

**Statement of Consultation
Regulation 18(4)(b)
Character Areas Supplementary Planning Document**

1. Background

Bracknell Forest Council has produced a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) called Character Area Assessments SPD Consultation Draft (July 2009). It was been published for public consultation between Monday 20 July 2009 and Friday 18 September 2009.

Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 requires that prior to adoption of the a statement be published summarising who has been consulted during the preparation of an SPD, how consultation has taken place, and how any issues raised have been addressed.

2. Consultation

In the preparation of the SPD Bracknell Forest Council consulted with a range of key and statutory stakeholders to help assess the scope of the SPD, the consultations included:

- Statutory bodies and organisations.
- Government Office and Agencies.
- Statutory Undertakers.
- Service Providers.
- Planning Agents.
- Developers.
- Land Owners.
- The general public.
- Relevant local interest bodies and organisations.
- Bracknell Forest Town and Parish Councils.
- Local Councillors.

Section 3 provides a summary of issues raised and how they have been dealt with.

The Council also produced and consulted upon a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and the Draft Sustainability Appraisal with the following groups:

- Statutory Environmental Consultees.
- Government Office and Agencies.
- Statutory Undertakers.
- Service Providers.
- Planning Agents.
- Developers.
- Land Owners.

The document was also available on the Council's website. The results of consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and how the comments have been taken into account is provided in Appendix 1 of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/calibrary reference: CAL 3) for the Character Area Assessments Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft. The responses made to the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report are detailed in section 3 below.

3. Consultation Responses and Actions

Name	Organisation	Comment Summary	Action
Rachael Bust	The Coal Authority	No comment	n/a
Louise Colman	Highways Agency	No comment	n/a
Sue Janota	South East England Partnership Board	No comment	n/a
Richard Evans	Surrey County Council	No comment	n/a
Amy Turner	Wokingham Borough Council	No comment	n/a
Matt Thomson MRTPI	The Royal Town Planning Institute	No comment	n/a
Ian Dunsford	Government Office for the South East	The draft SPD is consistent with national and regional planning policy and is clearly linked to Core Strategy policy CS7 which the document would supplement. No further comments to offer	Noted
Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	No comment	n/a
John Woodhouse	Environment Agency	Chapter 2 - welcomes reference to the river corridor landscape and would support proposals to open up parts of the river Chapter 4 - suggested recommendation in relation to the Cut Chapter 6 - suggested recommendation in relation to retaining watercourses	Noted Not felt necessary Not felt necessary
Janis Harding	Warfield Parish Council	The document is supported. However, it is felt Objective SA14 should only be used where absolutely necessary	Noted
Adele Swadling	Crowthorne Parish	The document is commended and	All comments are noted. The issue in relation

	Council	<p>supported</p> <p>The character of Crowthorne has been well considered</p> <p>Possible future development has been realistically evaluated</p> <p>The 'Rolling Feast' is included in any future re-appraisal of the Conservation Area</p>	<p>to the 'Rolling Feast', whilst noted, is a separate Conservation Area issue not relevant to this consultation.</p>
Marc Turner	Natural England	<p>Limited reference is made to the SPA and the Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy throughout the document</p> <p>Pleased to see a recognition of the landscape as contributing to character. The Council's attention is drawn to the South East Green Infrastructure Framework, health and green infrastructure issues and the climate change agenda</p>	<p>Amendments have been made throughout the document and new recommendations included to take account of the SPA issues and the Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
Nicholas Bather	Barton Wilmore & North Bracknell Consortium (Berkeley Strategic, Martin Grant Homes, Harcourt Developments, Thomas Lawrence (Bracknell) Limited and Cordea Savills)	<p>Concern is expressed that part of the Character Area Assessments SPD gives guidance on character and context on land to the edge of Newell Green and Warfield Street, including the identification of rural gaps. Bearing in mind CS5, land north of Whitegrove and Quelm Park, it is considered inappropriate to include Warfield Street and Newell Green in this SPD as it may prejudice future development proposals for this area. It is therefore requested that recommendations in relation to Warfield</p>	<p>It is felt appropriate to include Warfield Street and Newell Green to continue to provide guidance for small scale development proposals that potentially could come forward within these existing settlements. However, an additional paragraph has now been included in the Introduction chapter of the SPD making reference to the future growth areas and the need for specific SPDs that will come forward for these areas.</p> <p>Reference to 'gaps' have been removed from the SPD</p>

		Street and Newell Green are deleted from the Character Area Assessments SPD	
D W Alford	Resident	Background information provided on some of the recent history of the area A request is also made to extend area F to include the north side of Park Road Concern also expressed in relation to the replacement of fencing and hedging in the area	Noted This is not considered to be appropriate at this stage Noted
Melvyn Kendall	Resident	An incorrect reference is made to Church Street in Cranbourne and this should be amended to Crouch Lane	Agreed and amended
Stuart McDougall	Chairman of King's Ride Resident's Association	Would like to congratulate the Council on an accurate assessment of Prince Consort Drive Concern is expressed in relation to noise from the King's Ride Industrial Park and how development adjoining the character areas can have a negative impact for residents	Noted Noted
Mr Buckle	Crowthorne Village Action Group	Concern is expressed that the Character Area Assessments do not cover all parts of Crowthorne, in particular the TRL site Preservation of Victorian buildings is requested Support for the recommendation to work with Wokingham DC Much of the residential areas are ignored when discussing area B No mention of the importance of trees in	It is felt that the areas identified are the areas with cohesive characteristics Whilst noted as important in terms of character, unless listed or within a conservation area, demolition can not be controlled Noted Only areas of defineable character are discussed The importance of the existing boundary

		<p>Dukes Ride Flats are not considered an appropriate built form for Duke's Ride 'Iron Horse' should be the 'Iron Duke' Confirmation of the importance of adhering to the existing building line when considering new development proposals Duplication of landscape character paragraphs on p41 Typing error, 'confirm' should read 'conform' The TRL site is an important 'strategic gap' and some guidance on this area should be provided</p>	<p>treatments is stated within this chapter Flats, if appropriately designed, can maintain and add to the defined character Amended Noted Noted and deleted Amended Not appropriate to this SPD</p>
Ian Cox	Resident	Request to stop the destruction of the Victorian architecture of Crowthorne	It is stated within the document how the architecture can inform character. However, unless a building is listed or with a designated conservation area, demolition can not be controlled
Brett Murden	GlebeWood Resident's Association	It is felt that no consideration has been given to traffic management issues when assessing character and that this makes the document unviable	It is agreed that highway issues do have an impact on character. This has been considered as part of the assessment by the consultants and internally by our engineering colleagues
Moira Hankinson	Hankinson Duckett Associates consultants on behalf of Interlaken	<p>Concern that only specific areas of Borough are covered by the SPD and that the rationale behind the selection is not clear Concern is expressed that new development should not replicate existing, in relation to density, scale or rurality Revisions requested to the boundaries to areas A, B and C in chapter 1</p>	<p>It is considered that the selection rationale is clearly stated No reference is made to replication, however issues of scale and rurality are relevant to character issues The boundaries have been re-examined but no alterations are to be made</p>

		The green arrow on the historic map in chapter 2 is not detailed in the ledger Reference to 'rural gaps' is misleading	Agreed, the green arrows have been removed Agreed and removed
Helen Roberts	Charles Planning Associates on behalf of Croudace Strategic Limited	Reference is made to 'rural gaps' in chapter 1 and how these are to be implemented is not stated in the recommendations The area to the north of Popes Manor has been agreed as suitable for development, however, it is within the 'rural gap' area. Concern is expressed that the text for Foxley Lane does not follow through to an appropriate recommendation	Reference to 'gaps' and 'rural gaps' have been removed and amended text is provided See above Reviewed but no amendments made
Dr Ward-Smith Ian and Susan Scott Dr Robert Jackson Mr and Mrs Jones Mr and Mrs Needham Mrs Simmons-Hodge Mrs Hodgson Mr and Mrs Potts Mr A Seggar Dr and Mrs Ward-Smith Douglas Shorey	The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents Association 8 The Ridgeway 26 The Ridgeway 9 The Ridgeway 2 The Ridgeway 20 The Ridgeway 15 The Ridgeway 12 Woodridge Close 10 The Ridgeway 11 The Ridgeway	The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Resident's Association produced and submitted a document entitled 'History in the making: The case for recognising and preserving the unique character of a Bracknell New Town estate'. This document makes a number of points and recommendations for the SPD. Residents as listed, then wrote individually in support of the residents association document. The key points are as stated:- Chapter 5 defines, Area B and three sub-areas, Area Bi, Bii and Biii. The status of Bi, Bii and Biii is misleading and should be included in Area B. It is felt that the definition of architecture in Bi is too limited and more architectural	The document from the residents association was noted It was agreed that this section needed to be amended to clarify the areas. Area Bi is now an area in its own right. The SPD states the predominant architectural style and is not intended to list all the styles in

	22 The Ridgeway	<p>styles are found in the area</p> <p>The houses in area Bi have no white weatherboarding as stated The estate has a rural feel</p> <p>Any development in the area should be low density</p>	<p>the area. No amendment is therefore made.</p> <p>Agreed, reference to white weatherboarding has been deleted Disagree, this is a residential area close to Bracknell town centre Disagree, higher density in this area could be appropriate, subject to the design and built form following the character of the area</p>
<p>Maria Grazia & David Holmes</p> <p>Bob Pennell - SCRAM co-ordinator</p>	Resident	<p>Detailed comments made on Chapter 5, Area B, Broad Lane</p> <p>The area and subdivided areas be reassessed to give areas Bi, Bii and Biii the same status within area B Rename sub areas Bi, Bii, Biii Delete recommendations in relation to density Add a comment on the evergreen hedges along Broad Lane Add a recommendation in relation to the semi-rural quality of Broad Lane</p>	<p>Agreed, this has been amended</p> <p>Agreed and amended Noted, but comment not accepted</p> <p>Noted - however it is felt the text already addresses this issue Noted - consider existing recommendations are appropriate</p>

Mrs J Lovell	Chavey Down Association	<p>The maps are awful and very difficult to follow Chavey Down falls into chapter 4 and chapter 6 and parts of the area are not included at all and historic areas</p> <p>Chapter 6:- The area in chapter 6 is not 'urban fringe'</p> <p>The term landfill should be removed Untrue to say no focal point</p> <p>Inaccurate references to the area Disagree that this area contains narrow long plots with mixed housing development Recognition of parking problems supported Disagrees with the recommendation for higher density</p> <p>No mention is made the SPA</p> <p>No mention is made of no buses</p> <p>No mention is made to lack of school spaces</p> <p>No mention is made of the London Road Tip No flats should be allowed as out of</p>	<p>Do not agree</p> <p>The boundaries of the areas were set by character, not all areas are appropriate for inclusion and historic buildings may not be set within areas with any definable character</p> <p>This area is next to the Bracknell Town boundary and therefore considered urban fringe The word 'former' has been inserted In relation to the defined area in the SPD, there is no focal point In relation to the defined area, the plots are primarily long and narrow</p> <p>Noted If designed appropriately, higher density development could contribute to the character of this area References to the SPA have now been inserted throughout the document Considered to be outside the scope of this document Considered to be outside the scope of this document</p> <p>It is not considered that this is relevant to the character of the area Too restrictive, if appropriate in design, flats</p>
--------------	-------------------------	--	---

		<p>character The merging of plots should be avoided Chapter 4:-</p> <p>The reference to Chavey Down should read Chavey Down Road The recommendations for Area D should be split The recommendations fail to note that this area is not a sustainable location</p>	<p>can contribute to the character of the area Merging plots will alter the grain of development. The grain of development is key to informing the character of the area and hence it is felt that merging plots will, over time, erode and change the character Noted and amended</p> <p>This is not considered appropriate</p> <p>This would be taken into account when assessing the appropriateness of new development proposals</p>
--	--	---	--