

QUESTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING

Question 1

Responses requested from Bracknell Town Council and Bracknell Forest Council

Does the way that the plan has been presented, meet the expectations of the Secretary of State, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance that plans should be “as focussed, concise and accessible as possible”?

Yes. Whilst a long document, the policies are clearly signposted and presented and the supporting evidence gives the reader clarity regarding the justification for each policy. Whilst the Plan could be shorter – with some evidence going into separate appendices – this may serve to dilute the rationale on which the policies are based.

Is all the evidence presented in the document relevant to the policy and is specific to the plan area ?

The Policy areas are clearly marked as such, any relevant evidence is presented in each section to be specific to the plan area. It should also be remembered that, from the community engagement, a significant number of non-policy matters were raised. Whilst these are not explicitly part of the examination, they are important to the Bracknell Town community and therefore it is vital that they are reflected in the Plan. As such, there are matters relating to non-policy issues which are explained in the text. Whilst not specifically related to policy, they are important to the Plan as a whole.

Do the provisions of the plan only relate to land within the plan area ?

Yes

Can the way that the information is portrayed on maps be presented in a way that is “fit for purpose”, so that land covered by the specific policies can be identified ?

The maps are complemented by the appendices which, in the case of policy EV 3, is detailed to individual BK Land Registry title level. All the maps were produced by BFC map specialist Chris.Atkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk who should be asked to attend the hearing.

The BTNP information is presented in “building blocks” such as the Introduction x 1, Forewords x 7, Action sections x 4, Issues x 1, Projects x 1, Policy Sections x 7, List of Appendices x 1, Appendices Contents x 1, References x 1, Illustrations x 1, Implementation & Monitoring x 1. The “building blocks” enable reconfiguration eg use of Action sections x 4, Issues x 1, Projects x 1 with Implementation & Monitoring x 1.

Question 2

Response requested from Bracknell Town Council

What is the value of differentiating in policy terms, between land used for active and passive recreation as set out in Policies EV1 and EV2 which are almost identical, or should there be a single policy for a combined open space category ?

The value, as this is a community undertaking for residents as well as for planners to determine planning applications with, is to break down the Bracknell Town open spaces into “active” and “passive” areas for its residents to better understand the distinctions and their configuration and enable them to decide on their future. The term “open space” is very broad and the engagement with the community demonstrated that different people have very different ideas about how open space should best be provided and to what purpose, if any, it should be put. The distinction between active and passive helps to establish the types of open space provision and use that are acceptable and ensures that there is a range of provision which the community wants to see.

How would the LPA be able to assess whether there is a “sufficient quantity of existing provision” as referred to the second paragraph of the policy ?

The LPA could assess its “current provision” as of 14 May 2019 by dividing the m2 of open space listed in the BTNP by the most recent census data total for Bracknell Town. This can then be compared with recommended standards for provision, as informed by the BFC evidence base eg:

- The Bracknell Forest Play, Open Space and Sports Study (2016-2036) August 2017
- The Playing Pitch Strategy for Bracknell Forest (2016-2036)

Should any replacement open space be within the same vicinity or neighbourhood as the area from where it is lost ?

Yes, doing otherwise would skew the current balance. NB some open space areas are open space because for instance they have physical constraints such as large sewers running under them so there were good structural engineering reasons for their establishment and continuing existence. It is not the case that like for like space would be readily available especially as Bracknell Town has expanded way beyond the original plans for it see illustration 6 page 9 of the Introduction.

Question 3

Response requested from Bracknell Forest Council

Can the LPA elaborate on their concerns that the policies needing to reflect the need as set out in the recent NPPF to be making efficient use of land, in terms of how and where open space is to be protected ? What is the relationship between efficiency of land use with references made to “low quality amenity land” referred to in the Councils representation as corporate landlord ?

Note that BFC is not the only corporate landlord in Bracknell Town, large swathes of public realm green space were transferred over to Bracknell Forest Homes now Silva Homes on 11 Feb 2008. More information from BFC solicitor Sanjay.Prashar at Prashar@bracknell-forest.gov.uk . Silva Homes have their land inventory online. This includes BK24713 for instance...

Question 4

Responses requested from both Bracknell Town Council and Bracknell Forest Council

Will the designation of the whole of Easthampstead Park and South Park Arts Centre, including the buildings and their immediate curtilage, as Local Green Space preclude any development of these facilities and is there any inconsistency with Policy EV12 ?

Easthampstead Park is a clearly defined entity in one BK land registry title.

Policy EV 3 includes many BK land registry titles as listed in Appendix 4 with maps available on the dropbox as per the BTC Town Clerk’s letter to John Slater of December 2018. EV 3 excludes the area in EV 12 defined on page 59 para 2 as BK2546982. There is no inconsistency.

Easthampstead Park is a Historic Asset. English Heritage in their Pre Submission Consultation Response dated 17 August 2018 “welcomed and supported HE 1 and the intention behind HE 2 & HE 3”. They did suggest “that HE 1 should require development proposals to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets not just their settings.”

The intention is for Policy EV 3 Protection & Maintenance of Local Green Space : Designation Thereof to cover the land thereof but not the buildings and their immediate curtilage.

Question 5

Response requested from Bracknell Town Council

When considering the relocation of lost community facilities, should their replacement be within the vicinity of the area from which it is lost or can it be anywhere in the plan area ?

Policy EV 13 Co-location of Community Facilities, see answer to question 23. These are community centres, specific to their area and other – shared-community facilities (for larger areas eg libraries) relating to parts of Bracknell Town eg the area designated for the BTNP. Yes to within the vicinity of the area from which it is lost.

Question 6

Responses requested from Bracknell Town Council and Bracknell Forest Council

How would the policy affecting air quality Policy EV11 apply to all development or just development within or adjacent to the Air Quality Management Area ?

- Policy EV 11 Air Quality applies only to the Bagshot Rd A322 and to Downshire Way- now being dualled, a year's project- to Twin Bridges roundabout so including and adjacent to the AQMA.
- Add p50 Policy EV 11 Policy Intent after the words "Bracknell Town", the words "along the Bagshot Rd from the Coral Reef roundabout, along Downshire Way to the Twin Bridges Roundabout".

On what basis would a decision maker be able to decide whether a particular proposal met the policy EV11 or breached EU or UK legislative limits on air pollution ?

The road cited is the subject of an Action Plan so has AQMAs..
It is listed on the Major Roads in England 2012 A roads map by the Dept for Environment Food and Rural Affairs .DEFRA.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/453620/noise-mapping-source-guidance.pdf page 8.

- A developer could be required to carry out an air quality assessment which included the guidance "with opening windows the developer should advise the future occupants that their health could be at risk due to relatively high levels of air pollution in the area". The LPA could include a planning condition on the planning application that ensures any building will meet air quality objectives. (as per a recent decision in Lewisham ?) This would enable the LPA to assess the suitability of the general

environment as required by the NPPF especially in the case of recently converted office buildings under prior approval.. See BFC planning application <https://planapp.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/online-applications/> enter 17/00457/PAC

- Note that there has been speculation as to whether dementia is linked to air pollution .Note that the LPA has approved a planning application for a dementia care home which has now been built with opening windows on the Bagshot Road. Other examples are the flats at Kelvin Gate with balconies on the Met Office roundabout, the rather longer established Beechcroft and Alice Gough Homes on Downshire Way. The inspector has made provision for time for a site visit and so suggest this for this question.
- Long term suggestion for this road is a case study by the LPA on the possibility of installing a toll on the Bagshot Rd.

Question 7

Responses requested from BracknellTown Council and Bracknell Forest Council

To what extent do HMOs constitute a major issue in Bracknell if only 23 properties are registered and what role do HMOs play in meeting housing need in the town ?

How does their impact on an area differ from large Class C3 uses, where up to 6 persons can live together as a household ? What is the rationale of treating a situation of 2 HMOs in a sequence of 20 properties as an “overconcentration” and how defensible is in in the context of the type of neighbourhoods found in Bracknell.

- BFC is concluding a Scrutiny Commission report on HMOs contact kirsty.hunt@Bracknell-forest.gov.uk so it is an issue in Bracknell. The BTNP Steering group includes several experienced Cllrs in different wards who have all had HMOs flagged up to them as an issue.The registration of 23 – official - properties is not representative of the whole.
- The impact is clearly demonstrated in the production of more rubbish, typically 2 green wheelie bins, 2 blue recycling bins, creating a demand for more than 2 cars especially in areas such as Wildridings and Great Hollands built round courtyards and accessed on foot with limited parking adjacent.
- The “overconcentration” is a suggested identifier subject to review and to the outcome of the scrutiny report. Some specific pockets of areas eg ones built as town houses are good examples in areas such as Bullbrook which already exceed this. Would the inspector consider a quick site visit ?

Question 8

Response requested from Bracknell Town Council

Do the policies in Policy H08 only relate to development within existing neighbourhoods or is it relevant to areas where new neighbourhoods are being formed ?

- Policy HO 8 is relevant to both especially if new neighbourhoods are adjacent to existing ones. Note that Bracknell Town surrounding the centre is an (almost) fully developed area.
- Note Issues 2, 4 & 5 relating to the Town Centre.

Question 9

Response requested from Bracknell Town Council and Bracknell Forest Council

Would there be benefits if the tree policies set out in Policies EV 5, 6 and 7 be consolidated into a single tree policy ?

- BFC Tree specialist Stephen.Chown@Bracknell-forest.gov.uk helped formulate these policies. Suggest that he be asked to attend the hearing as trees are a hallmark of Bracknell Forest and are taken very seriously indeed in this area.
- English Heritage welcomed Policy EV 4 Tree Heritage : Avenues of Trees and Policy EV 6 Tree Heritage Protection in their letter dated 17 August 2018 in response to the Pre-Submission Consultation.
- The BTNP Steering group understands the examiner's helpful suggestion but is concerned not to dilute the robustness of its individual policies.

BTNP 14 May 2019 q 1-9+8answers : file name