

Binfield Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2026

Summary of representations received by Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) as part of Regulation 16 publication and submitted to the independent Examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Parish/Town name: Binfield Parish Council

Consultation date: 10am on 12th October 2015 to 10am on 23rd November 2015

Please note: All the original representation documents will be included in the examination pack. The table below is a summary of the representations received so will not be verbatim.

Ref	Consultee	Summary of Comment
001	Mr Peter Myall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aim of the Plan seems to be to make residents of new developments feel like they are part of the community. • Volume of new houses, people and traffic allocated by Bracknell Forest Council will cause urbanisation.
002	Mr Andrew Downs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments on Binfield Neighbourhood Plan.
003	Julian Austin on behalf of National Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Grid does not have electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. • National Grid Gas Distribution does not have Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus in the Binfield Neighbourhood Area. • Information about gas distribution low/medium pressure provided.
004	Chris Johnson on behalf of SSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to Plan. • Information provided on impacts to existing network and ability to adhere to statutory obligations, and ability of future developments to connect to existing electrical network.
005	Mary Tomlinson on behalf of Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional comments to make on Plan – refer to comments made at pre-submission stage. <p>Pre-submission stage comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome policies on improving air quality, public green spaces and protection and enhancement of the environment. • Provided paragraphs in the NPPF to strengthen

Ref	Consultee	Summary of Comment
		<p>sections of the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome inclusion of text on Thames Basin Heaths SPA. • Note there is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within Neighbourhood Plan Area – advise that Plan is revised to demonstrate that this site has been considered in relation to any implications the Plan may have for this site, although do not anticipate any likelihood of harm arising from the Neighbourhood Plan on the site. • Confirmation that Plan proposals will not have significant effects and does not require a full HRA.
006	Teresa Gonet on behalf of Highways England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Binfield Neighbourhood Plan. • Information provided on role of Highways England, and notes that strategic road network in Bracknell Forest relates to the M4.
007	Russell Reeve on behalf of Bracknell Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held discussions with Binfield Parish Council on cross-boundary issues, including Jocks Lane – a park managed by Bracknell Town Council, but physically in Binfield. • Introduction and local context sections clearly set out issues. • Objectives considered to be clearly set out. • Supportive of Policy TC1, particularly in respect of access to Bracknell Town and railway station. Improved bus links to Bracknell Town Centre and railway station also supported. • Development of community facilities near planned Binfield Learning Village will be a challenge and an opportunity, including implementation of Policy CF1. • Protection of allotments considered sensible. • Broadband speeds in rural areas remain an issue, it is right that Policy CO1 recognises this issue where new development is concerned. • Note concerns over local issue of backland development.
008	Miss Sherlee Pillan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Binfield Neighbourhood Plan.
009	Bracknell Forest Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of Plan and consider that all policies meet the Basic Conditions, apart from Policy ENV3 'Local Green Spaces'. However Council is supportive of Policy ENV3 being included and considers that it could be modified to meet the Basic Conditions. • Provided suggested improvements and modifications

Ref	Consultee	Summary of Comment
		<p>to policies and supporting text for the purpose of correcting factual errors/providing clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of Equalities Impact Screening exercise provided.
010	Carmelle Bell on behalf of Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information provided on role of Thames Water Utilities Ltd. • Consider that the Plan should include a section on 'Infrastructure and Utilities' and have provided suggested wording. • Information regarding web-link provided on sewerage infrastructure.
011	Ms Katie Eleftheriou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Plan. • Not enough consideration has been given to additional traffic on current road network and there is not enough green area being retained at the Blue Mountain golf course site. • Would like to see separate review of anticipated additional traffic on road network, and to know if green areas identified will be permanently protected. • Concerned about distinction between Binfield and Bracknell going forward and additional pressure on schools.
012	Daniel Bradbury on behalf of Bellway Homes Thames Valley Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraged there is a section referring to Thames Basin Heaths SPA, but consider it should make reference to the Thames Basin Heath Supplementary Planning Document and mechanisms in place for securing delivery of SPA mitigation. • Wording in paragraphs 6.3 and 6.5 should be amended to reflect wording in the NPPF. Has provided suggested wording. • Paragraph 6.6 appears to omit the word 'species'. Has provided suggested wording. • Policy ENV1 is not considered to be consistent with 'saved' Policy EN4 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan. Considers policy should make reference to mitigation hierarchy.
013	Laura Graham on behalf of Persimmon Homes Thames Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports principle of a Neighbourhood Plan for Binfield. • Concerns regarding approach taken towards housing development and whether sufficient housing land is being provided for in Bracknell Forest and the wider South East/ Thames Valley area. Concerned about lack of housing allocations and that Plan has not looked to quantify what housing need is in Binfield

Ref	Consultee	Summary of Comment
		<p>now or going forward. Considers Plan should be more positive towards new housing. Considers that Plan therefore does not meet basic conditions (A, D and E).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has provided pre-submission consultation response.
014	Michelle Kidd on behalf of the Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make.
015	Mike Newton (Boyer Planning) on behalf of Luff Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive of the Plan but have some specific concerns with regards to some of the proposed policies that relate to the Blue Mountain site. • Policy TC1 – support policy with modifications. Concerns about wording of policy; suggested amendments provided. Clarity is sought on what the policy requires in terms of ‘community engagement’ and what policy is asking for with regards pedestrians and cyclists not sharing space. Unclear how links to Bracknell Railway Station can be improved when this is outside of the Neighbourhood Plan Area and outside the strategic site areas. Policy does also does not state what is currently lacking with regards to existing facilities and what the Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to achieve. • Policy TC2 – support policy with modifications. No background evidence to justify the claim that the identified pinchpoints exist. • Policy TC3 – support policy with modifications. Policy considered to be quite prescriptive. Also considers that the role of strategic developments is not to provide additional services to serve existing communities, and bus subsidies are included within Council CIL reg. 123 list and therefore cannot additionally come forward through a separate S106 contribution. • Policy CF1 – support policy with modifications. Need and requirement for a new healthcare facility within the area must be supported by robust evidence base to justify the need and shape of any new provision that comes forward. Considers that there may not always be sufficient room to allow for future expansion; suggested amended policy wording. • Policy ENV4 – support policy with modifications. If any additional engagement is required, this should be specified and justified.

Ref	Consultee	Summary of Comment
016	Fiona MacDonald on behalf of Berkshire Archaeology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support work being undertaken by Parish Council and local community. • Recommends Policy BF2 (and other references in the Plan) is extended to the protection of below ground archaeological remains, which may be suitable for preservation either in situ or by record if affected by development proposals. • Information on the Berkshire Historic Environment Record provided. Sets out that the Plan may wish to consider features of local interest and their treatment in the planning process.