach to the the proposed 2,200 homes.	**Response:** This is agreed and the final SPD which has been amended as a result of consultations provide a sufficient framework for negotiations to begin. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Existing land deals and options cannot dictate the ability to deliver the SPD requirements - the driver must be the masterplanning process. An independent and robust financial appraisal is required by the Council to ensure that any suggested departure from the adopted masterplan are fully justified and not a cost saving exercise by the applicant.	**Response:** It is agreed that land ownership or option arrangements should not dictate the delivery of SPD requirements. A masterplanning process is essential across the site. However, it is recognised that one application might not be achievable and therefore, the site should contain 3 comprehensive masterplans in line with the suggested areas in the revised Appendix 3. Text should be revised in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add new paragraphs 11.5 and 11.6 which read as **The Council has assessed the individual sites comprising the development area and considers it to be sound planning to group the sites**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	together to provide comprehensive development. The suggested blocks as shown in Appendix 3 are: • **Central Block 1** • **Western Block 2** • **Eastern Block 3** • **Manor Farm Block 4** • **Cabbage Hill A** **Therefore, the site could be masterplanned broadly in line with these blocks as shown in Appendix 3. The Council advocates planning applications to be submitted in accordance with the masterplan areas. However, provided the masterplans are approved, there may be circumstances where some site or individual development could come forward independently because of their relationship/location to the main development and subject to the requirements of the SPD. These are:** • **Land at Watersplash Lane which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Land at The Splash and West End Stables which should be delivered at the same time or following the delivery of the main Western Block 2 development.** • **Cohesive groups of sites within Eastern Block 3 provided major infrastructure subject to the provision of satisfactory primary school provision being put in place.** • **Land at Manor Farm (see paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47).**
Rapleys (rep K Henderson) Warfield Priory	
General support for low density residential development for Warfield St. South character area. However, density schedule should be flexible and not prescriptive	**Response:** The SPD is guidance as part of the LDF. However, should developers promote lower densities than that prescribed in the SPD it should be on the basis that they can demonstrate that the lower density does

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	not compromise the comprehensiveness of the development and the ability of the site to deliver 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Highway infrastructure unclear, particularly vehicular access in Warfield St South character area. Concern that residential and school traffic will be required to feed into Old Priory Lane creating congestion and problems at junction of Old Priory Lane and Warfield Street. Not convinced demand for buses through site either.	**Response:** The bus route is to be rerouted along Harvest Ride. The development must be consistent with the overall objective to ensure the development looks towards Bracknell Town Centre rather than outwards for it to be a sustainable urban extension. Forest Road is limited in its capacity to take further traffic. Therefore it is reasonable for development to be accessed from Harvest Ride and access to the school and development could come from an access off Harvest Ride by opening up the stopped up part of the lane. A new stop up point will need to be provided to ensure that Old Priory Lane is not used as a through route. The Amendments to the Concept Plan and SPD text should be made for confirmation. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to reroute the bus route and show access from Harvest Ride and a new stopped up point on Old Priory Lane. Amend paragraph 9.8 (now 9.9) which reads as: *The Council is undertaking a review of bus services that serve the Parish of Warfield and it may be that provision is~~by~~ through new services,* **or by r***e-routing existing* ~~*provision*~~**services. The preferred route is shown indicatively along Harvest Ride on the Concept Plan.** Add a new paragraph 9.20 which reads as: **Harvest Ride will provide the majority of access points into the development listed at the following locations:** • **Two points in the stretch of road next to Garth Meadows;** • **From the QuelmPark Roundabout (for the new link road);** • **Newell Green roundabout**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	• **Old Priory Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point); and,** • **Maize Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point close to Warfield Street).**
Character area principles focus around the pond and Green Lane area, therefore characteristics of other parts of this area must inform proposals on a site by site basis.	**Response:** The Detailed Concept Plan focused on selected parts of the site for the purposes of consultation. The SPD focuses on the character areas which provide a comprehensive coverage of the site. The development should be comprehensive and individual applications will not be acceptable. Sites should come forward in line with Chapter 11 and Appendix 3. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Document says nothing on timing. Suitable sites for early release should be supported where they do not prejudice wider proposals	**Response:** The timing of development was not the purpose of the Detailed Concept plan. The Final Warfield SPD includes details on timings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Berkeley Strategic (Managing Director Adrian Brown)	
Berkeley is committed to working in partnership with the local community, Bracknell Forest Council and interested community groups. They intend, in time, to submit an outline planning application for the land in their control as a stand alone part of the comprehensive development at Warfield.	**Response:** Noted.
No objection to a neighbourhood centre located centrally within the site, however, the SPD should provide sufficient flexibility for a suitable quantum of mixed use along the north/south High Street (link road)	**Response:** A mix of uses will be acceptable across the site provided it can demonstrate that the overriding need for 2,200 dwellings is not compromised. Text should be amended in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 3.5 which reads as: **The parcels of housing can contain appropriate additional uses provided this does not detract from the objective of delivering comprehensive**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	development including the overriding need to deliver 2,200 new dwellings on the site.
Support for Link Road and wish to work with Council to deliver this route.	**Response:** Noted.
Support for development platforms illustrated in Detailed Concept Plan	
Primary School 2 should be provided in the alternative location proposed on the Link Road. The alternative location can provide suitable and safe parking facilities and some of the playing fields can be located in the flood plain. Additionally, this location keeps parked cars away from West End residents.	**Response:** This is agreed and following consultation, the location of the western primary school will be in option 2 (of the Detailed Concept Plan) which is the site east of The Cut. The Concept Plan should be revised to accommodate this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include the school at the Option 2 location
Development parcels with frontage onto Forest Road and Harvest Ride will require accesses onto these roads at suitable and agreed points.	**Response:** Following, consultation there will not be development fronting Harvest Ride to the west of West End Lane (between the properties named West End Cottage and Shoshanna) and therefore an access is not required. The development should look towards Bracknell and Harvest Ride is suitable for new access points and Forest Road is not. As a consequence, more development will be provided on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill to compensate the removal of development in the area behind the existing housing on West End Lane. It is agreed that access points off Harvest Ride will be required. To clarify, there will be some development There will be some development on the eastern slopes of Cabbage Hill but this will be in a block south of the existing West End Lane houses. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to clarify access points off Harvest Ride for development on the southern slopes of the Cabbage Hill.
Illustrative character areas provide some context which can be further worked on and	**Response:** Noted.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
refined as part of the preparation of a Design and Access Statement to accompany an outline planning application. Berkeley will work with the Council through pre-application discussions to refine proposals for their area.	
Berkeley is supportive of the principle of the green link, providing views from Lark's Hill to Cabbage Hill, however, are concerned that this can only be achieved if existing development south of West End Lane and outside of Berkeley's control is demolished.	**Response:** It is the intension that Park Farm and its associated buildings, dwellings are redeveloped as part of the overall development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Support for some development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill. The relationship between development and open space and existing residents at West End Lane is a key consideration for any future planning application.	Response: It is agreed that some development should be accommodated on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill to its south and east. The Council has considered the views of the residents, developers and officers and have concluded that: 1. There should be more development on the southern slopes of Cabbage Hill and the Concept plan should be amended to accommodate this; 2. The should be no development to the rear of the West End Lane properties between West End House and Shosanna; 3. The should be development east of West End Lane south of the are in 2. above. 4. There should be housing beyond a minimum 20m buffer west of The Cut and east of West End Lane. The Concept Plan and SPD text should be amended. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to reflect the above. See also text amendments as a result of comments made from the West End Lane Residents (in the Specific Consultee Responses section).

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
West End Lane should not be blocked off in the vicinity of West End Farmhouse as this would sever links to existing businesses and households to the south. However, traffic from the new development should not have direct access onto West End Lane.	**Response:** West End Lane should be blocked off at an agreed point in the vicinity of the property named Shosanna. The intention is for West End Farm and its business operation to be part of the development in accordance with the Warfield SPD **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Berkeley consider their land can be delivered as a stand alone phase and seek to agree a viable package of planning benefits and to off set any disproportionate costs, such as the north south link road, with reductions in other planning contributions.	**Response:** The development should be provided in a comprehensive manner which meets current policy and the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
G. L. Hearn (James Cook) for Copper Estates	
A more Detailed Concept Plan is welcomed. However, the status is unclear. It should remain indicative as more detailed work is needed to clearly define boundaries such as the Natural Green Space in the Bullbrook River Park and the precise alignment of the Green Link.	**Response:** The revised Concept Plan is more detailed that the version in the Consultation Draft SPD. It reflects the main requirements of SPD although it does not take account of all of its detailed requirements. The status will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Concept Plan is also flexible in many areas such as it shows the East to West Greenway but it may be that there are some deviations from the shown route to reflect conditions on the ground. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Bullbrook area should have been a specific character area and more clearly defined, particularly as this sustainable area will come forward early in the process.	**Response:** This is not agreed because the area has two distinct elements to it namely its relationship with the Bull Brook and Harvest Ride. Therefore, there is a sound planning rationale to ensure development is designed and built to response to both features, hence the area falling in two of the defined character areas. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Whilst land owners in this part of the site are in discussion with each other, parcels 'aa', 'bb' and 'z' of the Density Schedule should be revised to reflect land ownership issues and the schedule should be indicative.	**Response:** The development must be comprehensive in line with Core Strategy Policy CS5. The Council has been consistent in discussions with developers that the developers should work together to bring forward applications that deliver the requirements of the SPD in full. Developers will be expected to demonstrate that they have fully considered all issues including appropriate densities. The development is a long term project and therefore it is not accepted that current market conditions should solely dictate development on the ground. Therefore, piecemeal development or development which provides only houses is not acceptable unless it can be demonstrated that it will not compromise comprehensive development including the sites ability to deliver 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Bullbrook should be confirmed as the first phase as a logical extension to the urban area.	**Response:** The delivery of development in this area will be dependent on the delivery of key elements of infrastructure within the site such as SANGS and primary schools. The latter of which is to be provided in another parcel which may warrant the later delivery of development at the eastern edge of the site. It will not be appropriate for the development at this site to simply pay financial contributions in lieu of provision because, for example, there is no or limited capacity for primary school places in the area. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development blocks need to be agreed with the local authority.	**Response:** The Council has consulted with the development industry during the production of the SPD and due to concerns about site accumulation and delivery across the site, officers have considered the rationale for grouping land plots across the

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	site. It has informed the revision of Chapter 11 and Appendix 3 which indicates the sites key development blocks. **Action:** Amend Appendix 3.
Warfield Consortium (Taylor Wimpey, Thomas Lawrence (Bracknell) Ltd., Martin Grant Homes, Harcourt Developments and Cordea Savills)	
It is acknowledged that no detailed plan for the site has been completed and constraints such as trees, drainage and land for allotments have not been fully considered at this stage, therefore, the Density Plan and Schedule of Accommodation should be considered in this light.	**Response:** The Density Plan and Schedule of Accommodation demonstrate how 2,200 dwellings could be delivered across the site. Different parts of the site can deliver more dwellings than others, both in terms of issues such as topography, character, acknowledging constraints already been identified and good urban design principles. Additional analysis when drawing up detailed plans will inevitably inform this process further. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
General disposition of land and broad development principles are supported. The Character Principles are considered an appropriate starting point for testing and informing the approach to design and layout within each Character Area.	**Response:** Noted.
The Density Plan and Schedule of Accommodation is not always consistent with the Character Principles, e.g. the Warfield Street South Character Principles do not align readily with the Density Schedule. Therefore, the final SPD should contain a statement that at the detailed design stage Character Principles will take precedence over the Density and Schedule of Accommodation.	**Response:** The Density Plan and Schedule of Accommodation detail the Warfield Street South character area as low density development. This is considered in keeping with the design principles stated, with particular reference to creating an informal, village feel to the area. The other character area design principles and proposed densities are also considered to align and be appropriate. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
There is concern relating to the internal vehicular access strategy and hierarchy of routes. Concern that the bus only east/west route and limited access onto Harvest Ride/County Lane for development within the parcels to the east of the new link road and west of the A3095 will mean that traffic will be directed out through village and Warfield Street. Suggest an east/west street is provided creating a through route linking Newell Green and the new north/south link road.	**Response:** The bus route is to be rerouted along Harvest Ride and the access road rerouted to the south of the existing properties on Watersplash Lane which provides and east /west link between the link road and Newell Green. The Amendments to the Concept Plan and SPD text should be made for confirmation. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to reroute the bus route and provide a link between Watersplash Lane and Newell Green (also showing Watersplash lane as a cul de -sac. Add a new sentence in paragraph 9.8 mend paragraph 9.8 (now 9.9) **The preferred route is shown indicatively along Harvest Ride on the Concept Plan.**
A more direct route to the new north/south link road should be provided in addition to that proposed by Watersplash Lane to encourage traffic onto the link road and away from Newell Green and through the village.	
Consideration should also be given to closing Old Priory Lane north of the east/west street and to provide a route south onto Harvest Ride so reducing traffic moving north through Warfield Street.	**Response:** The development must be consistent with the overall objective to ensure the development looks towards Bracknell Town Centre rather than outwards for it to be a sustainable urban extension. Opening ad access onto Old Priory Lane from Harvest Ride is consistent with this approach with a stop up somewhere along the route at an agreed point to avoid through traffic. The school should be accessed from the new access point also. Maize Lane should also be sopened up from its junction with Harvest Ride and stopped up near Warfield Street to prevent vehicular access here to only existing development in the area which currently us the access. Changes should be made the the Concept plan and SPD text for clarification. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to show access from Harvest Ride. Add a new paragraph 9.19 in line with that detailed above in the Action to Rapleys.
The junction of Maize Lane and Warfield Street is very limited and could be problematic for increased vehicle movements. Therefore, the northern end of Maize Lane should be limited to a footway/cycle and perhaps access for emergency vehicles and residential vehicles should be encouraged south to the more appropriate junction with Harvest Ride.	
Pick up and drop off for Primary School 01 could lead to significant vehicle manoeuvring which could affect the function of Newell Green as a secondary route.	
Pedestrian routes south to the existing footway/cycleway network will require enhanced crossing points along Harvest Ride.	**Response:** This is agreed and should be provided in accordance with paragraph 9.11 of the Warfield SPD.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The final SPD should include wording to allow for flexibility in the exact alignment of the new north/south link road due to constraints being identified as the detailed design work progresses, subject agreement with the Council.	**Response:** It is agreed that there should be flexibility in the SPD to ensure that the development and link road can be provided. **Action:** Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9.16 (now 9.17) to read as: T*he development will includes the construction of a new ~~spine~~***link** *road between the Quelm Park Roundabout and the Three Legged Cross junction* **as shown on the Concept Plan (although the Concept Plan is flexible to allow for necessary deviations of the route subject to specific site conditions).**
Boyer Planning (Krzys Lipinskion behalf of Mr. J Daborn) re Grove Gardens, Forest Road parcel 'dd'	
Support the general principles of the SPD and welcome the inclusion of the Grove Gardens site as parcel 'dd' on the Detailed Concept Plan.	**Response:** Noted.
Suggest the density figures as stated in the Density and Schedule of Accommodation should be treated as guidance only.	**Response:** The SPD is guidance as part of the LDF. However, should developers promote lower densities than that prescribed in the SPD it should be on the basis that they can demonstrate that the lower density does not compromise the comprehensiveness of the development and the ability of the site to deliver 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Clarification is needed as to which parts of the site identified as natural green space is to be SANG and which will be public open space.	**Response:** The SPD make provision for SANGs in Development Principle W6 and its accompanying paragraphs. It is not certain exactly where the SANGs will be in the site at this stage but for clarification the Concept Plan key should be amended to read as SANGs/OSPV.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the key relating to the Concept Plan to read as SANGs/OSPV rather than Natural Green Spaces
PRO Vision Planning & Design (on behalf of Bloor Homes Ltd Southern Division)	
Consider the Council's vision for the new development at Warfield is flawed due to: - a failure to identify existing character and context issues and development opportunities and constraints, - not being based on detailed assessment or analysis, - failing to identify the Council's overall strategy of what it is trying to achieve and why.	**Response:** The SPD is clear in what it is trying to achieve for example: to deliver comprehensive development; and defining character areas across the site. The document is an SPD and will not contain detailed analysis across the whole site. However, it sets out requirements to consider all planning matters in a comprehensive and detailed manner. The SPD should be read as a whole and then it is clear that there is a logical planning rationale behind why it recommends densities or certain types of development in specific areas. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Bloor Homes state that it is unclear whether sufficient survey work has been undertaken to support the Detailed Concept Plan and therefore it is considered that an inappropriate Urban Design concept is being imposed unrelated to any evidence base. Analysis of land to the east of Jigs Lane North has been carried out by Bloor Homes which informs their comments.	
One of the new primary schools should be located close to the existing local centre off County Lane.	**Response:** Whilst there are merits in locating a school closer to the Whitegrove Centre there are issues of deliverability early in the development given that this area is dominated by fragmented ownership . The proposed locations for the school are on the western side of the site (east of The Cut) which can be delivered early in the development and is well located to serve the the western half of development. The other primary school is to be located next to the new proposed neighbourhood centre. This school is on land controlled by the consortium and deliverable and is in reasonable walking distance to the eastern elements of the development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Creation of a key frontage opposite Tesco would result in removal or significant loss of existing green edge.	**Response:** The development should integrate as much as possible with existing development. The loss of the green frontage allow an active development frontage to be achieved. The development at this location will also be more accessible to the centre. Compensation for the loss of greenery here will be made up elsewhere in the development site including the opportunity to create the Bullbrook River Park. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
No distinction made between existing parks, Public Open Space (POS), unbuilt areas off site, existing or proposed SANG, or proposed parks and POS.	**Response:** This is mostly agreed and a plan should be included in the final SPD which clarifies existing parks and open spaces. Figure 4 shows the existing SANGS. **Action:** Include a Landscape Concept Plan
Existing hedgerows and trees have been ignored in many locations.	**Response:** The Concept Plan is not a masterplan so it does not pick up all details of features to be retained or otherwise. The text in the SPD requires detailed assessment which should be followed by retaining , enhancing, replacing or providing new planting and tress within the development. However, for clarification, the Concept Plan should be revised to incude important TPO's. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan
Very few links proposed to the existing residential area to to the east of Bull Brook.	**Response:** Some residential development and Westmorland Park is east of the Bullbrook and the SPD Consultation Draft and the Detailed Concept Plan both made it clear that the park should be linked to the development across the Bullbrook to form the East to West Greenway. This means at least one bridge crossing. However it may be that there needs to be a further crossing to allow effective access to and from the Bullbrook River Park. Additional text should be provided in the SPD for clarification.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the second sentence to paragraph 4.28 (now 4.42) to read as *Pedestrian and cycle access should be provided across the river* **in at least two locations** *connecting to the existing cycleway and into Westmorland Park***and contribute to the delivery of the East to West Greenway** .
Further analysis of floodmap data is needed.	**Response:** It is up to developers to demonstrate if there should be changes to flood zone areas at critical points within the site. Any justification must be also agreed in writing with the Environment Agency. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development is proposed east of Strawberry Hill. Much of this land is designated as a local nature reserve under Local Plan Policy EN4.	**Response:** The Beggars Roost Wildlife Heritage Site is required to be protected in line with the text in the SPD. However the Concept Plan should be amended to reflect this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan
No reference is made to a vehicular access to land east of Jig's Lane North.	**Response:** Access to this land should be made from Jig's Lane North or from Strawberry Hill as required by paragraph 9.20 of the Warfield SPD.**Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Bloor Homes challenge role of the Character Area and Key Points Plan on page 5 and the boundaries of the character areas and state that the Character Principles for each area are without justification.	**Response:** The boundaries of the character areas are logical. The Bloor site falls within two character areas, namely the Bull Brook River Park and the Harvest Ride North character area. Different treatments will be required across their site but this is achievable with careful design. The rationale for development in these areas was set out in the SPD Consultation Draft and has been refined following the further consultation on the Detailed Concept Plan.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend Chapter 4 to reflect the character areas in line with the preparation and consultation responses from the Detailed Concept Plan. Amend the Concept Plan.
The size and capacity of identified developable areas are questionable in whether what is stated can be achieved. This is due to a failure to take account of the physical constraints to the development site.	**Response:** The Council has met with the prospective developers and there was no indication that the physical site constraints are a problem to achieve densities. The problems seem to be other issues such as concerns over current market conditions. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Density and Schedule of Accommodation does not fit with the Character Principles in relation to 'z' and 'bb', nor the constraints on these sites.	**Response:** The density schedule is consistent with the character principles in that it promotes higher density apartments facing the roundabout and County Lane. The indicated density on parcel bb can be achieved if the development is well designed whilst responding to on-site constraints. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The document fails to judge correctly what is feasible in current economic and market conditions.	**Response:** The development is to be constructed over a long time period and therefore it is reasonable for the planning framework to be based on this period rather than the current pessimistic market conditions. Logic says that if you plan for current market conditions you are likely to remain in such market conditions. The SPD is not unrealistic in its optimism because it is reasonable that the market will respond to the development over 10 + years it will take to plan and develop the site in full. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Tesco area should be referred to the Whitegrove Centre	**Response:** This is agreed and changes should be made the the Concept Plan for clarification.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the Concept Plan by replacing *Tescos* with **Whitegrove Centre.**
The flatted elements suggested for character area 06 are considered incongruous with the 'suburban' character identified as a Design Principle for this area.	**Response:** It is appropriate at this location to include some apartments close to the existing centre to maximise activity between the two and to give the site a presence. The apartments will not be high rise but 3 - 4 storeys which, if designed appropriately in accordance with the SPD, can work in an urban design context with the rest of the development and existing area. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The nature reserve, if retained, can provide the total SANG allocation for the eastern end of the concept plan. Retention of trees and hedgerows along Jigs Lane North, Strawberry Hill and County Lane could contribute towards both passive and active POS.	**Response:** It is reasonable that the WHS and the Bullbrook River Park can perform a role as either passive OSPV or SANGS (subject to passing an appropriate assessment). However, at this time the Council is not convinced that a hedgerow or trees fronting, for example, Jigs Lane North falls would be usable OSPV. It may be that it is simply incidental planting. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The suburban/rural edge character of this part of the development should be preserved by providing lower density development here. This approach is supported by the Parish Council and therefore this approach represents the principle of Localism.	**Response:** There is a need to make the most efficient use of land possible which is what the whole development is trying to achieve. To provide low density housing at a location next to existing facilities clearly does not achieve this aim. The net result of lower densities would either that more of the site is developed or higher densities would be need elsewhere in the site which is away from a centre and more suited to lower densities. The Council has responded to the Parish Council consultation responses in the previous section. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Boyer Planning (on behalf of Millgate Homes) re Manor Farm, Binfield	
Millgate Homes support in principle the objectives of the SPD and Detailed Concept Plan.	**Response:** Noted.
Consider the amount of developable land at 'ee' is greater than 0.5ha and suggest an amendment to the concept plan showing an allocation of 1ha for housing development.	**Response:** It may be that the developable area is able to be expanded subject to agreement with the Environment Agency and provided that the site meets other requirements in the Warfield SPD. Additional text has been included in the final Warfield SPD as detailed in the Council response to Millgate Homes on the SPD Consultation Draft). **Action:** See Section 2 of this statement.
This part of the Warfield site should form part of the earliest phase of development as it is not dependent on the other parts of the site coming forward.	**Response:** The Council has considered this issue as detailed in the Council response to Millgate Homes on the SPD Consultation Draft). **Action:** See Section 2 of this statement.
The need for an additional pedestrian crossing on Binfield Road in front of the Manor Farm frontage is questioned as one already exists.	**Response:** Currently there is not a formal crossing in this location only an island near the Framptons Bridge Roundabout. There is a need to provide a formal pedestrian crossing with traffic lights. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Approximately 1 ha of land, immediately adjoining The Cut, will be transferred for natural green space purposes. There will be direct access across The Cut from the new natural green space land to the rest of Garth Meadow via a new foot bridge. However, access to this area should be via the existing route and not through the new development at Manor Farm. Therefore it is suggested that a footbridge across The Cut into the Manor Farm natural green space is identified on the Concept Plan.	**Response:** It is not agreed that there should not be a through route. The land has potential to provide mitigation as SANG or as open space of public value. If it is to be a SANG it must pass an appropriate assessment in terms of its design and function. Demonstrating connectivity between Garth Meadows and Tinkers Copse/Jocks Copse is one reasons to help the potential SANG pass an appropriate assessment. It may be appropriate to connect the land to

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Garth Meadows by one or twp bridges depending on detailed layout and access constraints. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Concept Plan should detail which parts of the site noted as natural green space will be SANG and which is to be public open space.	**Response:** It is not defined exactly which land should be OSPV or SANG. There is a need to provide on-site SANGS of which the preferred option is for it to be in the Cabbage Hill country park. Development will be expected to provide the requisite amount of OSPV/SANGS in accordance with policy, guidance and the development principles in the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Alliance Planning (on behalf of Kitewood Estates Ltd) re Central block south of Watersplash Lane	
Support for the production of the Detailed Concept Plan to accompany the Warfield SPD.	**Response:** Noted.
Support for the location of the neighbourhood centre close to existing facilities at Newell Green however some concern that the centre is bisected by a major road. The neighbourhood centre should be located to the east of the A3095.	**Response:** There is no planning rationale why the neighbourhood centre should not be on both side of the street. Many neighbourhood centres operate like small high streets and function very well because of activity on both sides of a street. Further, such activity and a pedestrian crossing will actually slow the street to safer and more appropriate speeds. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The proposed primary school location alongside the neighbourhood centre is welcomed. However, the allocation of 2.2ha is considered excessive. The school should be located on the northern area of 'PS1' freeing valuable land around the neighbourhood centre for medium density housing.	**Response:** The size of the school is to be a 2 form entry school and which is capable to be expanded in the future. The school area is consistent with the requirements of the Local education authority and the Limiting the Impact of Development SPD.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The SPD and Detailed Concept Plan should make provision for additional facilities for the urban area and to meet this objective a care home should be included within the scheme.	**Response:** There is an overriding need for housing and the development must demonstrate that its meets the Core Strategy DPD which includes the provision for 2,200 dwellings. There is no overriding demonstrated need for a such a facility in the area. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The most suitable location for a care home is next to the new neighbourhood centre.	**Response:** Any elderly care facilities must be self contained and contribute towards the housing numbers to be provided across the whole development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The existing houses which form part of area 'm' are currently not represented or show interest in being part of the development. Area 'm' should therefore be amended as the current area distorts the amount of housing achievable on this part of the site.	**Response:** The preferred option is to include the dwelling in this area as part of the redevelopment. However until such time they can become available the land should become a cul-de-sac with frontage development to the north of the land. The access will then go through the land controlled by the landowner to the south of the area (land owned by Kitewood). Text and the Concept Plan should be amended for clarification. **Action:** See Section 2 of this statement..
Area 'm' should be designated for low density housing due to its proximity to existing low density housing in the area and the Cut River Park area. A care home within a low density housing area here would be appropriate. An alternative medium density area can be found elsewhere within the development.	**Response:** The response to the provision of a care home can be seen above. It is appropriate to provide medium densities in the location which will be close to and will be part of the neighbourhood centre. However sensitively designed development will be required which fronts onto Larks Hill at this location.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Some areas shown as low density housing areas, could be increased to medium density areas to use the land more efficiently around the existing built development of Newell Green. Therefore areas 'g', 'j' and 'k' should be detailed as medium density housing areas.	**Response:** there is a need to ensure that the character of the existing settlement of Newell Green is respected in accordance with policy, guidance and the Warfield SPD. Further, development fronting the new proposed river park should be sensitively designed. Development will however, need to maximise its efficiency of land use. If these areas can accommodate higher densities than prescribed in the SPD, then the Council will consider such proposals at the detailed master planning stage. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Two thirds of the total designated land is open space. The proposed densities and development areas should be reshuffled to provide a better form of development that balances the need to protect and complement existing housing and that can also meet housing need and targets.	**Response:** There is an overriding need for housing and the development must demonstrate that its meets the Core Strategy DPD which includes the provision for 2,200 dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Edward Irish Partnership for land at The Splash	
Broad agreement with the proposals	**Response:** Noted
Support the frontage of parcel “h” being towards the link road, rather than Harvest Ride.	
Support the principle of access not being from Harvest Ride but from The Splash which would also avoid the potential of a ransom strip.	
This is a small and difficult shaped parcel. The design of this parcel of land is left a little more flexible with potential for three storey development at density of 40 units per hectare.	**Response:** The density is indicative an therefore should the site reasonably be able to take more development then the Council will consider this through the application process. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The existence of the houses along the The Splash separates parcel "h" from the The Cut River Park and therefore the "character principles" of The Cut River Park are not so applicable.	**Response:** This is noted and text should be included in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** Add bullet points to paragraph 4.27 (now 4.41) to read as: • **Dwellings to front onto The Splash in the south of this area and follow the rhythm of development along this lane.** • **Within the parcel alongside The Splash, informal courtyard and mews development will be appropriate.** • **To the east of the parcel within The Splash area, development should overlook the existing footpath/cycleway, creating natural surveillance and activity.**
The significant drain crosses the site should be diverted if the opportunity arises.	**Response:** This is agreed and should be considered at the detailed planning stage of this site. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Residents Responses - General Issues

.1 The following summarises the key issues and the Council's response to comments received by residents in relation to general issues. In the main these relate to matters of principle of development in this location, lack of consultation, housing numbers, impact upon character etc, which have been addressed in previous consultations (Site Allocations Development Plan Document Preferred Option: November 2010-January 2011 and Warfield SPD Consultation Draft: December 2010-January 2011).

Table 16

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
General issues	
Asks whether there will be compensation available for existing residents.	**Response:** There will not be compensation for existing residents. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Asks about likely start dates for the development	**Response:** It is not exactly certain when the development will start because of the time taken to prepare, submit and determine planning applications and the pace of the local housing market. However the Council has indicated that the delivery of first housing for occupation could be 2014/15 although this could be sooner. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned about the impact of development upon working stables/riding schools in the area.	**Response:** The development will change the character of the area. Some of the stables will either be redeveloped or will need to be relocated. The bridleway network will be enhanced though such as to allow passage through the site and through Cabbage Hill. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concern that here will not be sufficient "buffers" onto existing properties.	**Response:** The development will be required to ensure that the character of existing dwellings will remain. This will be achieved through a number of ways including:

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The proposed development will overlook existing properties leading to a loss of privacy and amenity. The proposed development will be overbearing to existing properties surrounding the site and result in the loss of privacy.	- retaining/enhancing trees and planting where appropriate; - ensuring that there are not issues of overlooking; - back gardens against back gardens; - having regards to existing policy and guidance. This is a normal consideration in determining planning applications. Text has been included through the SPD as a result of other responses in this statement. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Fundamentally disagree with the proposals for Warfield and Newell Green area. Questions whether the development is required. Common sense says that this proposals should not be accepted/allowed to go ahead. Objects to the development of this area which will devastate the village of Warfield. Concern that the development will happen despite any comments made.	**Response:** The Council identified the area as a major location for growth in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The Council also consulted extensively during the production of the Core Strategy DPD in this respect. Please see document WL21 for further information about the chronology to produce the Core Strategy DPD. The Council has consulted in line with prescribed regulations. All details of the consultation have been published in the Consultation Proforma (see WL8). **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Putting this massive infrastructure change into such a tight space will lead to a congested, frustrating landscape and in terms of road usage, a dangerous environment The development will substantially increase all health and safety issues.	**Response:** The development will provide all the necessary infrastructure and services to make it a safe and sustainable urban extension including providing significant open space. The development will need to ensure the development is safe and healthy for all residents in accordance with the requirements of the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Cannot find any information on the timing and provision of infrastructure as the development progresses.	**Response:** Information on the timing (where known) and provision of infrastructure is detailed in the Warfield SPD including Appendix 2. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Council should be clear about the level of financial incentive it will get from the development (including the New Homes Bonus), in terms of what it will be spent on and how existing residents will benefit	**Response:** Under the current provisions, the amount of New Homes Bonus will be equivalent to six years of Council Tax payment (based on the national average for each band) for each new home with an additional sum for each affordable home. The amount the Council would receive will depend on the size of the homes provided, which Council Tax bracket they will fall into and how many are affordable homes. New Homes Bonus funds are not ring-fenced and it is not therefore possible to state what the funds will be spent on. The Council's spending priorities are established through the budget setting process which is subject to separate consultation and the democratic process. Because of its scale and the number of landowners involved, the development at Warfield will take place over a prolonged period and there is no certainty that the current New Homes Bonus scheme will last for the duration of the construction of the planned new homes. The plans for Warfield do include the provision of extensive areas of new public open space that will be available for the enjoyment of existing residents along with new community facilities and other infrastructure. The Community Infrastructure Levy which is being introduced in the Borough includes a requirement that a significant proportion (the final percentage is yet to be confirmed by government) of the money collected from this source should be passed to local communities within which development is taking place. This will provide a source of funding for communities to spend on their local priorities.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There will be an even greater burden with a huge increase in population on welfare and social services especially with more people living longer.	**Response:** Social services are consulted on the Borough's future development proposals as a matter of due course. Where relevant requirements have been accommodated in the Council forward plans and strategies. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The development will cause existing residents to move away which puts additional pressure on an already declining housing market.	**Response:** The development will provide new housing opportunities which will improve the local housing market at a time of need. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The proposals seem to be to pack as many people into the area as possible.	**Response:** The development balances the need for new homes and infrastructure with the need to make the most efficient use of land. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Views of West End Farm House and farm buildings should be left so that it is prominent from the green corridor.	**Response:** The intention is for the development to including the redevelopment of the West End Farm House and buildings. The listed Old Farmhouse will be retained as detailed in the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Object to the loss of peace and quiet around the Larks Hill area used by many local people. Object to the loss of existing open space and park areas which are used as local recreational facilities.	**Response:** The development will increase the amount of publicly available open space. This is because the development will retain the existing accessible open space areas of Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth Meadows. The development will also provide additional open space areas which will be accessible including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Confusion regarding the nature of the consultation and whether previous comments have been taken on board as 2,200 home are still planned.	**Response:** The development will be for 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. The Council has considered all comments mad on this and the previous consultation as demonstrated in the Statement of Consultation. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development will impact upon existing property values.	**Response:** The provision of new houses adds to the overall market value of housing in this country/market area. There is little or no evidence that says that new housing erodes housing values in an area but there is evidence to the contrary. For example, the construction of housing in Whitegrove did not devalue housing values in the Bracknell new town area. Furthermore, the price of houses is not a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
No new housing should take place until Jennetts Park is completed.	**Response:** The development is part of the overall strategy for the borough to 2026. It is appropriate for different developments to proceed without waiting for others. It is the Council's intension to provide for homes and all other development needs in this timescale. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
No new housing should take place until Bracknell Town Centre is redeveloped (Waitrose and redevelopment at the Peel Centre is only a small step).	
Need to improve Bracknell Town Centre before build additional houses.	
Contrary to the Council's claims, the development will not create local jobs, as national builders use their own workforce (not always local).	**Response:** The development will provide some job opportunities for local trades people and will contribute to the local and wider economy. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Concerns that before some people purchased their properties, they contacted the Planning department , and were given assurances that the green field site between Harvest Ride and Warfield Street was there to protect the surrounding villages from being absorbed into Bracknell, yet development is now going ahead.	**Response:** Details of the proposed development can be identified by correct solicitors search during the buying and selling process. There is no evidence that the planning department has given assurances that the area was going to be protected for development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Increased houses, especially affordable housing will increase crime which may filter into surrounding areas.	**Response:** The development will be a sustainable community with low crime like the rest of the borough. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned that feedback from previous consultations only mentions favourable issues, not many of the concerns.	**Response:** The Council has considered all comments on this and the previous consultation as demonstrated by this Statement of Consultation. The Council has in its response said why it disagrees with the comments made or how changes have been made to the SPD as a result of the consultation comments. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There should be an explanation of what a 'landmark opportunity' is.	**Response:** Clarification of what the term landmark opportunity is required and therefore additional text should be included in the SPD. **Action:** Add new sentences to paragraph 4.10 which read as **The Concept Plan highlights a number of locations where there are "landmark opportunities". These are sites within the development where it is considered the buildings should be of a greater scale or be visually prominent, acting as a marker at a junction or corner, helping people to find their way around the site and creating distinctive and memorable places and streets. The locations identified will need careful design and should continue to relate to**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	the surrounding area and context of the site. Add a new second sentence to paragraph 5.3 which reads as **Landmark buildings will be buildings of distinctive character and form and will help to provide a point of reference within the development, emphasise the hierarchy of a space or conclude a view.**
Concerned that the mapping is inaccurate which raises questions about the accuracy and value of the proposal.	**Response:** The Concept Plan was in draft format giving ample opportunity for amendments as necessary. Any errors were unfortunate and corrected quickly. **Action:** The final version of the Concept Plan has been thoroughly checked for any inaccuracies.
Proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Locational principles.	**Response:** The site is consistent with Policy Cs2 criteria 2 and Policy CS5 as demonstrated in evidence presented at the examination to the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Consultation/how to get involved	
Concerned that local residents may not be fully aware of the proposals. Consultation has been inadequate.	**Response:** The Council held a focused consultation which include: • Placing all information on the website; • Placing documents in the Parish office and Whitegrove Library; • Targeting and e-mail or letter to all who responded on the SPD Consultation Draft; • Holding exhibitions; • Placing an advert in the Wren Magazine which went to all households in Warfield. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Consider that the unless you had registered as a consultee or seen the plans at the Parish Offices or on the Council's web site, you would not be aware of the consultation. Consider that every house in the area should have been notified and whilst this would have been a low cost exercise, the Council did not do this in order to avoid a public outcry.	
It appears that the full extent of the plans have not been fully publicised, with the hope that people will not realise what is happening until it is too late. Consider this is underhand and undemocratic	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Not acceptable to only have the documents on a web site for people to comment on	
Consider that the concept plan information stating that some of the issues raised related to a call for more consultation and the need for a more detailed concept plan is misleading and a misrepresentation of feedback. Whilst the lack of consultation was an issue, there were other points such as impact upon the environment and impact upon infrastructure also raised which have not been addressed.	**Response:** This consultation was a focused consultation on only part of the Warfield SPD , e.g. the Concept Plan. All other comments on other issues/concerns have been considered in full in preparing the final version of the SPD as demonstrated in Section 2 of this statement. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Consider that there has been a lack of time to comment, only 28 days compared to the first generic plan where the consultation was open for 4 months.	**Response:** The consultation was additional an non-statutory. 4 weeks gave ample time to consider the document and provide a response and this was proved by the high volume of responses received. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Only 3 consultation sessions were held over 6 days. Some were not aware that they had taken place. Consultation events were held on days when people could not attend - felt that this was intentional (i.e. one was on bonfire night one of the busiest days of the year for families; one was the same evening as a rare school function; one on a weekday morning when most people are at work).	**Response:** The Council held 3 sessions for the general public covering a weekend morning, weekday morning and week evening period. The Council also held meetings with local residents at West End Lane and the Parish Council. The events were advertised on the web, on posters and in the Wren parish magazine which was delivered to all properties in Warfield. All the events were very well attended. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Concept Plan states that officers are continuing to engage with the local community - consider this has not happened and local residents views are being ignored.	**Response:** The Council has considered all responses made during both consultations and made necessary changes where appropriate in the final SPD as demonstrated by this Statement of Consultation. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Hope that consideration for the villagers that have lived here for some time will be taken into account.	**Response:** The Council has considered all views made during both consultations during the production of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Do not make the mistake of thinking that the view of Warfield Parish Council (who only seem to object to the proposed density of the development) represents the views of ordinary residents.	**Response:** The Parish Council understand that the decision to develop in the area was taken through the Core Strategy DPD process between 2004 and 2008. The Parish Council made their objections known during this time to the independent Inspector during the examination of the policy relating to the area. Subsequently, the Parish Council has and will continue to make representations to get the best results from the development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
How do they object if they are not happy with the next/final version of the SPD?	**Response:** The next version of the SPD is the final version. Further opportunities to make views known will be during the production of the Site Allocations DPD or application process. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Dwelling Numbers	
The proposed number of dwellings is a complete over development of the site and significantly above the 1800 houses proposed by the developers. A green separation must be retained between Warfield village and North Bracknell.	**Response:** The development will provide 2,200 dwellings in accordance with the Core Strategy DPD. The 1800 proposed by developers are on part of but not all of the available site. Furthermore the developers are making their comments based on the current market as opposed on a longer term basis. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Questions why such a large number of housing has to be built in such a concentrated area, couldn't some of the houses be located in other parts of Bracknell.	**Response:** The amount of dwellings forms part of the overall housing allocation for the borough which includes substantial housing in other parts of the Borough. The size of the

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Suggest that the development is reduced by half to lessen the impact on Warfield. The proposals are too big and should be cut down.	development is appropriate to secure substantial open space, infrastructure and other necessary services. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Seeks information justifying the need for new homes in the Borough. There is no evidence for the demand for housing. JennettsPark is unsold and the market is sluggish.	**Response:** The amount of housing provided for in the Core Strategy under Policy CS15 has been Examined by an independent Inspector and found to be soundly based. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue to plan for the requirement of 10,780 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The latest household projections were published in November 2010 and are based on the 2008-population projections. They are produced by applying projected household formation rates to the population projections published by the Office for National Statistics. The assumptions underlying national household and population projections are demographic trend based. The estimated increase in households for Bracknell Forest between 2006 and 2026 is 12,000. This is slightly above the number of new homes being planned for over the same period (10,780). The Bracknell Forest Housing Market Assessment shows that the number of households increased by 28% between 1981-1991, 16% between 1991 and 2001 and 9% between 2001 and 2008. This reflects the popularity of the area as a place to do business and reside in. The level of development planned is in accordance with requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The household projections indicate that there is a need to provide more housing due to a large increase in single households. Evidence indicates that the number of completed but unsold properties at Jennett's Park is very low.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The significant population increase that will result (a figure of 400% & 408% are referred to in many of the responses) is contrary to the South East Plan and safeguarding the countryside. The loss of space between Warfield Village and Bracknell is contrary to other elements of the South East Plan.	**Response:** The principle that development will occur in the area was considered during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. Following evidence and examination Policy CS5 identified the area as a major location for growth. The Core Strategy DPD and its policies were therefore found to be in accordance with the then emerging South East Plan. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Considers that the population estimates from 2,200 homes is under estimated.	**Response:** The population estimates are based on the most accurate information available. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The style of housing shown on the plans does not blend in with existing properties and will be to the detriment of Warfield Village.	**Response:** The development will be expected to , where appropriate be designed to take account of the character of existing areas in accordance with existing planning guidance such as the Character Areas Assessments SPD. Amendments to the text in the SPD will also provide further clarification **Action:** Amend the second sentence on paragraph 4.2 to read as *Sensitive treatment ~~may~~***will***be required at the edges of the site where new development abuts existing areas of character, or where development affects the setting of a listed building.*
There will be increased street lighting leading to increased global warming.	**Response:** The street lights will be expected to be provided so they are efficient in terms of their electricity use to combat global warming and rising electricity costs. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The proposals would result in the loss of the gap between Warfield Village and Bracknell.	**Response:** The development will be in the fields south of Warfield Street and Newell green . The issue regarding the loss of the gap was considered during the production of the Core Strategy DPD which resulted in the land being identified as a major location for growth. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Many comments also objected to the proposal for 2,268 proposed dwellings, and asked why the 2,200 as originally proposed has now been increased.	**Response:** The amount of dwelling has not been increased the density schedule merely demonstrated there is capacity for more dwellings in the land identified. However localised constraints such as trees and development requirements such as allotments would take land which would bring the number to 2,200 dwellings. The development will be for 2,200 dwellings and the final version of the SPD makes this clear. **Action:** Ensure that the text in the final SPD refers to 2,200 dwellings.
Queried the ratio (to the square mile) of new homes planned south of Bracknell v's north.	**Response:** It is unknown what the ratio is but overall between 2006 and 2026 for the housing allocation (approx 11,000 dwellings): Bracknell - 43% Binfield - 20% Crowthorne -14% Sandhurst - 1% Warfield - 20% Winkfield 2% **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Unclear why the Council is still progressing with these plans when regional policies no longer exist.	**Response:** The Government has made it clear that local authorities should set their own housing targets. The Council has done this in

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	its Core Strategy DPD which also includes identifying Warfield as a major location for growth. Regional policies have yet to be revoked and even when they are, government policy is to provide for housing need. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned about the combined impact of a significant number of new homes in Wokingham, particularly the resultants population and traffic impacts.	**Response:** All development must mitigate their impacts they place on services and infrastructure. This development must provide necessary facilities, and infrastructure in accordance with the development principles of the Warfield SPD. The Council has liaised closely with Wokingham on issues such as transport and infrastructure needs and provision. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Factors affecting the shortage of housing include immigration policies and council tenants right to buy schemes. There needs to be a significant increase in the proportion of affordable housing.	**Response:** The development must provide a range of housing including for the general needs of the market. The development will provide 25% of affordable housing in accordance with the Council's policy. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Asks what percentage of past developments were purchased by local residents.	**Response:** The Council does not know this total because it is not involved in buying or selling market properties. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Asks that the Council reconsiders sites for housing that were previously rejected.	**Response:** The opportunity for considering alternative sites is in the Site Allocations DPD. However, policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008) establishes the principle that a major development will happen in Warfield. The Council cannot effectively reverse this decision.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Housing	
Unclear what the proposals densities will be - will they be greater than Whitegrove or Quelm Park.	**Response:** The densities are detail in the Warfield SPD and at an average of 35 dwellings per hectare will be about 5 dwellings per hectare denser than inWhitegrove or Quelm Park. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Densities similar to Jennetts Hill (NB: assumed this relates to Jennetts Park) will be too high - small housing and tiny gardens.	**Response:** There is a need to ensure that there is an efficient use of land, for example, the lower the density the higher the land take needed to accommodate the Council's housing allocation. Where gardens may be smaller than they used to be in new development, the amount of publicly accessible open space provided is now greater. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
No information provided on the level of affordable housing.	**Response:** The development will provide affordable housing in accordance with up-to-date policy which is 25% of the overall total dwellings which will be at affordable rents or part buy/part rent. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
housing should be focused on 'affordable'.	
Questions whether the cost of the land, its development and current house prices will mean that any housing that will be provided will be affordable.	
There is a lack of affordable housing in the South East, but building on greenfield sites is not the answer. This issue could be addressed by individuals moving to more affordable parts of the country.	**Response:** There is a need to provide affordable housing where people work and live including the south east. A democratic society cannot force people to move to other places. There would need to be significant incentives and policy made by central government to do this. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Town houses are out of keeping with the surrounding areas.	**Response:** The type of dwellings will need to respond to a number of issues such as density, character, the housing market and how the overall development will look. Town houses will be appropriate in some parts of the site. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
80% should be two-storey 1 & 2 bed flats and two-storey 2-bed houses, the rest should be 3-bed houses, and match the current area i.e. No more than two storey and provide adequate gardens sizes.	**Response:** The development will provide a range and type of different dwellings covering 1, 2 ,3 4, sand 5 bedrooms in accordance with need and other factors such as market conditions. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Do not want to see a repeat of the relationship between existing housing and new development such as Staff College (The Parks) in Warfield - dislike the design of houses.	**Response:** The architectural style of housing is invariably a matter of taste and is in any case a detailed design matter. This will be assessed when proposals are submitted by developers as part of a planning application. Principles being established at this stage are ones of form, character and context which should inform any future proposals by developers. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Street lighting should be kept at a minimum so to avoid any further light pollution to the rural area.	**Response:** It is agreed that street lighting will need to be sensitive to rural parts of the site and text changes should be made to clarify this. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.37 (now 7.40) which will read as:**The location and design of street lighting should be sensitive to the semi-rural character parts of the site. Any lighting schemes are to be agreed with the Council**.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Suburban character - the definition used by Tibbalds should not refer to any of the development in Warfield, and emphasises this is not in touch with the existing rural area.	**Response:** The Warfield site is primarily referred to as rural and semi-rural. Reference to suburban is only used within the context of Harvest Ride and how it will appear in the future. Harvest Ride and County Lane currently has a significant housing development to the south leading to Tesco and the neighbourhood centre for Whitegrove. In the future, it is proposed to have housing development, in part, to the north also. Once housing is provided on both sides of Harvest Ride it is considered appropriate to refer to the character of this area as suburban. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Only 25% of the 2,200 houses are to be social housing. Who the the remaining houses intended. Are there sufficient jobs for these people within Bracknell?	**Response:** The market dwellings will be for sale to anyone who wants to live and work in the area just like the rest of the housing market in this country. There will be sufficient jobs. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Flooding	
The plan is not supported by a Flood Risk Assessment.	**Response:** The Council undertook a strategic flood risk assessment which was used in evidence in support of the Core Strategy DPD including the identification of Warfield as a major location for growth. There is a need to provide a detailed flood risk assessment to support detailed proposals for development as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
What effect will the new homes have on the local areas that already experience flooding?	**Response:** The development will be expected to take account of topographical matters in preparing schemes. The development will be required to fully mitigate its flood risk by a number of ways including proving Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS), not building in
Reducing the amount of green spaces will reduce drainage and increase flooding.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
No coherent plan of the terrain and topography regarding flooding in very wet weather and drainage.	prescribed flood areas and other specific solutions where there may be a risk as identified by detailed flood risk assessments. All are requirements of the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Old Priory lane has a deep ditch which runs along the length of the road to the pond near the Warfield Street junction, which could be subject to flooding with increased building or infilling of the ditch.	**Response:** The development could ensure this ditch is retained or enhanced to for part of the Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) required by the SPD. Should the ditch be filed or developed a suitable alternative drainage measure must be provided. Text should be include generally about drainage ditches across the site for clarification. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.23 (now 7.24) which reads as **Consideration should be given to retaining/enhancing existing drainage ditches across the site to contribute as part of the SuDS provision.**
A large area known as 'Fiveways' is a known floodplain. The area around Battlebridge (Three Legged Cross) is subject to frequent flooding.	**Response:** Any development in this area will be required to ensure that a detailed flood risk assessment is carried out and any necessary mitigation are put in place as required by the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The development will build on a designated flood plain along The Splash and the east side of The Cut with serious implications for the value of existing properties.	**Response:** Development will not be allowed in floodzone 3 and this area both sides of the Cut will be converted into a river park. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Ecology	
No thought seems to have been put in to creating wildlife corridors and leaving large areas of woodland and grassland for wildlife.	**Response:** The Concept Plan does not show all the required features of the development including green corridors. Chapter 7 of the

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	SPD required a comprehensive network of green infrastructure including habitat and wildlife corridors. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development will result in the loss of one of the few remaining areas of unspoilt countryside in the Bracknell area and will adversely impact on local wildlife and habitats (such as deer, foxes, owls, buzzards, kites, herons, geese, mallards, grass snakes, kestrels, buzzards, great crested newts, badgers & bats). Impact upon local wildlife - development will take areas away/how will it be protected or new wildlife encouraged? The loss of the strategic gap will result in the loss of habitat for a range of wildlife.	**Response:** The development will provide opportunities to enhance wildlife provision for example, by creating a country park in Cabbage Hill which currently is subject of intensive agricultural practices and of little biodiversity value. The SPD could clarify this issue more and therefore additional text should be provided. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.33 (now 7.36) which reads as **The site provides the opportunity in many areas to improve biodiversity, for example, by converting the agricultural fields in Cabbage Hill to a country park. Development proposals should demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity value across the site to contribute towards the semi-natural character of the area.**Amend the first sentence of Development Principle W7 to read as All development will **demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity value and** conserve and enhance biodiversity which is identified.
The development and road widening will result in the loss of ancient field boundaries and protected/mature trees. Existing green buffers around existing trees, hedgerows and meadows need to be retained to minimise the impact of development and retain a rural character.	**Response:** The development will be expect to have regards to existing planted features such as trees and hedgerows. The development will seek to retain and have as much as possible and to provide new features. There is opportunity to plant more hedges and increase biodiversity opportunities on Cabbage Hill which is currently intensively farmed. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Warfield Street South is a breeding pond for protected species (Great Crested Newts). When on land the newts require rough grassland or wood, not a nicely kept village green. The EPR surveys also indicates 2 ponds within a 250m radius of the main pond, which the newts could use for hunting or future breeding. The survey mentions areas of grassland and scrub acting as wildlife corridors, but the concept plan does not mention these. A greater buffer will be needed than that proposed.	**Response:** The Concept Plan should be redrawn where necessary to ensure that there is sufficient habitat for amphibians (including Great crested Newts) and show additional ponds which will have the potential to sustain increased amphibians even if they do not currently contain any. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add a new 2nd sentence to paragraph 7.34 (now 7.37) which reads as **Relevant ponds within the development should be enhanced and include necessary buffer areas for amphibians and other wildlife. Green corridors should be designed to allow movements between ponds including where necessary, crossings under roads and footpaths.**
Loss of natural drainage streams and ponds for drinking water for wild life.	**Response:** The development will try to avoid the loss of ponds and most if not all will be retained and enhanced I line with the SPD. The development will also be required to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) which may be in the form of swale ditches which would provide the opportunity for drinking water for wildlife. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
No survey carried out in the plans regarding wildlife habitats, the types of animals and birds that live and breed in the planned area of development.	**Response:** There has been Phase 1 Habitats Survey and other assessment carried out. Further detailed work is required to support planning applications as required by the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There is no documentation in the plans of local climatic effects to illustrate that destroying a rural setting has an effect on the local climate	**Response:** The SPD is subject of a sustainability appraisal which considered all elements of sustainability including climate change matters. The final sustainability appraisal is published alongside the final Warfield SPD

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The green link is for the benefit of wildlife as well as the well-being of residents. As such it must be easy for wildlife to cross busy roads safely. Thought must be given for providing culverts at the major Newell Road and the new Link Road.	**Response:** This is agreed and additional text should be included in the SPD which clarifies this. **Action:** add a new sentence to paragraph 7.10 which reads as **Where the East to West Greenway is bisected by new or existing roads, appropriately designed tunnels must be provided to allow safe passage for wildlife.**
Open Space	
Request that green spaces remain and new ones created.	**Response:** The development will increase the amount of publicly available open space. This is because the development will retain the existing accessible open space areas of Larks Hill, Priory Field and Garth Meadows. The development will also provide additional open space areas which will be accessible including part of Cabbage Hill and two new river parks. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Objects to the loss of outdoor recreational uses - where will the extra children play?	
The provision of allotments is essential and should be shown on the Concept Plan. At least one of the allotments in the south east should be for Whitegrove residents.	**Response:** The Concept Plan does not show all requirements of the Warfield SPD. Paragraph 7.18 and Development Principle W5 make provision for allotments. It is not for the Council to decide who the allotments will be for, this will be a matter for the Parish Council once they are ready and transferred. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The site is mostly within 5 km of the SPA and insufficient SANG is provided.	**Response:** The development will be expected to provide a minimum of 8 hectares per 1000 persons in accordance with the Council's policy. The preferred option is for all the SANGS to be provided on-site including at Cabbage Hill. Some of the SANG provision

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	can be provided off-site subject to passing an appropriate assessment and meeting the criteria for SANG provision. All of this is detailed in Chapter 7 including Development Principle W6 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The green corridor that transects the site east to west should be widened to include verges and 'rides' for flora and fauna. It could link to and incorporate the newt pond.	**Response:** The East to West Greenway is shown indicatively on the Concept Plan. The route will include existing open spaces and there may be opportunities to provide widened parts along its route for features such as pocket parks. Further text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 7.10 which reads as: **There may also be opportunities to create new open space areas next to the Greenway such as pocket parks and verges for flora and fauna. This could be achieved through tree lines or planted areas.**
Green spaces should be protected and have a very high level of tree planting, and should be protected from future development	**Response:** This is agreed and Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD provided details on retained/new and enhanced open space areas. All SANG land is protected in perpetuity. Existing open spaces are protected by covenants and new open space will be transferred to Council or other suitable ownership. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Disruption/impact upon existing amenities	
Concerned about the impact of new development on air quality and emissions and on noise pollution. What allocations have been made to control the amount of pollution. This will be worsened by loss of green spaces.	**Response:** The development will need to ensure that any consequential pollution matters (e.g. noise and air quality) are assessed and mitigated if necessary. The process for assessment and mitigation will be in an Environmental Impact Assessment to be completed prior to the grant of planning permission which will outline and assess all

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	likely environmental impacts as a result of the development. The development will also be required to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and provide suitable on-site renewable energy generation in compliance with the Core Strategy DPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The total destruction of woodland and copses of over 20,000 mature trees plus many younger saplings will destroy the character of the area that creates a good feel factor. The trees help to filter pollutants, carbon emissions and low level ozone. The pollutants are a risk to health especially vulnerable groups.	**Response:** The existing wooded area of Long copse and at Beggars Roost will be retained and enhanced. The development will seek to retain as many existing trees as possible. Additional planting is also required throughout the development as required by paragraph 7.15 of the SPD. It is unknown where the figure of 20,000 trees comes from because this will not be the case in Warfield. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
What areas of infrastructure will be improved to support the development e.g. emergency services, schools, hospitals, road/traffic management.	**Response:** The Warfield SPD details the infrastructure provision e.g in Chapters 7 Green Infrastructure, 8 Social and Physical, 9 Transport and Accessibility Infrastructure and Appendix 2 Infrastructure Development Plan. The neighbourhood centre will provide uses such as shops, café, a dentist surgery, a multi-purpose centre for local community activities (such as Parish related administration, meetings, police, youth and children's provision) as detailed in paragraph 4.15 of the final Warfield SPD. A doctors surgery has not been identified as required by the health authorities however, should one be identified the centre could accommodate it. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. Text should also be added to enable a pharmacy should one want to locate there **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.15 (now 4.16) to read as:*Typical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and*
The adequacy of the infrastructure needed to support this development should be addressed in more detail before any decisions are made, particularly transport infrastructure.	
Object to the development as it will put too much pressure on the transport network and schools.	
With the possible closure of Heatherwood Hospital how will new residents receive medical attention.	
Concerned about increased pressure on the emergency services.	
Development since the 1980's has resulted in overburdened infrastructure in the area. Particular concerns about GP surgeries, schools and the sewage treatment plant.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The doctors surgeries are already at capacity. There is no reference to new health care provision. Existing facilities (schools, doctors etc) will not be able to cope.	*A5***such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a Dental Surgery**. *Provision should also be made for a multi-purpose centre for local community activities, such as Parish related administration, meetings,* ***police,*** *youth and children's provision.* **Whilst a Doctor's Surgery has not been identified following consultation with the relevant health authority at the time of the SPD, a surgery may be provided in the neighbourhood centre should the need for one be subsequently identified.**
There will be noise and congestion during the construction period through building works and increased traffic. Will construction traffic be routed away from the village?	**Response:** The development will be built out in phases to be agreed by the Council rather than in one large hit. Paragraph 10.5 and Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD requires that the development minimises it impact in terms of disturbance in the construction phase. The Council will seek to implement this through e.g. agreeing plant storage compounds, hours of operation, agreed routes to transport materials/waste and measures to clean roads/vehicles. These measures will be secured via planning conditions attached to any planning permissions granted. However, further text is required to clarify the need for agreed construction traffic routes. **Action:** Amend the second sentence of paragraph 10.5 to read as *The developers will be expected to work with the Council on developing a plan setting out the construction phases, plant storage,* **construction traffic routes** *and how they will limit the level of disturbance.*
Development will result in loss of existing views for existing residents.	**Response:** The development will be required to assess and respect key views in the designing of their schemes in accordance with the Warfield SPD. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Concerned that development (particularly properties along Harvest Ride) and increased traffic will impact upon foundations of existing properties.	**Response:** The supporting road network is constructed to accommodate the level of traffic that ensures there is not a problem with the foundations of existing dwellings. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Existing shops (Tesco) will not cope with additional housing - regularly runs out of food and always queues at the petrol station.	**Response:** The development will provide a new neighbourhood centre with its facilities as described in paragraph 4.14 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Impact upon character	
The plans will not benefit, and is not wanted by current residents and will lead to resentment.	**Response:** The development will provide new home, infrastructure, schools, open space and other measures as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The plans will be devastating to the current appearance and character of the local environment and important countryside. Development will destroy the rural character of the area.	**Response:** The development will be required to provide a net gain in biodiversity. The development will consider and assess all existing landscape and biodiversity and protect the most important features. It will provide an extensive range of green infrastructure with open space, wildlife corridors, hedges etc. As detailed in Chapter 7 - Green Infrastructure. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Objects to the development of land at Warfield for 2,200 homes due to the loss of greenfield land, impact on the rural character of the area and on parts of Warfield and Newell Green, and loss of amenity for local residents.	**Response:** The land was identified as a major location for growth in Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy document which was adopted in February 2008. The process included widespread consultation and an examination in public. This was concluded

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
This is an inappropriate form of development in a greenfield area.	with a binding report by an independent inspector who found both the Core Strategy DPD and its policy relating to Warfield sound. The Council has produced the Warfield SPD to provide guidance to developers on the design, shape and look of the site so they can produce planning applications which will deliver a comprehensive development. The development should be designed to respect existing character where appropriate and provide substantial semi-rural element throughout in the form of open space, trees, planting and biodiversity enhancement in line with the Warfield SPD. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The layout and siting is inappropriate and unsympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment.	
Object to the development due to the loss of the gap between Bracknell and Warfield, and the loss of the village character and identity and the rural aspect.	**Response:** Assuming this means the settlements of Newell Green and Warfield Street, it was agreed that a major development will go in Warfield in in the Core Strategy DPD in February 2008. The character of these settlements should be protected in line with existing guidance such as the Character areas Assessments SPD as required by the Warfield SPD. However there will be development in the vicinity of the settlements but the task is to ensure that development is buffered, screened etc. Where appropriate to protect private amenity and overlooking. However, the gap between these settlements will not be maintained. **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned about how the visual impact of the new buildings will be minimised.	**Response:** The Detailed Concept Plan consultation was supplementary to the main SPD consultation. Taking account of consultations the final SPD has been produced which sets out how the development should be designed and how the context of existing development should be treated in terms of visual relationship and other design matters.
Layout and siting in relation to itself and the surrounding area is inappropriate and not in keeping.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Questions why areas are identified as green belt but the boundaries can then be moved for massive and unpopular projects. Development would result in the loss of Green Belt.	**Response:** There is a formal process to make plans and designations and review them over time which is what has happened in this location. The area has never been identified as green belt. It was identified as Land Outside Defined Settlements (i.e. Countryside) as part of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (February 2002) which was intended to run until 2006. This designation was reviewed during the production of the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008) which is intended to run until 2026. The Core Strategy DPD is where the land was designated as a Major Location For Growth (under Policy CS5). The Warfield SPD provides guidance to Policy CS5. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Detailed Concept Plan refers to rural green frontages, green corridors, existing natural landscape, green cluster and pond, green wedge and semi rural housing. How will this fit in with the proposed densities? Will it be possible to achieve both? If not which will suffer?	**Response:** The green infrastructure measures are a requirement of the Warfield SPD. There is enough land across the whole site to ensure that densities are achieved with other necessary measures including green elements. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned that little thought will go into the detailed planning and design of the properties. There needs to be strong design leadership and some of the phrases used are confusing to the general public.	**Response:** The Warfield SPD provides lots of guidance for the detail planning and design of the properties in line with Chapter 4 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Transport	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
There will be considerable disruption caused by the building works and the local roads won't be able to cope (which is also confirmed by the Highways Agency).	**Response:** The Highways Agency remit is only about their strategic road network (i.e. motorways). Planning conditions will be used to set out acceptable construction routes and times for movement of materials **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development on this area will result in the loss of rural walks and trails.	**Response:** The development will provide a range of north to south and east to west leisure routes including the retention of many of the existing routes as specified in Chapter 7 of the Warfield SPD.**Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
How will Harvest Ride cope with another 3,000 - 5,000 cars?	**Response:** The Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements which will mitigate the increase in vehicles to and from the site. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerns regarding increased traffic/congestion, existing road network cannot cope.	
Concerned at the pressure of 3000 - 5000 extra cars onto local roads particularly Forest Road. The infrastructure is not available to cope with this level of traffic and will impact upon the safety of cyclists and horse riders.	**Response:** The development will focus upon its access to Bracknell Town Centre. This means that access will be from Harvest Ride which does have capacity to take more traffic subject to improvements as described in the SPD. Access will not be appropriate along Forest Road and the development should ensure the protection of semi rural communities in transport terms by not encouraging unnecessary traffic along this road as required by paragraph 9.22 (no renumbered as paragraph 9.24 of the Warfield SPD). **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concern that there are already accidents on Warfield Street and the new roads built must become the primary routes to the new developments.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
What provisions are made for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists?	**Response:** The Development will be required to provide connections to existing routes near to the site and new routes within the site as required by the Warfield SPD. All will be subject to safety audits and constructed to prescribed standards before they are accepted to be transferred to the Council. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The exit from QuelmPark onto Harvest Ride is already dangerous and will only get worse with a link road/increased traffic.	**Response:** The layout of this junction will be addressed as part of the development mitigation measures ensuring any safety issues are addressed at the same time as required in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The plans will bring additional traffic both during and after construction.	**Response:** Developers will need to ensure the traffic impact of their development is mitigated The development will be built out in phases to be agreed by the Council rather than in one large hit. Paragraph 10.5 and Development Principle W16 of the Warfield SPD requires that the development minimises it impact in terms of disturbance in the construction phase. The Council will seek to implement this through e.g. agreeing plant storage compounds, hours of operation, agreed routes to transport materials/waste and measures to clean roads/vehicles. These measures will be secured via planning conditions attached to any planning permissions granted. However, further text is required to clarify the need for agreed construction traffic routes. **Action:** Amend the second sentence of paragraph 10.5 to read as *The developers will be expected to work with the Council on developing a plan setting out the construction phases, plant storage,* **construction traffic routes** *and how they will limit the level of disturbance.*

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
There is little information on access to the new housing plots. The limits on creating new roads and additional junctions on Forest Road supports proposals to limit the number of houses within plot c.	**Response:** Comments relating to area c have been fully assessed and proposals for this area have been amended as a result. No new access onto Forest Road to serve area c is now proposed. Additionally, further work has been undertaken to assess how to access parcels, although at this stage the proposed access points are indicative and will be finalised as part of future detailed planning applications. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concern about the use of Warfield Bridleway 26 as a vehicle access and a bus route, and using Warfield Byway 8 as an urban cycle track. This is in conflict with other parts of the document.	**Response:** In response, the Council has removed the a vehicular route from the Concept Plan to a nearby alternative location, thereby ensure that the bridleway remains as a leisure route. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Would like to see a robust Transport Assessment carried out before the proposal is progressed further. There is no traffic study for the additional 3000 cars.	**Response:** The SPD is supported by evidence such as the modelling work carried out to support the SADPD. There is a requirement for detailed development proposals to be supported by robust transport assessments as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Do not consider that proposed new/improved junctions or speed limits will be sufficient to enable local roads to cope with increased traffic. Existing road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with increased traffic. Surrey council and the Highways Agency have already objected to increased traffic on the M3 and the M4. How will these and local roads cope with 50% additional traffic?	**Response:** The Council has undertaken extensive modelling which allowed the authority to assess the impact of additional trips and prepare mitigation measures. The model also tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements which will mitigate the increase in vehicles to and from the site. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 and the Infrastructure Development Plan of the Warfield SPD being put in place, the

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
No thought has been given to road widening or other mechanisms in relation to increased traffic along Harvest Ride south and west of County Lane along along Jigs Lane north with the junction of Forest Road.	development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerns that traffic at the following junctions (which are already bad in peak travel) will worsen: • Traffic heading to Windsor, which backs up along Bracknell Lane at the junction of the A330 Cocks Lane at Maidens Green • Junction of Forest Road with Winkfield Road • Locks Ride trying to cross or join Forest Road • Warfield traffic joining the traffic going to and from Ascot along the A329 • Traffic lights at Newell Green • Traffic lights at the Plough and Harrow crossroads • A3095 through Holyport to junction 8/9 of the M4 • Forest Road heading to south Ascot • A329 past Priestwood • A322 from the A329 to the M3 • A30 to the M25	
Objects to any downgrading of Strawberry Hill.	**Response:** As a result of development in the area the character of this road will change to form access to housing. Turning movements in the area will also change and as a result surrounding junctions will need to be improved in terms of capacity and how they operate. Therefore, it will be appropriate to downgrade this road and possibly stop it up as a through route to vehicles in line with the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Objects to the new link road to the Three Legged Cross.	**Response:** The new link road will benefit the development and wider traffic issues in the area such as alleviating pressure on Newell Green. Therefore the council consider the link road to be an important part of the overall development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerns regarding increased traffic and impact upon local junctions, and what type of improvements are planned, such as 3 Legged Cross.	**Response:** Capacity and congestion issues will require mitigation measures to show nil detriment. These are detailed in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD and included within the infrastructure development plan and will be funded by the development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Bus routes are shown along existing bridle ways and footpaths. Objects to the proposed bus route parallel to Watersplash Lane. Concerned that turning areas such as Maize Lane into a primary road and bus route is ludicrous	**Response:** The bus route will now be re-routed along Harvest Ride. Maize Lane will not provide an access point to the development from Warfield Street other than it will allow access to existing properties. Therefore access along Maize Lane will be from the roundabout on Harvest Ride. The Concept Plan and associated text should be revised accordingly. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to show the bus route along Harvest Ride and add a new sentence to paragraph 9.8 (now 9.9) which reads as: **The route is shown indicatively along Harvest Ride on the Concept Plan.** Amend the Concept Plan to show Maize Lane being stopped up. Add a new paragraph 4.45 which reads as **Access to this part of the site should primarily be from the south limiting new traffic movements through existing residential areas to the north. It will not be appropriate to provide access to the development along Maize Lane from Warfield Street other than to existing dwellings along Maize Lane in this area. Therefore, Maize Lane will be stopped up to vehicular traffic**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	at a point near its junction with Warfield Street as shown indicatively on the Concept Plan. South of this point Maize Lane should be upgraded to accommodate vehicles and serve as access to the development in the area from its roundabout junction with Harvest Ride. (this will require the removal of the existing block to vehicles).
Concerned that some of the existing local roads such as Osbourne Road will become rat runs.	**Response:** The layout and character of these roads will be protected and unchanged whilst the main routes in and out of the Borough will be improved in terms of capacity, structure and directional signing. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There are no links to train stations, there is little parking at Martin's Heron train station and Bracknell is busy - where will people go if they want to use the train?	**Response:** The need for improved public transport is one of the Council's transport priorities**.** As well as improvements designed to mitigate the impact of the development as required by the Warfield SPD, there are also measures included to improve links to services where they are currently weak. These have been developed alongside the Councils new long term transport strategy, Local Transport Plan 3, which focuses on encouraging and implementing sustainable transport measures and providing an alternative choice to the motor car **Action:**No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The proposed development should see entry and exit from Harvest Ride, Jigs lane North and Newell Green Road and should not allow for any additional form of vehicle entry or exit onto Warfield Street.	**Response:** The development must be consistent with the overall objective to ensure the development looks towards Bracknell Town Centre rather than outwards for it to be a sustainable urban extension. Forest Road is limited in its capacity to take further traffic. Therefore it is reasonable for development to be accessed from Harvest Ride. Amendments to the Concept Plan and SPD text should be made for confirmation.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the Concept Plan to show access from Harvest Ride. Add a new paragraph 9.20 which reads as: **Harvest Ride will provide the majority of access points into the development listed at the following locations:** • **Two points in the stretch of road next to Garth Meadows;** • **From the QuelmPark Roundabout (for the new link road);** • **Newell Green roundabout** • **Old Priory Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point); and,** • **Maize Lane (which will require stopping up at an agreed point close to Warfield Street).**
Sceptical about the provision of public transport as Quelm Park has only recently got a bus stop and existing service is poor. Questions why a bus route is needed as people can walk.	**Response:** The development will be required to provide bus provision in line with Development Principle W12 of the Warfield SPD. The development will also make provision for walking and cycling in line with Development Principle W13 off the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Have cross-boundary impacts with other neighbouring authorities been considered?	**Response:** The council has worked in partnership with Wokingham on transport matters taking account of ours and their development. Further assumptions on development from other authorities have been included in the Council's transport modelling which includes the Warfield site and all other in the Site allocations DPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
There needs to be sufficient/ample parking for the new development and all properties. Housing should have a minimum 1 garage and 2 parking spaces	**Response:** The Warfield SPD requires that there should be sufficient parking in the site in paragraph 9.14 and Development Principle W14.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Colour coding for different types of streets would have been useful.	**Response:** It is agreed that more information on the different type of streets is required and therefore amendments to the Concept plan have been made. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.
To facilitate the green link there need to be pedestrian crossings (or underpasses) on Newell Green (link to Larks Hill and Priory Field) and across the proposed new link road down to the Cut River Park.	**Response:** It is agreed that there will be the need for safe pedestrian crossings through the development including on the new link road, Jigs Lane North and the new link road in the SPD should be added to clarify this. **Action:** Amend the final bullet point of paragraph 9.11 (now 9.12) to read as: *The provision of, or contributions towards, formal pedestrian/cycle crossings at appropriate locations, for example,* **the new link road, Jigs Lane North,** *Harvest Ride, Newell Green (A3095), Warfield Street (B3034). Binfield Road and Folders Lane.*
Local facilities	
Cannot expect Tesco to provide the solution for all the new population. Concerned that they will become open for 24 hrs.	**Response:** Tesco's and other nearby stores including the new Waitrose will provide the choice of supermarkets for the residents. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The town centre is not able to support the current populations.	**Response:** The intention is for this development will support the forthcoming regenerated town centre and vice versa. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Facilities on this side of Bracknell are not able to support the existing residents and will cope with additional residents (such as doctors,	**Response:** The Warfield SPD details the infrastructure provision e.g in Chapters 7 Green Infrastructure, 8 Social and Physical, 9 Transport and Accessibility Infrastructure

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
dentists, schools, playing fields, post offices, few shops, no restaurants etc).	and Appendix 2 Infrastructure Development Plan. The neighbourhood centre will provide uses such as shops, café, a dentist surgery, a multi-purpose centre for local community activities (such as Parish related administration, meetings, police, youth and children's provision) as detailed in paragraph 4.15 of the final Warfield SPD. A doctors surgery has not been identified as required by the health authorities however, should one be identified the centre could accommodate it. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. Text should also be added to enable a pharmacy should one want to locate there **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.15 (now 4.16) to read as:*Typical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5***such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a Dental Surgery**. *Provision should also be made for a multi-purpose centre for local community activities, such as Parish related administration, meetings,* ***police,*** *youth and children's provision.* **Whilst a Doctor's Surgery has not been identified following consultation with the relevant health authority at the time of the SPD, a surgery may be provided in the neighbourhood centre should the need for one be subsequently identified.**
Local emergency services will not be able to cope (police, fire brigade etc).	
Lack of health facilities/hospitals/A&E (particularly with the planned closure of Heatherwood, which will place a further strain on existing hospitals such as Frimley, Reading and Wexham).	
Education	
There will be additional strain on school places and an additional school will not be sufficient for 2,200 additional homes.	**Response:** the development will provide 2 new primary schools and financial contributions towards Special Educational Needs and Secondary School Provision as detailed in Development Principle W8 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Local schools are already oversubscribed.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Consider that the school should be on plot g as access to plot d is likely to be very restricted.	**Response:** This is agreed and following consultation, the location of the western primary school will be in option 2 (of the Detailed Concept Plan) which is the site east of The Cut. The Concept Plan should be revised to accommodate this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to include the school at the option 2 location.
Two possible school sites are proposed, what will happen to unused site, will it be used for more housing?	**Response:** The unused site will be for housing as part of the 2,200 dwellings to be built. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned about the provision of secondary school places and asks if there are plans for an additional secondary school. No secondary school provision on the site, nearest is Garth Hill College - traffic implications particularly during rush hour of travelling.	**Response:** The plan is to provide a new secondary school on Blue Mountain Golf Course. This is being delivered through a separate document called the Site Allocations DPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Supports another school but should be placed near the biggest population not near a main road. Concern at a new school being so close with associated issues of traffic and parking. Question why the need for new facilities was not taken into account when the school at Harvest Ride was built. Concerns regarding increased traffic during school drop off/pick up and potential for increased accidents, and where drop off areas will be.	**Response:** The new schools are well located to the development which will serve them. Careful design will be required to ensure they are safe and that there is adequate drop off/pick up points. Text should be added to the SPD for clarification. The development at Whitegrove provided schools which were not big enough to serve the demand. This development will ensure that the sites are big enough to meet current demand and flexible to grow if need be. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 8.6 which reads as **Suitable provision for dropping off/picking up children by car should be made. The roads around schools should also be designed to slow traffic and to maximise road safety.**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Secondary schools should be built nearer to the housing and not in Binfield (associated traffic impact of school children being driven from Warfield to Binfield).	**Response:** The Warfield development will not require a complete secondary school, it justifies part of the school in terms of projected pupil numbers. The secondary school will be built in Binfield and is intended to serve Binfield and the residents from the Warfield development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
When will the new schools be built?	**Response:** The first school will be required early in the development and the other later at timings to be agreed with the Council subject to negotiation. Further text should be included in the SPD for clarification. **Action:** add new sentences to paragraph 8.2 which reads as **Given that there is likely to be no spare capacity in existing primary schools in the area, it is essential that one of the schools is built very early in the development.The other should follow later at a timing to ensure an unacceptable burden is not placed upon the Council to accommodate children waiting for schools places within the site.**
Concerned about not providing schools until a certain number of houses are completed as local schools are already oversubscribed and will result in increased traffic on the roads. Where will school children go until the new schools are open, local schools are already oversubscribed?	**Response:** The first school will be required early in the development. There may be be an instance where a small amount of development is built (i.e. if there is some capacity in local schools at that time). A contingency to provide temporary accommodation should be required also to ensure that pupils form the site are catered for. Amendments to the SPD should be required to clarify this. **Action:** Amend paragraph 8.7 to read as **Subject to the capacity of local schools at the time of development, there may only be an opportunity for a limited amount of development to be occupied before the new schools are provided. Furthermore, as a contingency t***here may be a need to make provision for temporary accommodation*

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	*~~if the schools are not delivered within the agreed timescale~~***until the schools are ready to be fully occupied**. *~~The~~ Developer**s** will address all associated issues if the school is not delivered on time such as the submission of any planning application(s) for temporary buildings.*
The location of the school will increase traffic along Newell Green along Warfield Street, the narrow roads will not cope and cannot be widened within destroying the character of the village (loss of hedgerows & field boundaries). These streets cannot accommodate existing parking for the school, and introducing parking restrictions would be out of the keeping with the rural nature of the village.	**Response:** The SPD requires the roads serving the development are built to an appropriate size and standards to accommodate the traffic needs of the development. There will need to be adequate drop off and pick up points near the schools. Chapter 7 of the SPD also requires the enhances and retention of key natural features within the site including hedgerows. Compensatory measures will also be required to improve biodiversity across the site. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Other infrastructure issues	
What provision is made for sustainable energy sources.	**Response:** the development will need to make sure it is built to most most sustainable standards in compliance with the relevant Code for Sustainable Homes or Breeam and building regulations. Development will also have to provide at least 20% of its energy provision from renewable energy sources. Other sustainable measures include cycleways, bus support, improved bodiversity and sustainable drainage. All measures are set out in the Warfield SPD **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Why don't the plans include proposals to improve Bracknell Leisure Centre or provide a new sports centre?	**Response:** Development Principle W9 of the Warfield SPD requires a financial contribution towards build sports facilities. This could go towards improving Bracknell Leisure Centre and its swimming pools
The plans don't include leisure facilities such as a swimming pool.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Need to make sure there is provision for recycling.	**Response:** Development Principle W10 of the Warfield SPD requires appropriate individual waste and recycling facilities for the dwellings and on-site community recycling facilities to be provided. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Alternative sites	
There are other more suitable locations such as empty/derelict offices within the Borough (such as the 3M in the town centre) or Garth Meadows.	**Response:** The Council consider reasonable alternatives in identifying the area as a major location for growth in the Core Strategy DPD which was adopted in February 2008. This policy document was subject to evidence, appraisal, consultation and examination. The Council's development strategy as set out in this document is to provide housing to 2026 and this will be achieved on Brownfield and greenfield sites. It was accepted at the examination to the Core Strategy that there will be the need for a mix of such sites and Policy CS2 Locations Principle sets the criteria for allocating new site both brown and greenfield. The Site Allocations DPD will allocate further land in accordance with Policy CS2 for development including on brownfield sites. This document is alos subject of evidence, appraisal, consultation and examination. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Brownfield sites should be developed first instead of green spaces.	
If there are sufficient brownfield sites within Bracknell, development at Warfield should be substantially reduced to lessen its impact.	
Development should be placed near areas such as Martin's Heron where there are train stations.	
Ask that the Council resubmit proposals making use of existing urban and brownfield sites in Bracknell, dedicates resources to the regeneration of the Town Centre and proposes a more sensitive approach to the character of Warfield village.	
If development must take place, there must be clear evidence to prove housing is required and all other alternatives in Bracknell must have been fully explored and consulted on with local people.	
Has been informed at a Parish meeting that there is no alternative plan and it is too late to stop development, very concerned that there is no agreed plans or planning permission for the land.	**Response:** The principle of development in the area was established in Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD (February 2008). The next stage is to establish guidance to this policy in the form of the Warfield SPD. This will be an

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	important document to ensure that developers provide for the development needs and the associated infrastructure provision. It will be used to inform and judge planning applications. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Consideration should be given to extending Jennetts Park instead where there is already infrastructure in place, and access to the A329M and M4.	**Response:** Jennett's Park cannot reasonably be extended further because it also provides a large country park as part of the site. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Localism Act & Neighbourhood Planning	
The Localism Act gives more say to local residents in relation to future housing development, and alternative plans should be produced and consulted upon. This plan and consultation is contrary to the Act.	**Response:** The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011, after the consultation on the Detailed Concept Plan had started. The Localism Act includes a range of neighbourhood planning provisions that give locals greater say about development in their area. Neighbourhood Planning is an addition to (not in place of) the existing planning documents, as Local Planning Authorities will still be required to produce Borough wide local plans (through the Local Development Framework). Neighbourhood Plans can be submitted to a Local Planning Authority by (in the case of BracknellForest which is fully parished) a Town or Parish Council. The Plan would need to be in conformity with national and local strategic policies (which would include the Core Strategy DPD which contains a Policy relating to mixed-use development at Warfield, Policy CS5). Any plan that is submitted would need to be subject to an independent examination, following which, if the Local Planning Authority agree with the recommendations, the Plan would then be subject to a referendum.
Localism Act clearly states neighbourhood planning gives new rights to allow local communities to shape new development and can decide where new homes and business should go and what they should look like.	
The Localism Act sets out that parish/town councils or neighbourhood forums can lead the creation of neighbourhood plans, and once written the plan will be independently examined and put to a local referendum.	
Despite there being huge opposition to the plans, consider the Council is continuing to push through the plans and ignore local views. This is ignoring the clear process in the Localism Act which dictates a referendum must take place for approval by local people.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	There is no current Neighbourhood Plan pending consideration relating to Warfield. The production of the current Warfield SPD is not in conflict with the provisions for Neighbourhood Planning as contained within the Localism Act.**Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Residents Responses - Site Specific Issues

.1 A number of developers and land owners within the site also commented on specific sites and the concept plan and also suggested some changes.

Table 17

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Neighbourhood Centre	
Could consider repositioning the Neighbourhood Centre closer to the higher density housing along Harvest Ride/Lawrence Hill to provide better access to the majority of the population.	**Response:** Whilst this is a reasonable response, the centre cannot be located next to Harvest Ride because the land it would be on (Priory Field is covenanted as open space and it would be extremely unlikely to be removed. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD
Questions why need another neighbourhood centre – isn't Warfield/Tesco's community centre enough?	**Response:** There is a need to provide a mix of uses on the site and a centre next to a new school with extra facilities would be appropriate. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD
Do not see that the essence of Warfield village is being preserved when a new neighbourhood centre is being created.	**Response:** The Council has agreed with many consultation responses on the location of the neighbourhood centre. The neighbourhood centre will be small in its size and status. It is appropriate to ensure the centre is maximised in terms of the activity around it and elements of higher density dwellings in the area will be appropriate. It will also be necessary for the centre to be designed and built so that it is appropriate to its surroundings including sports fields and dwellings which will remain on Newell Green. The SPD text should be amended for clarification. **Action:** Add new text to paragraph 4.21 (now 4.28) which reads as **<u>The neighbourhood centre should demonstrate the following character principles:</u>**
The neighbourhood centre is totally out of proportion with the surrounding village properties. Questions the need for hard landscaping as this is out of keeping with the surrounding area.	
The neighbourhood centre is out of keeping with the surrounding area.	
Concern that the new centre will result in a noisy area where people congregate.	
Hard landscaped/concrete nature of the centre is out of keeping with the surrounding area.	
Three storey buildings are out of keeping.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Objects to the highest density housing being around the neighbourhood centre as this area is already busy, congested and would be out of keeping with the surrounding area. It will also encourage 'town centre' problems such as crime/litter/graffiti.	• **The space will be defined by a mostly continuous frontage.** • **The Neighbourhood Centre will consist of a primary school, residential buildings and small retail facilities, with the potential and flexibility to accommodate health facilities, such as a dentist, and community uses. Buildings will therefore need to be designed to have flexibility in terms of uses.** • **The central square should provide opportunities for activities to spill out into the space from surrounding buildings.** • **The Primary School (number 1 on the Concept Plan) will provide an active frontage onto the square with the potential to incorporate community uses from separate public access points.** • **Drop off for the school, visitor parking and play facilities should be accommodated within the square.** • **Dwellings should consist of terraced town houses and flats and be more urban character in comparison to other areas in the development.** • **As Newell Green approaches Warfield Street to the north, the frontage should become less continuous and be fragmented to reflect the existing grain, with semi-detached and detached houses**
Set back of housing with trees and service road will create a feel of Hounslow/London, and will not be semi-rural in character. The area will be overcrowded and create a feeling of being near Heathrow Airport.	
The neighbourhood centre will not be sufficient to meet the needs of this many new homes and there is no other supermarket proposed.	**Response:** A small centre is considered to be appropriate for the area which is linked to new and existing facilities nearby. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Unclear as to what facilities will be provided within the neighbourhood centre.	**Response:** The neighbourhood centre will provide uses such as shops, café, a dentist surgery, a multi-purpose centre for local community activities (such as Parish related administration, meetings, police, youth and
The neighbourhood centre should focus on facilities such as dentists, pharmacy and	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
communal hall/sports area for children, together with a police drop in service.	children's provision) as detailed in paragraph 4.15 of the final Warfield SPD. A doctors surgery has not been identified as required by the health authorities however, should one be identified the centre could accommodate it. Text should be included in the SPD to clarify this. Text should also be added to enable a pharmacy should one want to locate there **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.15 to read as: T*ypical uses might include small scale retail, services and food and drink space, within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5***such as as shops, a pharmacy, café and a dentist surgery**. *Provision should also be made for a multi-purpose centre for local community activities, such as Parish related administration, meetings,***police,** *youth and children's provision.***Whilst a Doctors has not been identified following consultation with the relevant health authority at the time of the SPD, a surgery may be provided in the neighbourhood centre should the need for one be subsequently identified.**
Concerned that the only types of units will be takeways and hairdressers. Need a doctors surgery and improved leisure facilities.	
The neighbourhood centre should focus on facilities such as dentists, pharmacy and communal hall/sports area for children, together with a police drop in service.	
Was previously referred to as a communal area with local facilities and now described as a residential area with facilities - this will create traffic and parking issues and increase crime.	**Response:** The neighbourhood centre will be required to be designed to respect existing character and be modest in scale to provide local people with local facilities. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Mixed use flats and shops will feel like a town centre.	
No garages are shown, parking is already an issue. Problems at Jennett's Park show that garages need to be provided to ensure parking issues are kept to a minimum.	**Response:** It is not the purpose of the Concept Plan to detail all the development requirements. All requirements of the development are included within the text of the Warfield SPD. The development will be expected to be masterplanned at the detailed planning application stage using the SPD as guidance. The Warfield SPD requires that there should be sufficient parking in the site in paragraph 9.14 and Development Principle W14. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Watersplash Lane	
Is concerned about potential use as a bus route and proposed development alongside and close to it which would increase traffic, destroy the countryside feel and prevent continuation of the current recreational use.	**Response:** The bus route is to be rerouted along Harvest Ride and the access road rerouted to the south of the existing properties on the lane. Amendments to the Concept Plan and SPD text should be made for confirmation. The intention for many of the properties on Watersplash Lane is for them to be redeveloped as part of the development. However, it may be that it is not viable to redevelopment the dwellings and therefore there is a need for a contingency for Watersplash Lane. To ensure the that character and amenity of the lane is protected as much as possible. There should be amendments to the Concept Plan to show Watersplash Lane being stopped up and associated text changes in the SPD. **Action:** Add a new sentence in paragraph 9.8 which reads as: **The route is shown indicatively along Harvest Ride on the Concept Plan.** Amend the Concept Plan to reroute the bus route and show the access road south of Watersplash Lane. Add a new paragraph 4.28 which reads as **The junction between Watersplash Lane and Newell Green road is unsuitable to take significant numbers of additional traffic from new development in the vicinity. Therefore, a new access road should be designed to the south of the existing housing on Watersplash Lane as detailed on the Concept Plan. The intention is to redevelop as much of the land in and around Watersplash Lane as possible. However, should some of the existing dwellings not come forward for redevelopment then it will be necessary to retain access the eastern end of Watersplash Lane for the existing dwellings as a small cul-de-sac accessing Newell Green as they do currently. A minimal number of additional new units on the north edge of the lane could front onto the**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	lane and use this existing access. However, access would not be allowed here for the remaining development parcels which would use the new access and junction on Newell Green.
By converting this (and Maize Lane and Old Priory Lane) to a main road you are removing the few rural lanes where people can safely enjoy walking/cycling. There will be an increased risk of accidents.	**Response:** There will be many safe pedestrian and cycle routes which will be more direct routes to destinations or as leisure routes such as the East to West Greenway. All of which are specified in the Warfield SPD **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Questions the logic of area 'm' being medium density as it is adjacent to open space and should therefore be low density.	**Response:** The planning rationale for higher density in this area (plot m) is because it is in the centre of the development and well located to the new school and neighbourhood centre. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Newell Green	
Seeks consideration of the preservation of the village atmosphere around Newell Green. Development will destroy the rural character of the area.	**Response:** The development will be required to ensure that the character of existing dwellings will remain. This will be achieved through a number of ways including: - retaining/enhancing trees and planting where appropriate; - ensuring that there are not issues of overlooking; - back gardens against back gardens; - having regards to existing policy and guidance. This is a normal consideration in determining planning applications. Text will be included in the SPD to reinforce this issue.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Add a new paragraph 4.45 which reads as **This character area should reflect development in Newell Green, in so far as it should provide a variety of dwellings in an informal layout. Development in the Newell Green South area should demonstrate the following character principles:** • **The east end of Watersplash Lane should be maintained as a semi-rural lane and continue to provide access for existing residents and dwellings. The west end of Watersplash Lane will provide access to new development parcels, whilst maintaining the character of the lane as far as is possible. A new access road will also be provided to the south of existing dwellings.** • **Development should front onto Watersplash Lane whilst retaining the existing trees and hedgerows as a green buffer area.** • **Trees and hedgerows should be retained and layouts should take into account the important trees and planting, including the trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders.** • **The function and character of the existing semi-rural Avery Lane to the west is to be retained and will provide an important recreational and strategic pedestrian and cycle route, maintaining its status as a bridleway. The lane will be closed to vehicles other than where a vehicular access may need to cross the lane.** • **This area should be verdant in character with significant areas provided for new trees and landscaping.** • **The area should be informal, providing a mix of dwelling types. Within parcels, there will be opportunities to**

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	• **create internal mews areas and shared street courtyards.** • **Plot sizes and set backs should vary creating an informal area and interest within the streetscene.**
Parcel K, is planned for 280 houses, which is too many for this piece of land. Concerned that they will back directly onto existing gardens of properties already along Forest Road. Also queried where will the residents traffic from this piece of land be routed.	**Response**: This area is suitable for the desired density of development. There will be a mixture of higher and power density elements within this area to achieve the numbers. Furthermore, the development will be expected to respect the existing character of Newell Green in accordance with policy and guidance as required by the Warfield SPD. Further text on additional text which should be included in the SPD is detailed above. Access to this parcel is not confirmed although it is likely that access will be from the new link road and/re the new road which will connect Watersplash Lane to Newell Green (which is routed in the fields south of the existing dwellings on Watersplash Lane). Please see the text changes in respect to this access road as detailed in the Watersplash Lane section below. **Action:** Changes detailed elsewhere in this statement.
Questions how are the residents in the houses sited at area k going to get to their houses? If this is off the new link road that means there would need to be at least one rather busy road (to service 280 homes/560 cars) dissecting the pedestrian cycle route which would be unacceptable.	
Increasing the traffic at Newell Green will raise the risks of accidents.	**Response:** The development will provide an alternative route to Newell Green traffic in the form of the new link road between the Three Legged Cross and the Quelm, Park roundabout. Therefore the development will not increase the risk of accidents.
Existing problems of accessing properties between the Plough & Harrow & Three Legged Cross will be worsened by increased traffic.	
Warfield Street/Village	
These (Warfield Street and Forest Road) are the 'original' parts of the village (character housing and well established trees & hedgerows) and must not be allowed to be urbanised. Additional traffic on these roads will cause safety and parking hazards.	**Response:** All access roads will be required to be upgraded/built to adoptable highways standards which means they will have capacity and be safe. The development will retain or enhance as much of the hedgerows and trees in the area as possible as required by the Warfield SPD. The development is required to be designed so it looks towards Bracknell Town Centre and that new access points to
Warfield Street is a busy street, with several police registered accidents recently. Many	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
of the properties do not have off-road parking, and therefore park on the road. Increased traffic will lead to more accidents.	the development should be off Harvest Ride to demonstrate that the site is a sustainable urban extension. Further, paragraph 9.22 of the Warfield SPD requires that the semi rural character of the northern villages along Forest Road in transport terms should be protected. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Areas k, tt, p, q, s, c, cc & dd will swallow up existing villages, and will become part of Warfield, will result in loss of local history and heritage.	**Response:** The area was identified in the Core Strategy DPD in 2008. The development will need to respect the character of the existing settlements through careful design as required by the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Infilling could ruin the character of the villages (which is a dispersed settlement) whilst estate development would overwhelm it. Development should be moved further south to preserve a buffer zone between Bracknell and Warfield village.	
The proposals will eliminate Warfield as a separate village and it will become a part of Bracknell.	
Development to the rear of Warfield Street will be overbearing and intrusive to existing properties.	
Water Splash Lane/Maize Lane & Old Priory Lane are shown as a primary road access with bus route. These lanes are currently restricted (and some are 'dead ends'), upgrading these roads will increase traffic beyond the safety limits currently enjoyed by the village. These lanes are currently used for walking, cycling, horse riding and by children.	**Response:** Vehicle access will be mostly from new access points from the south of the development. Maize Lane will be stopped up to avoid traffic access from Warfield Street and access from the south will be opened up. Watersplash Lane will become a cul-de sac and the access road will be moved to the south of the existing housing in this area. Old Priory Lane will not become a primary access from Warfield Street. The bus route has been rerouted along Harvest Ride. All changes to text and the SPD are detailed elsewhere in this statement. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Document is not clear regarding the access to the proposed development (properties to the rear of properties along Warfield Street). This relates to a current footpath. Existing road network will not be able to cope with increased traffic.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Concerned at the impact of the development on highway safety, especially at the junction where Warfield Street crosses Jigs Lane North, which is already prone to accidents.	**Response:** The layout of this junction (and others) will be addressed as part of the development mitigation measures ensuring any safety issues are addressed at the same time as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Existing roads are inadequate to accommodate even small increases in traffic.	**Response:** Existing roads within the site will need to be upgraded where appropriate to be able to accommodate traffic and additional text should be made to the SPD to clarify this. **Action:** Add a new sentence to paragraph 9.18 which reads as: **It will be necessary, where appropriate, to upgrade existing roads within the site to accommodate the development**.
The proposals would result in the loss of the gap between Warfield Village and Bracknell - contrary to the South East Plan and safeguarding the countryside (which sets supports the vitality and character of the region's rural areas, whilst protecting the valuable natural and historic assets of the region; has a strong policy to maintain a separation of settlements; check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preserve the special character and setting of historic towns).	**Response:** The principle that development will occur in the area was considered during the production of the Core Strategy DPD. Following evidence and examination Policy CS5 identified the area as a major location for growth. The Core Strategy DPD and its policies were therefore found to be in accordance with the then emerging South East Plan. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Are there any plans to investigate the volume of traffic along the A3095 & Forest Road - whilst this is currently a 30mph limit, people travel in excess of this speed. There should be a budget allocated for speed management measures.	**Response:** The Council has assessed and will continue to assess the impact of traffic along this route. Development will be expected to ensure that the development slows traffic for example, along Harvest Ride.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Traffic should be routed from the A3095 along Harvest Ride and the new link road by the Three Legged Cross.	**Response:** The link road will be provided to alleviate pressure on Newell Green/Forest Road by acting as an alternative route for through traffic. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Forest Road is constrained by a humped back bridge between Binfield and Warfield and will not be able to cope with additional traffic.	**Response:** This is agreed and the development is required to be designed so it looks towards Bracknell Town Centre and that new access points to the development should be off Harvest Ride to demonstrate that the site is a sustainable urban extension. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Grove Farm House/Stables	
Objects to development at Grove Farm Stables and paddocks, due to being out of keeping with the area, the impact of new roads and resultant traffic and highway safety concerns, and an increase in air pollution. Suggests that the maps being used are inaccurate and questions the number of inhabitants that would result from 70 dwellings.	**Response:** Grove Farm will form part of the development. Development in this location will be required to take account of the character of existing dwellings. This will be achieved through a number of ways including: - retaining/enhancing trees and planting where appropriate; - ensuring that there are not issues of overlooking; - back gardens against back gardens; - having regards to existing policy and guidance. This is a normal consideration in determining planning applications. Text will be included in the SPD to reinforce this issue. Maize Lane will not provide an access point to the development from Warfield Street other than it will allow access to existing properties. Therefore access along Maize Lane will be from the roundabout on Harvest Ride. The Concept Plan and associated text should be revised accordingly.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	There are a number of existing gardens and a dwelling which are included in Core Strategy Policy CS5 designation which following this consultation are confirmed as not part of the development area. The Concept Plan should be amended to reflect this. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan to show Maize Lane being stopped up. Add a new paragraph 4.37 which reads as **It will not be appropriate to provide access to the development along Maize Lane from Warfield Street other than to existing dwellings along Maize Lane in this area. Therefore, Maize Lane will be stopped up to vehicular traffic at a point near its junction with Warfield Street as shown indicatively on the Concept Plan. South of this point Maize Lane should be upgraded to accommodate vehicles and serve as access to the development in the area from its roundabout junction with Harvest Ride. (this will require the removal of the existing block to vehicles close to the roundabout).** Amend the Concept Plan to excluding the gardens and dwelling.
Requests that the greenspace north of the existing bridle path and proposed 'east to west green link' is retained which will benefit existing and future residents.	**Response:** This area is suitable for some housing development although it will need to be designed and built having regard to existing character. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Cabbage Hill/West End Lane	
There should be a minimum of new development to the west of existing properties from Forest Road to the Old Farmhouse. If large scale development is deemed essential it should be restricted to areas a,b, and f.	**Response:** There will be housing development in block e and d to the west of West End Lane subject to an appropriate buffer (see below). Areas a, b, and f will be expanded to take more development. Area c will be revised to not contain any development behind the main line of properties on West End Lane. This will protect the views to the rear of the properties. There will be opportunities for development in the area generally behind the Old Farmhouse
Whereas new houses will benefit from views to Cabbage Hill, existing residents will be sandwiched between new developments and current views curtailed.	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
There should be no new development to the west of property boundaries in West End Lane stretching from Forest Road to land at the Stables, West End Farm. Objects to houses being built behind properties on West End Lane.	on the lower reaches of Cabbage Hill. The Concept Plan and SPD text should be amended. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and add an additional sentence to new paragraph 4.29 to read as **There should not be any development to the west (behind) of the existing properties in West End Lane between West End Cottage and Shoshanna.**
Open space G13 should be expanded to the north and south. The woodland buffer zone (Plot G13) between west End Lane and any development east of the Lane must take priority over the start of any future development. The proposed development will be overlook existing properties along West End Lane resulting in the loss of privacy.	**Response:** It is agreed that the existing rural character could be enhanced by providing a wooded buffer along West End Lane from its entrance to the Old farmhouse. It should be at least 20 metres wide and should include the existing Farm Shop. There should be no breaks to allow traffic access but there should be at least one break south of the stopped up part of West End lane to allow pedestrian and cycle access for residents eastwards toward the newly provided river park and westwards towards the Cabbage Hill country park. **Action:** Amend the Concept plan and add a new sentence to new paragraph 4.29 which reads as **The development will provide a planted wooded buffer zone of at least 20 metres in widthwhich also provides the opportunity to retain the existing Farm Shop which runs in parallel with the east side of West End Lane from its entrance at Forest Road to The Old Farmhouse.There should be no vehicular access across this buffer but there should be pedestrian and cycle access at a to be agreed point south of the stopped up part of West End Lane to allow access to the Cut River park and the Cabbage Hill Country Park.**
Rather than use Park Farm for green space it would be better to use the existing green space which already gives visual access to Cabbage Hill and use the area at Park Farm for development	**Response:** It is the intention for Park Farm to be redeveloped as part of the scheme. There is a sound planning rationale such as retaining the semi-rural nature of the area by bringing Cabbage Hill into the new development via

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	the East to West Greenway. The Concept Plan shows this very well. Additional text should be provided to clarify this intention **Action:** Amend paragraph 4.32 (now renumbered as which reads as: ~~*Development should front onto areas of open space and SANG where appropriate.*~~**The development will provide significant amounts of open space (as described in Chapter 7) including a new country park at Cabbage Hill and two river parks. The aim is to create a semi natural feel to the development using a** ~~*A*~~ *green corridor*~~**running east/west linking areas of open space should provide**~~*providing a pedestrian and cycle friendly spine route through the development from east to west,* ~~*This is*~~ **referred to within this document as The East to West Greenway, see Development Principle W5. Development should be designed sensitively to respect the landscape character of Cabbage Hill and front onto areas of open space and SANG where appropriate.** *The* ~~*parcel*~~ **layout of parcels through the development** *will need to be informed by the existing landscape. Hedgerows, footpaths and bridleways within the site should be maintained and used to develop routes through the site, both north/south and east/west.*
The important area around Cabbage Hill should be protected in line with the Council's own evidence. Objects to major development shown around the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill/West End. Cabbage Hill was identified in the previous plan (the document was not specified in the comments) as being a country park, this has now changed.	**Response:** There will be development on the lower southern and eastern slopes as shown on the revised Concept Plan. A large part of Cabbage Hill on the eastern side will be converted to a country park and form part of the SANG solution for the site giving public access. Therefore, whilst some land will be lost to development this will be more than compensated by making a vast area which is currently intensively farmed, publicly accessible and as a biodiversity haven as described in the Warfield SPD. The annotation on the Concept Plan should be amended to clarify the area as a country park/SANG.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the annotations on the Concept Plan.
Pleased to see that West End Lane is to become a cul-de-sac.	Noted.
There is an inconsistency in the road layouts between the map on page 6 of the Concept Plan and the Illustrative layout on page 8. Confirmation is sought that West End Lane will not be used as a link for traffic from any new development.	**Response:** It is agreed that clarification is required and the Concept Plan and illustrative diagrams should be amended to clarify that the cul-de-sac part of West End Lane will not be used as a link for traffic. **Action:** Amend the the Concept Plan and illustrative diagrams.
It is vital that the semi-rural identity of West End Lane is preserved.	**Response:** The semi rural nature of West End Lane will be preserved through the measures such as: protecting the rear of the properties from redevelopment; converting the lane into a cul-de-sac; providing a buffer to the front; and, providing a new country park on Cabbage Hill. All amendments are detailed n the responses above. **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan and text in the SPD in line with those outlined elsewhere in this document.
Suggests a parking area at Cabbage Hill with paths leading to the river park and green corridor.	**Response:** This is agreed and is included in paragraph 7.29 of the Warfield SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
House type shown is too tall for Cabbage Hill. Three storey buildings will be out of keeping.	**Response:** The design principle of the development have been carefully considered in terms of their impact and the need to balance the efficient use of land with density requirements. It is considered that the site can accommodate some 3 storey elements in appropriate locations within the site. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The area if green space (as set on page 6) needs to be increase to 72 ha plus 11 ha not counted to provide an additional 40ha (total 120+ha), as the current proposals would lead to an inappropriate form of green field development.	**Response**: The development will need to provide open space in accordance with the prescribed standard for Open Space of Public Value and SANGS as set out in policy and the Warfield SPD. There is scope for providing enough land on-site but there may be opportunities to provide some land off-site. The SPD is flexible in this respect. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required**.**
Suggested larger houses at Cabbage Hill and West End will not be affordable (will be priced in excess of £450k which will be out of reach of the average earner).	**Response:** The development will make provision for affordable housing in accordance with current policy as required by Development Principle W3. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Tree planting to provide privacy and noise control will take 15 years to grow and have effect - this is not sufficient to protect existing residents.	**Response:** As part of the detailed planning application process, Officers will ensure reasonable measures are taken by developers to provide privacy and protection from noise. This could be the retention of existing vegetation or it might be necessary to plant additional trees and other vegetation to sensitively buffer existing residents from development. Different species and environmental conditions affect the establishment and rate of growth of trees and other vegetation, such as hedges which could mature in a quick period of time. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Building on Cabbage Hill will result in the loss of local wildlife.	**Response:** Cabbage Hill has little local wildlife value in its fields because they are intensively farmed. Part of this ,and is where development will be. Long Copse will be retailed in its entirety. The conversion of a large part of the fields into a country park will enhance biodiversity such as through creating wooded areas, planting hedgerows and areas of natural meadow.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Object to building on open space currently designated as EN10 and EN14 land by the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan.	**Response:** The designations affecting Cabbage Hill are the current Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan designations relating to Policy EN10ii Area of Local Landscape Importance and EN14 River Corridor. It is intended to ensure that development is in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS5. This will result in a revision where necessary to the existing EN10ii and EN14 designations on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map. However, these designations will remain until the extent of the built up area has been clarified. The designations whilst remaining a material consideration will have less weight since the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD. However, they will be revised/moved through the DPD process in due course. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The Cut	
Any proposals to widen The Cut to accommodate changes in the volume of water will have significant implications for the wildlife that is found there.	**Response:** There are no plans to widen the Cut as part of the development. The development will be required to enhance habitats in both river parks as required by the SPD. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Concerned that there is periodic flooding most winters on land shown as G5.	**Response:** The area most prone to flooding in this area will form the river park as specified in the Warfield SPD so there will be no risk to the new dwellings. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Harvest Ride/Jigs Lane/County Lane	

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
The house type shown on page 12 (including by Tesco roundabout) would create an urban block out of keeping, as there are no other apartments in the area - do not want to see a repeat of the development at the Met Office roundabout (buildings too tall).	**Response:** It is appropriate at this location to include some apartments close to the existing centre to maximise activity between the two and to give the site a presence. The apartments will not be high rise but 3 - 4 storeys which, if designed appropriately in accordance with the SPD, can work in an urban design context with the rest of the development and existing area. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Blocks G12, X and Y at medium and high density would be at a higher elevation that the surroundings and overlook existing properties to the south of Harvest Ride resulting in loss of privacy and be overbearing.	
The proposed height of the buildings in areas y and z are too high and would not be sympathetic to the surrounding area.	
Development will not integrate with current retail uses uses as Tesco which are two storey.	
Asks what is proposed for areas cc and dd as not shown on the Concept Plan.	**Response:** The Concept Plan shows these area are for housing development. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Density of areas r, u, x, y & z are too high and will exacerbate traffic and congestion at peak times.	**Response:** The Council has undertaken extensive modelling which has tested a number of road, junction, public transport, pedestrian and cycle improvements which will mitigate the increase in vehicles to and from the site. With the measures set out in Chapter 9 being put in place the development will demonstrate that it mitigates the impacts arising from the increased number of vehicles. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The plan should also refer to this as Country Lane, which is also shown on the plan.	**Response:** This is agreed and amendments should be made for clarification: **Action:** Amend the Concept Plan.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
Concerned that parking and traffic will be an issue in the area due to the proposed high density.	**Response:** The Warfield SPD requires that there should be sufficient parking in the site in paragraph 9.14 and Development Principle W14. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
The route to Whitegrove School along County Lane and Westermorland Drive is already busy and dangerous during school pick up and drop off, this will become worse with extra traffic from new housing.	**Response:** The impact of the development has been assessed using the Bracknell multi modal transport model which allowed the authority to assess the impact of additional trips and prepare mitigation measures which have been included within the Chapter 9 of the Warfield SPD and the infrastructure development plan. As well as these roadspace issues there will be further measures to improve what is an already impressive footway and cycleway network which provides direct routes to and from the school for parent and children to walk or cycle to school. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Development is too close to the (Tesco) roundabout and should be further away, facing inwards.	**Response:** There is sound planning rationale to ensure development looks onto the roundabout such as creating activity at the front which will for example, create surveillance of the area. The properties will also be closer to the services in the centre making it easier for residents to walk to the supermarket etc. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Hedge Lane/Avery Lane	
These are currently byways, placing a bus lane over these roads will not maintain the rural nature of these lanes.	**Response:** The bus route has been rerouted to follow along Harvest Ride and this amendment is detailed elsewhere in this document. There may be opportunities to provide access roads across agreed at points which are less sensitive on both these routes. Text will be revised to clarify this.

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	Action: Amend the first and second bullet points of paragraph 7.13 to read as: • ~~*A*~~ **Hedge Lane** *Bridleway between Old Priory Lane and Maize Lane* ~~*(also known as HedgeLane)*~~ *(Warfield BR 26)***There may be a need to provide at least one access point across Hedge lane for vehicle access. This should be at a point to be agreed and which is not sensitive in terms of its existing planting.** • **Avery Lane which runs**~~*Running*~~ *from Watersplash Lane northwards to the Three Legged Cross Junction (Warfield BW 8)***which may include access routes across it at less sensitive parts**.
Comments on Specific Plots	
There should be no houses built on parcel h as any hard surfaces will add to the the natural run off from this area which consists of heavy clay soils and will result in increased risk of flooding.	**Response:** Development will be required to respond to localised conditions including soil conditions and drainage as required by the Warfield SPD. This plot of land is beyond the floodzone which means there is not a planning constraint relating to flood risk for this land. With appropriate mitigation and measures put in place this plot of land is suitable for redevelopment. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Part of garden is in G5 open space and will present an overbearing and intrusive element to the rear of the property in Watersplash Lane and adjoining properties in The Splash.	**Response:** It is unsure exactly where this rep relates to. However the development will not include parts of gardens unless the whole of the plot of land is available for redevelopment. Furthermore Concept Plan has been revised to reconsider the area around Watersplash Lane which could result in the lane being converted into a cul-de-sac. Access will now be provided at a point beyond Watersplash Lane opposite the new neighbourhood centre to then join up with Watersplash Lane beyond the cul-de-sac stopping point. Development opposite the properties in the Splash will need

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	to respect the character and amenity of the existing properties. Text should be added to the SPD to ensure this. **Action:** Add bullet points to new paragraph 4.43 which read as: • **<u>Dwellings to front onto The Splash in the south of this area and follow the rhythm of development along this lane.</u>** • **<u>Within the parcel alongside The Splash, informal courtyard and mews development will be appropriate.</u>** • **<u>To the east of the parcel within The Splash area, development should overlook the existing footpath/cycleway, creating natural surveillance and activity</u>**
Suggested changes to concept plan	
Remove housing areas r, u, x, y and z to create a nature green space protecting the space between new and old developments and Reduce: • Area k to 100 houses • North of area q to 70 houses • North of area cc to 25 houses • North of e to 30 houses • North of c to 80 houses Remove areas s, v, dd and aa, bb and ff to create a natural rural barrier to Newell Green and protect Hayley Green. This will also assist with parking and traffic congestion. This will still provide 1084 houses and is still 1.5 times the size of Warfield, but will reduce demand on existing services.	**Response:** In respect to plots r, u, x, y and z, During the production of the Core Strategy DPD it was demonstrated that the identification of development was to provide a sustainable urban extension to Warfield which looks towards Bracknell Town Centre. This sprinkle was accepted by the inspector and the Core Strategy and its relating Policy CS5 was adopted. Furthermore, there are other sound planning rationale why development should be in these locations such as creating and active frontage; connecting the development with existing; and contribution to the desire to slow Harvest Ride. Therefore, there should be development in these areas. In respect to areas k, q, cc, e, c: areas k (280 dwellings) and q (166 dwellings) can reasonably take the amount of development to ensure the efficient use of land; area cc can can reasonably accommodate 47 dwellings although subject to the redevelopment of existing dwellings in this area; and area e can reasonably accommodate 75 dwellings subject to an adequate buffer to existing properties being provided; area c should be revised to exclude development behind the main line of housing

Summary of Main Issue Raised	Response
	on West End Lane. In respect to areas s, v, dd, aa, bb and should contain development provided the requirements of the SPD at met such as considering the character of Warfield Street and the need to provide a new (Bull Brook) river park. **Action:** Changes relating to area c are detailed elsewhere in this statement.
The proposed centre should be moved closer to the higher density housing along Harvest Ride/Lawrence Hill in order to try to preserve the rural setting of Warfield village.	**Response:** Whilst this is a reasonable response, the centre cannot be located next to Harvest Ride because the land it would be on (Priory Field is covenanted as open space and it would be extremely unlikely to be removed. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
A village green with community facilities and landscaping should be provided.	**Response:** There is scope to include a village green on the site in accordance with the SPD. It could be that the existing memorial ground performs this function. Therefore, this is an issue for the detailed planning stage. **Action:** No changes to the Concept Plan or SPD required.
Other	
objects to building on land leased to a local golf club.	**Response:** This comment relates probably to Blue Mountain which is a different site and therefore the comment is not relevant to the Warfield SPD.

Section 4: Appendices

Appendix 1: Compatibility with SCI and Community Engagement Strategy

The following tables indicate how the requirements of the SCI and the Partnership Community Engagement Strategy have been met. This is over and above that required by the statutory minimum set out in relevant regulations.

Table 18 Consistency with the SCI (taken from Table 3 of the SCI)

Stage of DPD Preparation	Engagement identified in the SCI	How did we meet this?
Evidence Gathering	Gather information on issues through: Informal dialogue with stakeholders to identify key issues One to one meetings	Scope of existing published documents, guidance and production of background papers and evidence as detailed in Table 1 of the Warfield SPD.
Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	Discussion with members of local environmental organisations and groups Publish information on BF online Free access to BFBC website at libraries	**SA Scoping Consultation: Jan – Feb 2010:** • Consultation with statutory agencies plus a number of other organisations. • Details placed on the Council's website. • Scoping prepared internally with relevant Council officers.
Issues and options and Initial Sustainability Appraisal & Draft Supplementary Planning Document and Final Sustainability Appraisal	Allow a maximum 6 week consultation Free access to BFBC website at libraries For a policy specific SPD, undertake targeted consuiltation with relevant stakehodler groups For an area specific SPD, undertake tragerted consultation with residents, community and occupiers, Use local notice boards, Hold community planning forums, mobile exhibitions, planning for real exercises, public exhibitions, public meetings, stakeholder briefings, street stalls,	**Design Workshops with stakeholders in May 2010.** **Warfield SPD Consultation Draft Nov 2010-Jan 2011:** • Letters to all specific and general consultees. • Press release • Documents available on the website • Documents available at town and parish offices and libraries across the Borough • Newspaper advert • Individual meetings held with some stakeholders **Consultation on Detailed Concept Plan, November 2011:**

Stage of DPD Preparation	Engagement identified in the SCI	How did we meet this?
	surgeries, workshops as appropriate to the subject and scope of the SPD, Be flexible with meeting times, use graffiti boards, incentives for taking part, interactive displays, interactive voting, maps and dots, parish walkabouts, photography projects, short plays, thought trees, video diaries, text messages, writing and poetry, as appropriate to the subject and scope of the SPD	• Posting the documents on-line for comment at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/warfield. • Copies of the Consultation Draft SPD and its supporting documents were made available at Warfield Parish Council and Whitegrove library. • A letter/email containing details about the consultation was sent to all interested parties who responded to the last consultation including developers, professional bodies, local interest groups and other interested parties as well as statutory consultees. • An article was placed in the The Wren of Warfield parish newsletter which promoted the consultation and including details of the public exhibitions • A copy of the Detailed Concept Plan was delivered to each residence within West End Lane • Meetings were held with The Keep West End Green Campaign (KWEGC) and Warfield Parish Council.

Stage of DPD Preparation	Engagement identified in the SCI	How did we meet this?
		• Three officer manned exhibitions were held for the public – all of which were very well attended. (see Appendix 3) • Officers spoke with individuals and groups on an ad hoc basis by phone, e-mail or face to face during the consultation.

Table 19 Consistency with the Bracknell Forest Partnership Community Engagement Strategy Principles and Values of Effective Engagement (Section 11).

Principle	Explanation	What did we do?
Clear Purpose	The purpose of any engagement activity will be clearly outlined to the local community from the start, and partners will be honest in sharing information and identifying any limited scope of consultation.	Purpose of engagement set out in each document. Purpose of the consultation set out in letters, an information leaflet and explained at meetings and exhibitions.
Inclusion	We will ensure all relevant parties are included, explaining who we are trying to engage with and why. We will identify and tackle barriers to engagement and seek alternative methods to engage a wider range of people or groups.	The Statement of Community Involvement, July 2006 sets out who we will engage with in preparing the LDF. A range of participation methods have been used to reach all relevant parties including hard to reach groups. This includes targeted mail, the website and social media sites, public exhibitions and specific stakeholder meetings and press releases.
Valuing all views	We will regularly ask for resident's views as well as those of local businesses and voluntary and community groups. Those views will be respected and valued and will form a part of our service planning.	Engagement has included seeking views from those who live, and work in the Borough as well as others who may have an interest. The Council has summarised all views received and identified how those views have been responded to.
Feedback	We will ensure feedback is given after any engagement activity, and this will include the findings and the outcome of how it has helped to make decision making.	As above, the Council has produced a summary of the consultation responses received at each stage of the preparation of the SPD and has identified how those views have been taken into account.

Principle	Explanation	What did we do?
Use of appropriate tools to engage	We will use the most appropriate method to engage with a local community, recognising that "one size does not fit all" and that many different measures are often needed to ensure we can engage with our diverse communities.	As set out in 'Clear Purpose' and 'Inclusion' above, the Council has used a wide range of engagement methods to seek views from the community. These methods are consistent with the Consulting Methods set out in Appendix 2 of the Community Engagement Strategy.

Appendix 2: Details of responders to the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft

This table lists all the individuals or groups who made responded to the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft.

Table 20

Ref	Details	Name	Ref	Details	Name
1a	Local Resident	Owen	103a	Local Resident	Rider
2	Local Resident	William	104a	Local Resident	Wools
3 part i	Local Resident	Jones	105a	Local Resident	Randles
3 part ii	Local Resident	Jones	106a	Local Resident	Edwards
4	Local Resident	Watts	107a	Local Resident	Woodbridge
5	Statutory Consultee	Binfield PC	108a	Local Resident	Bool
6	Statutory Consultee	Coal Authority	109a	Local Resident	Vassor
7a part i	Local Resident	Tyrell	110a	Local Resident	Barker
7a part ii	Local Resident	Tyrell	111a	Local Resident	Lavender
8	Local Resident	Walker	112a	Local Resident	Pitney
9	Statutory Consultee	Highways Agency	113	Local Resident	Blumenthal
10a	Local Resident	Tighe	114a	Local Resident	Leach
11	Local Resident	Bantleman	115a	Local Resident	Abbott
12	Local Resident	Lacey	116a	Local Resident	Cheesman
13	Local Resident	Wallen	117	Local Resident	Rumsby
14	Statutory Consultee	Natural England	118a	Local Resident	Mrs A. Dwane
14a	Statutory Consultee	Natural England	119a	Local Resident	Nixon
15	Statutory Consultee	Warfield PC	120a	Local Resident	Moynihan

15a	Statutory Consultee	Warfield PC	121a	Local Resident	Stockwell
16a	Local Resident	Lovell	122	Local Resident	Pitt
17a	Local Resident	Plowman	123	Local Resident	Lee
18	Developer/Land Owner	Schyde	123a	Local Resident	Lee
18a	Developer/Land Owner	Schyde	124a	Local Resident	Bhatti and Paddock
18b	Developer/Land Owner	Schyde	124b	Local Resident	Bhatti and Paddock
19a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Bisset	125a	Local Resident	Painter
20a	Local Resident within site	Walker	126a	Local Resident	Charles
21	Statutory Consultee	Theatres Trust	127a	Local Resident	Roseboom
22a	Statutory Consultee	South East Water	128a	Local Resident	Norton
23a	Local Resident	Alston	129a	Local Resident	Mullins
24a	Local Residents Group	Chavey Down Association	130a	Local Resident	Roseboom
25a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Bown	131a	Local Resident	Brewis
25a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Bown	132a	Local Resident	Douglas
26	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Osada	133a	Local Resident	Rodger
26a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Osada	134a	Local Resident	Matysiak
26i	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Osada	135a	Local Resident	Foster
27	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Leering	136a	Local Resident	Carr
27a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Leering	137a	Local Resident	Collery
28	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Crossen	138a	Local Resident	McDonald

28a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Crossen	139a	Local Resident	Curran
29	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Aiyathuray	140	Local Resident	Mrs C Downs
29a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Aiyathuray	140a	Local Resident	Mrs C Downs
30	Local Resident within site	Martyn	141a	Local Resident	Midson
31	Local Resident	Johnson	142a	Local Resident	Dacombe and Pardo
32	Statutory Consultee	Environment Agency	143a	Local Resident	Childs
32i	Statutory Consultee	Environment Agency	144a	Local Resident	Silavant
32a	Statutory Consultee	Environment Agency	145a	Local Resident	Whittington / van Der Laan
33	Developer/Land Owner	Purser and Lowe	146a	Local Resident	Humphrey
34	Developer/Land Owner	Bloor Homes	147a	Local Resident	G. Wilson
34a	Developer/Land Owner	Bloor Homes	148a	Local Resident	Rance
35a	Statutory Consultee	RBWM	149a	Local Resident	Luker
36	Local Resident	Young	150a	Local Resident	Painter
36a	Local Resident	Young	151a	Local Resident	Faubel
37	Local Resident within site	O'Neill	152a	Local Resident	Laine
38	Local Resident	Bailey	153a	Local Resident	Bhaskar
39	Local Resident	Spain	154a	Local Resident	Ramsdale
40	Statutory Consultee	Winkfield PC	155	Local Resident	Grantham
41a	Local Resident	Wade	155a	Local Resident	Grantham
42a	Local Resident	Faubel	156a	Local Resident	O' Regan
43	Developer/Land Owner	Henderson	157a	Local Resident	Grove and Turner
43a	Developer/Land Owner	Henderson	158a	Local Resident	Raj
44	Developer/Land Owner	Warfield Consortium	159a	Local Resident with the site	Davies

44a	Developer/Land Owner	Warfield Consortium	160a	Local Resident	Cole
45a	Statutory Consultee	RSPB	161a	Local Resident	Edwards
46	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Mr Marchant	162a	Local Resident	Naylor
46a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Mr Marchant	163a	Local Resident	Date
47	Developer/Land Owner	Berkeley Strategic	164a	Local Resident	Rose
47a	Developer/Land Owner	Berkeley Strategic	165a	Local Resident	Sage
48	Developer/Land Owner	Hambidge	166a	Local Resident	Litchfield
48a	Developer/Land Owner	Hambidge	167a	Local Resident	Litchfield-William
49	Developer/Land Owner	Alfred Homes	168a	Local Resident	Williams
49a	Developer/Land Owner	Alfred Homes	169a	Local Resident	Leary
50	Statutory Consultee	CPRE	170a	Local Resident	Layton
51a	Local Resident	Horan	171a	Local Resident	Wall
52	Developer/Land Owner	Collins	172a	Local Resident	Bickley
52a	Developer/Land Owner	Collins	173a	Local Resident	Bright
53	Developer/Land Owner	Persimmons	174a	Local Resident	Seller
53a	Developer/Land Owner	Persimmons	175a	Local Resident	Hatcher
53b	Developer other site	Persimmons	176a	Local Resident	Biggins
54	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Fitzwilliam	177a	Local Resident	Howard
54a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Fitzwilliam	178a	Local Resident	James
55	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Manor Farm)	179a	Local Resident	Taplin
55a	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Manor Farm)	180a	Local Resident	Fox
56	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Sumanga Farm)	181a	Local Resident	O'Neal

56a	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Sumanga Farm)	182	Local Resident	Wood and McHale
57	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Newell Green)	183a	Local Resident	Bales
57a	Developer/Land Owner	Millgate (Newell Green)	184a	Local Resident	Tomalin
58	Local Group	Warfield Environment Group	185a	Local Resident	Bhojani
59	Local Resident	Taylor	186a	Local Resident	Claveau
60	Developer/Land Owner	Kitewood Estates	187a	Local Resident	Hood
61	Developer other site	Charles Church Southern	188a	Local Resident	Freeman
62	School	Sandy Lane School	189a	Local Resident	Henderson
63	Statutory Consultee	BBOWT	190a	Local Resident	Muir
63a	Statutory Consultee	BBOWT	191a	Local Resident	Navarrete
64	Statutory Consultee	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	192a	Local Resident	Rothwell
65a	Statutory Consultee	Sport England	193a	Local Resident	Richards
66	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Osada	194a	Local Resident	Purnell
66a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Osada	195a	Local Resident	Bamford
67	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Higgins	196a	Local Resident	Bartle
68	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Higgins	197a	Local Resident	Cassie
69	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Fitzwilliam	198a	Local Resident	Roxburgh
70	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Stahl	199a	Local Resident	Stanmore
70a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Stahl	200a	Local Resident	Todd

71	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Stahl	201a	Local Resident	Magg
71a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Stahl	202a	Local Resident	Counsell
72	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Arnold	203a	Local Resident	Phillips
72a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Arnold	204	Local Resident	Runham
73	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Herd	205a	Local Resident	Boulter
73a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Herd	206a	Local Resident	Lisanti
74	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Ivall	207a	Local Resident	Andrews
75	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Herd	208a	Local Resident	Mr J Bell
75a	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Herd	209a	Local Resident	Larsen-Pass
76	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Doyle	210a	Local Resident	Holtom
77	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Ivall	211a	Local Resident	Worcester
78	Local Resident	Payne	212	Local Resident	Preston
79	Statutory Consultee	Surrey Council Council	213a	Local Resident	Herbert
80	Statutory Consultee	PCT	214a	Local Resident	Woods
80a	Statutory Consultee	PCT	215a	Local Resident	Ward
81a	Local Resident	Herd	216a part i	Local Resident	Birchmore
82a	Local Resident	Wilkins	216a part ii	Local Resident	Birchmore
83a	Local Resident	Flint	217a	Local Resident	Whiffin
84	Local Resident	Pitt	218	Local Group	SE Berkshire Ramblers
84a	Local Resident	Pitt	219	Local Resident	Perry

85a	Local Resident	Rider	220	Local Resident	Youel
86a	Local Resident	Greville-Eyres	221	Local Resident	Cole
87a	Jehovah's Witnesses living in the Borough		222	Local Resident	Williams
88a	Local Resident	Bhaskar	223	Local Resident	Menon
89a	Local Resident	Ferguson	224	Local Residents Group (KWELGC)	Marchant
90a	Local Resident	Tyson	225	Developer/Land Owner	Souter
91a	Local Resident	English	226	Local Resident	McGinley
92a	Local Resident	Gallo	227	Local Resident	Myall
93a	Local Resident	Bamford	228	Local Resident	Crip
94a	vacant		229	Local Resident	Ardron
95a	Local Resident	Pratt	230	Local Group	Northern Arc Action Group
96a	Local Resident	Coates	231	Local Resident with the site	Ferguson
97a	Local Resident	Vick	232	Local Resident	Finneran
98a	Local Resident	Dunley	233a	Local Resident	Kelley
99a	Local Resident	Bernard	234	Local Resident	Gough
100a	Local Resident	Dovey			
101a	Local Resident	Lindsay			
102a	Local Resident	Dock			

Appendix 3: Summary of main issues raised at Detailed Concept Plan exhibitions

The Council held public exhibitions at the Warfield Parish Council Offices as part of the consultation on the Detailed Concept Plan. A summary of the main issues from all three events and how they have been consider (in bold) are as follows:

Table 21

Public Session held 05 November 2011	
Topic	**Summary of issues and dialogue with officers comments/action**
Consultation document	Many people praised the consultation document stating it was clear and helped people to visualise what was proposed for the site. Some would like even more detail as to where the individual streets are to be located. Some did not directly find out about the consultation. **Further detail will be at the detailed planning stage. The consultation was advertised including an article published in the Wren magazine which went to all households in Warfield.**
East/West Greenway	Good concept linking green spaces – provide nice walks within the site, as exists at the moment. We should have an over-arching strategy for how these green spaces will also improve biodiversity. **The development will need to provide studies and evidence to support planning applications including improving biodiversity as stated in the Warfield SPD**
Buffer zones	There was concern regarding the boundary treatments between the existing housing and any new housing. Most people want a buffer strip to provide an element of screening between existing and new or the back gardens of the new properties facing existing back gardens (Especially at Newell Green and Warfield Street). **Developers will need to show that existing gardens are not unacceptably overlooked or they are screened or buffered in some way. The development will banned to take account of the character of the existing settlements in accordance with the Warfield SPD and other policy and guidance.**
Water table and flooding	Areas of ponding present on the existing site. There was concern that new housing will not take account of how water moves on the site and will make more and/or different areas flood. One owner has a basement in an existing dwelling in Old Priory Lane and was concerned as to how the water table and drainage would be affected in the area. **The development has to ensure that flood risk is mitigated in all ways and developers are to provide a detailed flood risk assessment to accompany their detailed applications. The SPD also requires an effective drainage system including the provision of sustainable drainage systems. Furthermore the identified 100 year flood zones should not be built on but used as open space areas.**

Impacts of construction works	Concerns expressed re controls on developers and construction workers, hours of operation etc. once housing starts to go up. Also concerns with how long the development will take to be completed. **The development is required to minimise disturbance during construction by developing a construction plan to be agreed with the Council. This will be controlled by conditions attached to planning permissions which for example will control construction routes, the hours of operation and ensure dirt is cleared from roads etc.The development will be phased over 10 -12 years.**
Schools	Why are we bringing more residents into the area when existing residents can't even get their children into the local schools? No housing should be built until a new school is built. Agreed approach on splitting schools to either side of the development area – support for alternative location (option 2) for western primary school. **The Option 2 site for the school has been include in the SPD.**
Developable land	Promises made by the Council that the land would not be built on and the area would provide a gap between Bracknell and Warfield. Outrage that land is being developed. Why couldn't we look to take more development to the Priestwood roundabout side of Cabbage Hill to reduce pressure on other parts of the development? **The Council has been through a rigorous plan-led process to identify the land for development in the Core Strategy DPD. Garth Meadows is identified public open space and cannot be developed for further housing. By allow some development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill it will allow a large part of the hill to come forward as a country park which will be publicly accessible.**
Ecology	Great crested newts present in the pond located along the Greenway. The approach to this area may need to be revised to make this less of a focal point and ensure the species is protected. There may be scope for an alternative new pond as a focal point through the drainage strategy. There will be a range of wildlife that needs to be protected. **There is a requirement for further assessments and amendments to the SPD and associated diagrams to ensure that if protected newts are found then there will be a need for habitat creation which will take precedence over recreational function in these areas.**
Views across Harvest Ride	One person expressed concern that views from the residential area to the south of Harvest Ride would be adversely affected. **It was explained that inevitably the view would change but that there would be a significant gap between the new and existing homes across Harvest Ride close to Tesco roundabout and the proposals include space for tree planting to soften the visual impact. It was also explained that the proposed density of 42 per ha around the Tesco roundabout is not the sort of density that you would find on a town centre site and is only slightly above the medium density of 40 dph.** Some concern at the proposal for apartments in this area as not being appropriate in light of existing development types in the vicinity. Concerns

	expressed about 3 storey development along Harvest Ride would block views of Cabbage Hill from Garth Meadows. **It is appropriate to have some higher density elements near to new and existing services. The views from Garth Meadows are largely obscured by planting along on the edge of the meadows running along Harvest Ride. From the bottom of the meadows near the stream you can only make out the cannot of Long Copse. However the development will provide two wide access openings which will allow views through to Cabbage Hill.**
Owners and Developers	There was interest from some adjoining properties in who owned which pieces of land and which developers might be involved. There was also a landowner interested in finding out how to contact the consortium. Another landowner supported the process but had yet to make up their minds to develop or not. **Details of the consortium were passed to the relevant landowners.** They raised concerns that we keep Larks Hill open spaces and also see possibility for improving existing traffic issues at Newell Green with new infrastructure improvements. **Larks Hill will be kept in accordance with the SPD and it is agreed that existing traffic issues along Newell Green can be improved by the development.**
Timescales	People wanted to know when development is likely to start and how long it will take. **It is not exactly know because of the market conditions, however it is anticipated the site will be built by 2026 as detailed in Appendix 1 of the Warfield SPD.**
Land Ownership	An elderly couple and their neighbour wanted to know if their land was affected as they couldn't see the plans Concept Plan properly. **An officer agreed to try and enlarge the plan and deliver it to their address and take the opportunity to discuss the matter further.The officer visited the property and their neighbours where it was confirmed that their gardens should be removed from the plans. The Concept Plan has been amended as a result.**
Impact on Horses	Concern was raised about the impact on horses as there are 10+ working stables in the area. Concerns that the development will mean that they are forced form the area. Concerned that the extensive construction period will disturb horses and that horses will not be able to use the area. **It was explained that the bridleways will be retained, extended and enhanced to allow movement.It may be that some stables will need to move further northwards of the site to continue their operations where the Council has policies for any relating planning applications.**
Traffic Concerns	Concerns were raised about the already busy Forest Road. The link road between the 3 legged cross and Quelm Park roundabout was generally supported because it would help to relieve pressure off the existing route through Newell Green. **The SPD has been revised to clarify that Forest Road should not be used as an access to the development and access should come from Harvest Ride.**

Pedestrian Access	Appropriate rear pedestrian/cycle access should be considered for Newell Green. **This is agreed and provided for in the Warfield SPD**
Listed buildings	The impact on existing listed buildings should be considered as they are an important part of the heritage of Warfield. **It was explained that the setting of listed buildings is a consideration in determining planning applications. There is text existing in the draft SPD and this has been strengthened further in the final version of the Warfield SPD.**
Public Session held 09 November 2011	
Topic	**Summary of issues and dialogue with officers**
Watersplash Lane	Should be protected and a cul-de-sac. Residents were concerned that the existing lane is not good enough and that the character would be ruined. **Officer said that the route is highlighted on the draft Derailed Concept Plan because it exists, however it is more likely that the route will come from the south of the entrance to Watersplash Lane (on Newell Green) e.g. opposite the Priory Field car park and then turn somewhere near the Community Orchard to then join with Watersplash Lane. It was agreed that the Council should focus more on this central block when finalising the Concept Plan. Amendments to plan showing the potential to cul-de-sac Watersplash Lane and have the access road at the location described above.**
Separation/buffer	A longstanding resident maintained it was essential to provide a green separation with Warfield Street. **The Council approved the Core Strategy in 2008 which identified the land for redevelopment. This will result it the separation between Warfield Street being lost although there will need to be the careful treatment of the area in terms of planting, buffers and to ensure that there is no unacceptable overlooking of existing gardens as required by the SPD.**
Why build on part of Cabbage Hill	The question of why Cabbage Hill is to be built on was asked. **Officer stated that there is a need to provide the majority of it as a country park and that the landowner would need some incentive to do this. Therefore, consideration that the lower slopes of the hill could take some development and not harm the visual integrity of the hill, some development has been included on the lower slopes.**
Existing houses on Strawberry Hill	Should the houses off Strawberry Hill be shown on the plan? T**here has been little/no feedback from the owners of these properties and should this consultation not draw any out then this revised Concept Plan may show the houses to be retained. Further consideration shows that should they come forward they will be redeveloped as part of overall scheme. However it text in the SPD has been included which says that not all propertied will necessarily be redeveloped.**
There should be no development	There should be no development at all you should listen to public opinion. **It was explained that the Council has been through an extensive**

	process to provide for development. This does not and will not stop objections to the overall principle of development.
The Splash	What will happen in the Splash area (fronting Harvest Ride)? There will be some frontage development which may need improved crossing to the open space areas. **It is not determined where access should come from - it could be either from Harvest Ride or from Watersplash Lane. It may be that an access close to the Qulem Park roundabout may not be appropriate in transport terms but it depends on detailed transport assessment at the detail planning application stage to determine this.**
Transport concerns	The site will generate an enormous amount of cars on the roads. **It was explained that the Council has looked at the matter strategically through detailed modelling and that has helped inform series of measures and improvements which the developers will need to provide to mitigate their impacts.** Lots of concern around increased traffic and what happens to key junctions. **The Warfield SPD has been revised to include the details of the junctions to be improved.**
Bus route	Concern about bus route along Watersplash Lane because the lane is not wide enough and there are ditches on either side. **Officers have re-looked at this issue and routed the bus route along Harvest Ride and moved the access to the south of Watersplash Lane. Detail on how the Watersplash Lane should be developed has also been included in the Warfield SPD.**
Small properties in the site	Queried how a small landowner with an existing house and small amount of land can move forward because site has too much value to interest developers but not large enough for bespoke SANG. **The development must demonstrate that it is comprehensive across the site in accordance with the SPD. However, it depends where the property is and that if it is required for a larger block to come forward then the value of it will be for negotiation between the owner and prospective developer. It may be that the dwelling remains in another instance. The development must demonstrate that it is comprehensive across the site in accordance with the SPD.**
Supermarkets	Worried about impact of increased population on Tesco (e.g. pressure for 24hr deliveries etc) – new development should include a new supermarket to relieve the pressure. **This is not a matter for the SPD and that it is a separate licencing/planning issue. The site will look towards Bracknell Town Centre and its facilities including those improved by a regenerated town centre.**
Previous commitments	Concern that Council promised that Bracknell would not be extended into this area – should honour previous commitment. **The Council has been through a rigorous plan-led process to identify the land for development in the Core Strategy DPD. The site will look towards Bracknell Town Centre and its facilities including those improved by a regenerated town centre.**

Gap retention	Should retain a gap between the new development and the houses on Warfield Street– need to preserve the integrity and setting of Warfield Village. **Developers will need to show that existing gardens are not unacceptably overlooked or they are screened or buffered in some way. The development will banned to take account of the character of the existing settlements in accordance with the Warfield SPD and other policy and guidance.**
West End Lane	West End Lane should be revised to improve the outlook for residents. **Officers have re-looked at this issue and made amendments to the SPD and Concept Plan including making part of the lane into a cul-de-sac, removed development from behind the existing dwellings and a buffer be planted to their front.**
School site	The school should not be located close to West End Lane to avoid disturbance for existing residents. **The Option 2 site for the school has been include in the SPD.**
Entrance to West End Lane	The existing access out of West End Lane is dangerous due to poor sight lines. Lack of clear road improvement proposals is a concern – especially Forest Road going towards Binfield due to narrow bridge. **The council agrees that existing access points along Forest Road including West End Lane are not suitable. The SPD has been revised to generally ensure that access to the development should come from the south and off of Harvest Ride rather than from Forest Road.**
Hedge Lane	Concern regarding the use of Hedge Lane as a bus route and access road to houses. Want bridleway kept as a car free route. **The Concept Plan and SPD has been revised to route the bus lane along Harvest Ride and that Hedge lane remain traffic free. There may be a need for access points across the lane at appropriate and agreed locations.**
Primary school 1	Concern that Primary School 1 will be accessed off Warfield Street causing parking and traffic problems. It will be access of the new link road and not Warfield Street. **Primary School 1 will be accessed from off of the new link road where appropriate set down and pick up provision will be required in accordance with the Warfield SPD.**
Street Lighting	Concern that Street Lighting maybe installed on Warfield Street to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Warfield Street is not part of the development site and will not be lit as a result of the development. **This development will not result in lighting Warfield Street. This is a separate matter for consideration by the Local Highway Authority.**
Screening/buffer	Suitable screening/buffer should remain or be in place between the rear of properties at Warfield Street and development south of Warfield Street. **Developers will need to show that existing gardens are not unacceptably overlooked or they are screened or buffered in some way. The development will banned to take account of the character**

	of the existing settlements in accordance with the Warfield SPD and other policy and guidance.
Dwellings	Concern relating to Numbers of houses. **The number of dwellings are specified in the Core Strategy DPD.The development should ensure that they are built and designed in accordance with the SPD providing the appropriate infrastructure, services, open space and facilities.**
Wildlife	Concern relating to Loss of existing wildlife incl. badgers, deer, birds etc. T**he draft SPD provides for a substantial element of green infrastructure provision including biodiversity improvements. Further text has been included to improve such requirements to ensure there is a net increase in biodiversity value across the site through retention (e.g. Long Copse and other areas), enhancing (e.g. identified hedgerows) and new provision (e.g converting the intensively farmed Cabbage Hill into a county park).**
Neighbourhood Centre	Neighbourhood centre – place for congregating youths, needs careful design, more shops needed. **It is agreed that it is there is a need for it to be carefully designed. The amount of facilities and shops provided must be balanced against the variability of them and by providing the centre as a neighbourhood centre ensures it will be relatively low key but important for local and passing trade.**
Town Centre.	Town centre needs to be redeveloped first – put this housing in town centre/brownfield sites/redevelop Winchester House as 2,200 flats. Why are we allocating all this land for housing when there is so much vacant employment space - land should be redesignated for housing. **The site is already identified in the Core Strategy as a major location for growth including 2,200 dwellings. Land is need for different types of housing including family houses which will not all be able to accommodated on smaller brownfield site. Other sites are being identified in the Site Allocations DPD to meet th overall housing allocation.**
Keep links to parks	Keep and improve pedestrian access for residents of Warfield Street to existing parks and improve road crossings. **This is agreed and included in the Warfield SPD.**
Content	Liked the new detail, useful documents, makes more sense than the SPD consultation draft. **Noted.**
Development need	Pleased council taking the lead and not leaving it to the developers, understanding that although the housing is not wanted, it is needed and we are helping local community by being proactive. **Noted.**
Cabbage Hill	Concern that development on the lower slopes of Cabbage Hill will be 'sprawl' and adversely impact the views to Long Copse from Harvest Ride. **The views from Harvest Ride are largely obscured by planting. The canopy of Long Copse will still be visible (as it is now) following**

	development. The development will provide two wide access openings which will allow views through to Cabbage Hill.
Primary school provision	Concern that there would be inadequate Primary School provision. **It was explained how pupil yields are considered when requiring developers to contribute towards school provision including 2 new on-site primary schools and contributions towards secondary and special need education.**
Abbey Place	Concern as to how the development might affect residents in Abbey Place. Appropriate buffer was requested. It was however acknowledged that Abbey Place's developers own land to the rear designated for housing on the concept plan. Resident did not want current cul-de-sac turned into a through-road. T**he SPD confirms that access should be from a new access road connect Newell Green (near Priory Field) to Watersplash Lane and then to the new link road. Access to the site in the field behind Abbey Place should therefore be served from the south (the new road) and not from Abbey Place. However, pedestrian connections should be provided through Abbey Place.**
North of the site	Concern that Warfield SPD development might pave way for development to the north of Warfield Street. **The Council does not have plans to go further north. The land was an initial option for the SADPD but rejected as unsuitable.**
Existing dwellings	Concern that people's land has been shaded for housing on the concept plan even when it has not been put forward for development. Why have some homes to be retained, e.g. At West End Lane, been shown on the concept plan whilst others have been excluded, e.g. At Old Priory Lane and Strawberry Hill? **The Council would like to see is many individual properties redeveloped as part of the scheme. West End Lane is not viable as a block to do so at this time. Amendments to the plan have been made where owners are adamant that their land is not available. Otherwise the land shows the potential for redevelopment should owners want to. The Council is not forcing people to redevelop their property.**
Overall proposals	General agreement that proposals should be plan-led. **Noted.**
What the development will look like	Concern that development will end up like that at Whitegrove and Quelm Park. **The development is required to be developed following the principles set out in the SPD in respect to design and layout responding to the character of the area as specified in the Warfield SPD. The Council will resist as much as possible standard housing types and layouts.**
Link Road	Concern that Warfield Street will be overwhelmed by traffic. **The purpose of the N-S spine road was explained in that it is to alleviate pressure on Warfield Street.**

Impact on Avery Lane	Concern that the historic importance of Avery Lane will be undermined by the new N-S spine road. **The SPD has been revised to ensure that Avery Lane is enhanced where appropriate, however there may need to be a crossing point at an agreed location for access across the lane**
Affordable Housing	Amount of affordable housing was questioned. **Affordable housing will be up to 25% , it will be spread around the development in small clusters rather than large areas. It will be a mix of rented and part rent/part buy.**
Spread development around	Why can't development be spread throughout the borough – land availability and implications for infrastructure was explained. **Development is being spread over the borough including sites at Warfield, Binfield, Bracknell, and Crowthorne.**
Public Session held 10 November 2011	
Topic	**Summary of issues and dialogue with officers**
Listed building on Old Priory Lane	Resident wanted to know if there was going to be Compulsory Purchase Orders on her land. **Officers confirmed that it would be very unlikely and that it was up to prospective developers to negotiate suitable values. The Council would not be involved.**
Access along Old Priory Lane	Concern was raised on how access should be achieved and that existing access from Forest Road is not suitable. **Officer said it seems logical that access would come from Harvest Ride (the stopped up part of the lane) which could then access the school and housing development. Old Priory lane could then be stopped off part way up to stop through traffic and rat running. Officers would consider this further.**
Old Priory Lane as a through route	Resident wanted reassurance that Old Priory Lane would remain a cul-de-sac and not be absorbed into estate roads. Worried about traffic and the lane's inability to accommodate more traffic in current form. Wants character of road to be preserved as compensation to existing residents. Worried it might become a cut-through from Warfield Street. **The SPD has been revised to show the stopped up part of Old Priory Lane opened up to form access from then Harvest Ride and a new stop up being provided at an agreed point further along Old Priory Lane.**
Link Road	Resident was pleased that the new N-S spine road should ease traffic pressure along Warfield Street. **Noted.**
Drainage	A resident of Old Priory Lane stated that drainage ditches along the lane helped to address flooding concerns from previous development in the area. With the adjacent school and highway enhancements, the resident is again very concerned flooding might become an issue for existing properties. **Flood risk assessments and a developers requirement to provide SuDS was explained and there are requirements in the**

	Warfield SPD to ensure that drainage and flooding issues are addressed in full.
Osborne Lane	A resident of Osborne Lane was upset that the development is happening and she new nothing about it when she has recently purchased her new home. There were also concerns about traffic impact on Osborne Lane. **Officer explained that the site was identified in 2008 and that it is a land charge on the land. It is a matter for the resident to discuss with their conveyancing solicitor. The development will not affect Osborne lane in terms of traffic because the lane is not a route for journeys other than for localised journeys.**
The Splash	Concern of the density in this part of the site and that it should be lower. Access is not suitable form Harvest Ride at this point. **Officer said that the nearby roundabout may make it difficult for access and there is a need to look at access.**
Parking	There is concern that the development needs to provide adequate parking provision. **Officer said the staring point would be the Parking Standards SPD as stated in the Warfield SPD.**
Density	There was concern that the density is too high and that spread the housing around and more across the site would be better. **How development is spread across the site needs to be balanced with the need to include substantial open space elements. The lower the density the more land needed for development. The Council maintains it has the balance about right with this development.**
Fields north of Tescos	A resident said that one of the fields was used as a dump many years ago. O**fficer said that there would need to be assessments and remediation before development can be built as required by the Warfield SPD.**
Tesco	Concern that Tesco could go 24hr. **This is not a matter for the SPD and that it is a separate licencing/planning issue.**
Does Tesco have capacity?	Would there be a need for an additional shop provision? Also general discussion about the retail needs of the new population growth in the north part of the Borough, particularly food retail. **Additional small shops will be included in the new neighbourhood centre. The site will look towards Bracknell Town Centre and its facilities including those improved by a regenerated town centre.**
Land off Old Priory Lane	A resident asked about if land was available off Old Priory Lane. **Officer said may parcels were either in the developer consortium or working with the consortium.**
Warfield Street	Concerns were raised regarding Traffic, access to the Primary School and street lighting. How the development would be accessed, current junctions are very awkward to north onto Warfield Street. More requests for planting/buffer area at rear of gardens and for the lower density

	elements to be placed along these boundaries. **The primary schools will be accessed from new roads which will include adequate set down and pick up points. The development will also be accessed off of Harvest Ride for the most part and it is not appropriate for new access from Forest Road/Warfield Street.The SPD has been revised to reflect this. The SPD requires appropriate buffer, screening and that overlooking is not acceptable to to existing gardens and properties.**
No development south of Warfield Street	Resident believed there would be no development south of Warfield Street and also raised serious concerns that the heritage of Warfield was being lost. **During the process to identify land for development in the Core Strategy or the subsequent process to produce the SPD, the Council has not given the impression that there would not be development south of Warfield Street.**
Wildlife	Warfield Street residents see deer and badgers to the rear of their properties. **Where appropriate, existing biodiversity and wildlife areas will be protected in accordance with detailed assessment of the areas at the detailed planning stage as required by the Warfield SPD.**
Ponds	Not all of the ponds shown on the concept plan. **Officer stated further work is required to support detailed planning applications in respect to water/flooding/drainage issues.** Concern raised that proper assessment be taken of newts in the area. **Further and detailed assessments are a requirement of the Warfield SPD and text has been included to ensure this.**
Neighbourhood centre	More concern over design of this space and what it would be like at night – place for youths to congregate. **The SPD has been revised to ensure that should the ponds be assessed to contain Great Crested Newts that their habitat will take priority over recreational activities. Provision for youths will be made near the neighbourhood centre. The areas around the ponds will provide surveillance.**
3 storey development	Three storey development, in any location, was completely out of character with the area and all dwellings should be two storey. Retain a village style development as on the edge of Bracknell. **Officer stated there was a key requirement to use land efficiently or else further sites would be needed for development.The development should respect character where appropriate and be designed in accordance with the SPD**
Green Lane	Request for no development north of this lane. Residents stating this would provide an element of separation between new and old – **Officer stated this would mean that further development would have to be placed on Cabbage Hill and we felt that placing development here would provide a more secure solution for existing residents.**
Traffic issues	Lots of concern around increased traffic and pressure on road junctions. New link road welcomed and thought to be vital to relieve Warfield Street.

	However, concerns raised that we would just be adding more traffic onto roads already congested at peak times. In particular, had we tested the impact of this growth not only on the most affected junction in and along with site, but also the road network to the south through Whitegrove over to Warfield Road. **The development will provided necessary improvements to the network. It is a matter for more detailed assessment to ascertain other localised impacts for example in Whitegrove at the detailed planning application stage.**