

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES (MAIN ISSUES) TO FURTHER CONSULTATION ON NEW SITES – DRAFT BRACKNELL FOREST LOCAL PLAN (PUBLISHED OCTOBER 2018)

This document contains a summary of the main issues raised in response to the Further Consultation on New Sites which took place between 3 September and 24 September 2018.

Comments are organised in three sections:

- Statutory consultees and duty to co-operate bodies
- Residents and other local organisations/groups
- Developers/promoters of sites

Within each comments section, the respondent is identified by either the surname of an individual, or the name of the group/organisation. 'ID' reference numbers are also included, which relate to the reference number of the comments generated by our consultation database.

Sections of the document can be accessed using the contents pages below.

Individuals/groups/organisations can also be searched within the document by using 'Control' and 'F' keys on a keyboard, which will bring up a search window.

Contents

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 - Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development.....	2
Responses to Section: 4.7/Policy LPX - Land at Hewlett Packard, Cain Road, Binfield.....	12
Comments of evidence base: Appendix C: Housing Background Papers Profiles.....	16
Comments of evidence base: LP/Ev/1c: Addendum to the Draft Sustainability Appraisal.....	18
Other comments.....	20

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
STATUTORY CONSULTEE/DUTY TO CO-OPERATE BODY	
Sport (England ID004)	Land previously used for sport should be either retained or replaced as per paragraph 97 of the NPPF.
Transport for London (ID005)	No comments.
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue (ID011)	No available public mains in this area to provide a suitable water supply in order to effectively fight a fire. Any planning consent terms must include the requirement for the applicant to provide suitable private fire hydrant(s), or other suitable emergency water supplies to meet Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service requirements.
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue (ID011)	Access requirements for fire fighting are to meet the functional requirements the Building Regulations 1991 and the relevant provisions of the Berkshire Act. Note gates for emergency access to provide a minimum 3.1m clear opening.
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue (ID011)	Provided layout plans have not been reviewed for fire safety provisions. This is the responsibility of your Buildings Regulations Department or Approved Inspector, in consultation with this Authority as part of a Building Regulations submission.
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue (ID011)	The benefits of sprinkler provision in saving life and reducing the damage to property are well documented; therefore recommend that domestic sprinklers are a requirement for these developments.
Network Rail (ID015)	<p>Network Rail (NR) will seek clarification on the protection of NR assets and train operation if the above sites come forward for development. NR's Town Planning team are to be consulted on any future application and the applicant is to contact asset protection team when detailed plans are available as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is near operational railway infrastructure. • Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from NR's existing drainage. • Trespassing and traffic incursion risk assessment to be undertaken and proposed recommended measures to be submitted for NR acceptance and should be implemented accordingly. • NR vegetation management guidance should be adopted and only recommended plant and species should be planted. • Detail ground investigation to be carried out and comprehensive remediation strategy to be adopted to mitigate the risks due to possible land fill contamination.
Network Rail (ID015)	<p>NR is not aware of any plans for a new station between Wokingham and Bracknell at this site, and raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is in close proximity to Bracknell station • it has the potential to impact journey times • it has the potential to impact the timetable. <p>Further work is needed on the feasibility of a new station at this site and will need close collaboration with NR.</p>
Network Rail (ID015)	NR doesn't consider there to be any significant impact on level crossings in the area at this stage.
Network Rail (ID015)	Improvements may be required at Bracknell station associated with additional patronage; this depends on the number of proposed residential units on the site at planning application stage. If this is demonstrated NR will seek developer contributions through S106 or Community Infrastructure Levy for the improvements.
Network Rail (ID015)	'Recommended Planting Species' and 'Vegetation Management Explained'

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	reports included with comments.
Historic England (ID024)	No designated heritage assets on or near either of these sites; therefore have no objection to their allocation.
Thames Water (ID035)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to BIN16. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing so any required upgrades can be determined.
Thames Water (ID035)	Sites have been assessed on an individual basis, thus there may be greater cumulative impacts with multiple sites coming forward in the same area.
Thames Water (ID035)	<p>Advises on how water and wastewater infrastructure delivery has changed since 01/04/18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all off site water and wastewater network reinforcement works necessary as a result of new development will be delivered by the relevant statutory undertaker. • Local reinforcement works will be funded by the Infrastructure Charge which is a fixed charge for water and wastewater for each new property connected. • Strategic water and wastewater infrastructure requirements will be funded through water companies' investment programmes which are based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan process. <p>As such are welcoming early contact with developers through the free pre-planning service, and request BFC include the following policy supportive text with the emerging Local Plan:</p> <p><i>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact Thames Water as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development</i></p> <p><i>Thames Water encourages developers to use their free pre-planning service (https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning). This service can tell developers at an early stage if we will have capacity in our water and/or wastewater networks to serve their development, or what we'll do if we don't.</i></p> <p><i>The developer can then submit this as evidence to support a planning application and Thames Water can prepare to serve the new development at the point of need, helping avoid delays to housing delivery programmes.”</i></p> <p>Note: Thames Water Network Infrastructure Delivery Position Statement included as part of comment.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Total contributions of brownfield sites and greenfield sites should be made explicit in the Local Plan, highlighting the contribution of brownfield sites ensuring they remain flagged for future purposes and to show delivery of Spatial Strategy.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Understand argument for over-allocating development against Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) and are pleased that original allocations may be revised given these additional potential sites.

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	As the allocation sites and the new brownfield sites in question provide a substantial buffer for targets (based on revised OAHN figure) until 2034/35 there is no need to allocate greenfield sites outside of settlements. If the buffer is not deemed enough greenfield sites should only be allocated very carefully.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Allocating brownfield sites will improve scores on Sustainability Objectives in line with the NPPF. BFC should allocate more, if not all, brownfield sites. This will protect countryside and green belt whilst securing a robust and ample housing supply.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Large allocations in east Bracknell's countryside have unsustainable infrastructure and impact the strategic gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell, therefore the sites in question are preferred.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Large scale potential loss of countryside in East Bracknell and Crowthorne. Although some sites such as BIN1, 5 and 6 are identified as more sustainable than sites at East Bracknell, based on present evidence it may be unnecessary to allocate these greenfield Binfield sites. These sites are close to new brownfield potential sites which would be preferred.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Local concern about the lack of green spaces and facilities within the area of BIN18/19, and nearby Amen Corner South development. Potential impact on existing community and biodiversity, therefore sites should facilitate development that addresses these concerns in line with draft BFLP policies LP1, LP11, LP12, LP18, LP36, LP37, and LP38.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (ID041)	Supportive of awareness of potential fragmentation to biodiversity networks. The scattered green spaces of BIN16, BIN18/19, and Amen Corner offer an opportunity to increase and enhance green infrastructure and ensure connectivity of ecological networks along with the protection and enhancement of ancient/woody habitats.
Surrey County Council (ID046)	No comments.
Wood on behalf of National Grid (ID047)	No comments.
Environment Agency (ID050)	Concerned about water quality and wastewater provision as there are constraints and new upgrades are required locally. Sites must be considered against the Water Cycle Study (March 2018) to determine impact on water quality and wastewater provisions before can fully comment. Otherwise the proposed submission document may be found to be unsound.
Binfield Parish Council (ID053)	BIN16, 18 and 19 have excellent proximity to town centre and a good road network. Could lead to improvements to the bus and rail network.
Binfield Parish Council (ID053)	Preference for these brownfield sites (BIN16, 18 and 19) over the proposed greenfield sites (BIN1, 5, 6, 7, and 10) in line with the NPPF, as there is a strong community objection to the allocation of greenfield sites.
Binfield Parish Council (ID053)	The new lower household projections should lead to the allocation of BIN12, 16, 18 and 19 and the omission of other sites in Binfield.
Binfield Parish Council (ID053)	<p>Preference for BIN16, 18 and 19 over BIN17 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BIN17 is outside current Binfield settlement boundary and provides a link to the areas historic and agricultural past. • BIN17 development would negatively impact local listed buildings. • BIN17 rural access route is not suitable for increased traffic, and will have a cumulative effect on the congestion of the surrounding area. • The proposed density for BIN17 is uncharacteristic of the rural area and will to urbanisation. • Development on adjacent site was permitted as a result of an appeal decision (15/00036/REF); the Inspector stated "if outline permission were granted for 28 dwellings, any reserved matters

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	<p>application could not exceed that number". Therefore proposal for BIN17 is a speculative attempt to turn the Inspector's decision into an unsuitable high density development, with little regard of the above issues or the wishes of local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal for BIN17 would also have a significant cumulative effect due to current nearby developments, particularly on roads and infrastructure.
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
Fenner (ID001)	Oppose allocation as roads are already blocked and unsafe for children and animals, and community services (schools, doctors etc.) are oversubscribed; further residences will worsen these issues.
Smith (ID002)	Hard to comment without details of proposed type or density of housing. Concerned the proposed 3M development could potentially impact on development along Turnpike Road. Suggests low density traditional two-storey housing with vehicular access from Cain Road only.
Smith (ID007)	Object to the allocations as there should not be further housing development within Binfield and Warfield.
Smith (ID007)	The sizing of the developments is unsuitable, as it is out of character of the local area, which is light industrial with greenspaces and small scale development.
Smith (ID007), Pegden (ID009)	Transport links are insufficient. Developments will bring further traffic to the already congested road network (highlight over capacity London Road and A329, and the potential congestion on Cain Road), increasing noise and pollution levels on main and residential roads.
Smith (ID007)	Lack of rail station and early morning/evening local buses will cause higher car dependency.
Smith (ID007)	Lack of nearby shops, GPs and schools will lead new residents to access services by car. Experience shows that developers will promise amenities but won't be held accountable in the longer term.
Smith (ID007)	Lower quality of life as local residents have had to put up with non-stop development over the last few years whilst there still is no reasonably priced local housing. Developers are making profits from building expensive housing, not affordable enough for local people, so that BFC can state enough housing has been built.
Smith (ID007)	Proposals take no account of local objections, which are routinely ignored.
Cooper (ID008)	BIN16 appears to be unused, so it would be sensible to utilise. However, it is next to open space and a play park, and could be used to make the open space larger, for the area's existing housing.
Cooper (ID008)	BIN18/19 is a good size for development.
Pegden (ID009)	Current Binfield and Warfield developments satisfy the area's housing need.
Pegden (ID009)	Business centre and residential area are separated with established vegetation, forming a natural barrier which should remain.
Pegden (ID009)	The proposed developments are an intrusion on people's work life balance only happening so the companies can make money.
Pegden (ID009)	Application should not be granted as it has previously been rejected.
Coyles (ID010), Britton (ID012), Davis (ID014), Banks (ID016), Hutton (ID017), Reeves (ID018), Glover (ID019), Smith (ID020), Marriot (ID022), Higgins (ID023), Smith (ID025), Shirley (ID026), Glasson (ID027), Sones (ID028), Kelley (ID030), Baloch (ID032),	Acknowledge duty to meet housing targets, and want BIN16, 18 and 19 to be allocated and to replace greenfield sites BIN5 and 6 which are integral to community wellbeing.

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
Harvey (ID033), Clark (ID039), Wetherall (ID042), Baker (ID043), Jacobs (ID044), Apoux (ID045)	
Coyles (ID010), Britton (ID012), Glover (ID019), Smith (ID020), Marriot (ID022), Smith (ID025), Shirley (ID026), Sones (ID028), Kelley (ID030), Baloch (ID032), Harvey (ID033), Clark (ID039), Wetherall (ID042), Baker (ID043), Jacobs (ID044), Apoux (ID045)	BIN5 and 6 should be omitted from Policy LP3 as they are exceptional wildlife habitats.
Coyles (ID010), Britton (ID012), Glover (ID019), Smith (ID020), Higgins (ID023), Smith (ID025), Glasson (ID027), Sones (ID028), Kelley (ID030), Baloch (ID032), Harvey (ID033), Clark (ID039), Wetherall (ID042), Baker (ID043), Jacobs (ID044), Apoux (ID045)	Additionally Government Policy (NPPF July 2018, Section 11, point 119) requests utilisation of brownfield sites and preservation of greenfield spaces; therefore BIN16, 18 and 19 should be allocated and BIN5 and 6 omitted.
Davis (ID014)	BIN16, 18 and 19 will be better for the traffic management of Binfield than BIN5 and 6.
Davis (ID014), Jacobs (ID044)	BIN5 and 6 should be kept as greenspaces to preserve Binfield village's integrity.
Davis (ID014), Smith (ID020), Sones (ID028), Baker (ID043), Jacobs (ID044)	Ideally there would be no further development in Binfield.
Hutton (ID017)	Support of changes of use from office to residential when offices lie unused.
Reeves (ID018)	Concerned the congestion and risk of accidents around the school will worsen as a result of the new sites.
Higgins (ID023)	The current plan includes far more houses than currently required by the government, further reason to omit BIN5 and 6 from Policy LP3.
Higgins (ID023)	BIN5 and 6 would provide few homes considering the number of objections; therefore they should be omitted from Policy LP3.
Shirley (ID026)	BIN5 and 6 should be omitted from Policy LP3 as greenfield sites can be important for aesthetic reasons
Shirley (ID026)	BIN16, 18 and 19 are currently unsightly; judicious and neatly designed development could make them more attractive.
Shirley (ID026), Glasson (ID027)	BIN5 and 6 should be omitted from Policy LP3 as their loss would be irreversible.
Harvey (ID033)	BIN5 and 6 should remain greenspaces following the loss of Blue Mountain.
Harvey (ID033)	BIN16, 18 and 19 are more suitable than BIN5 and BIN6 as they are further away from Binfield village.
McMullen (ID037)	BIN16, BIN19 and SAND8 are within 5km of the Special Protection Area (SPA), listed as a UK priority habitat and home to scientifically important wildlife; hence area should be protected for wildlife and not developed. Sites do not provide enough SANG.
Baker (ID043)	BIN5 and 6 maintain the separation between Binfield and Bracknell; therefore they should be omitted from Policy LP3.
Apoux (ID045)	Policy SA7 within the Site Allocations Plan (adopted 2013) states following the Blue Mountain allocation all remaining greenspaces would become Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). Therefore BIN5 and 6 should be omitted from Policy LP3.
Apoux (ID045)	Binfield village doesn't have the capacity to absorb the additional traffic from these sites, as evidenced by increased congestion resulting from recent developments

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
DEVELOPERS/PROMOTERS OF SITES	
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	<p>Owner of WAR25 Land north and east of Steeple View, Gibbins Lane, Warfield</p> <p>Policy LP3 needs to be amended to include WAR25 with a suggested dwelling capacity of 43 (15 affordable).</p>
Fisher German in behalf of Palmer (ID013)	<p>Owner of BIN7 Land south of Foxley Lane and west of Whitehouse Farm Cottage, Murrell Hill Lane</p> <p>Support revised policy LP3 which is continuing to propose the allocation of 'Medium sites' such as BIN7 in accordance to NPPF paragraphs 59 and 68. Providing a mix of housing will ensure that all types of house builders can have access to suitable land and provide a variety of housing products. Lower infrastructure constraints on small and medium sized sites such as BIN7 and BIN16 mean they can quickly improve the supply of housing.</p>
Fisher German in behalf of Palmer (ID013)	<p>Site-specific requirements for developer contributions/planning obligations contained within the 'Site Profiles for sites listed in Policy LP3' (Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan) are not wholly compliant with NPPF paragraph 56, as smaller sites like BIN7 should not need to contribute to open space or recreational facilities to make them acceptable, as this contribution is unfair and unreasonable considering their scale, and these amenities may not be directly related to said developments. Therefore request that the Site Profiles for sites listed in Policy LP3 are updated to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 54 to 56.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	<p>Owner of BIN4 Wyevale Garden Centre, Forest Road</p> <p>Support proposal to allocate sufficient land to meet the housing need whilst prioritising under-utilised Previously Developed Land (PDL) within settlements for housing in accordance to NPPF paragraphs 118, 119 and 121. Development of such land should be maximised, thus supports the new proposed allocations in principle and to meet the 5 year housing supply BIN4 should have been reconsidered as part of this allocation as it could provide finished dwellings quickly.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	<p>Vision should be amended to:</p> <p><i>“Small, medium and large sites will be allocated to meet these needs on both brownfield and greenfield land, <u>with a particular emphasis on previously developed sites</u>”.</i></p> <p>To bring it in line with the government’s increased emphasis on PDL sites.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	<p>Policy LP1 of the Draft Local Plan should be amended to</p> <p><i>“Proposals for development will be permitted that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i) Provide suitable land / buildings to help meet development needs</i> <i>ii) Make efficient use of land / buildings</i> <i>iii) <u>Utilise previously developed sites.....</u>”</i> <p>It may also be necessary to include a new policy within the Draft Local Plan to cover previously developed/brownfield sites.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	<p>BIN16 and BIN18 provide recreational land; therefore future applications must provide open space and should not lead to an overall loss of open space / recreational land in the area.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	<p>The costs of remediating the contaminated land under or near BIN16, 18</p>

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	and 19 could impact their viability, and therefore their deliverability and affordable housing. This should be considered within the draft allocations.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	Disagree with the findings of the Sustainability Assessment and those contained within the Housing Background Paper, as they have not considered that BIN4 is no longer viable for retail use, and the site will have an improved relationship with the settlement once the Blue Mountain and Tilehurst Lane developments have been completed. Said developments will also provide an all-through school, leisure facilities, a SANG and community facilities. The majority of the constraining trees are on the edge of the site, and the limited flood risk and impact on heritage assets could be easily mitigated.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes (ID029)	Binfield Parish Council have been supportive of the prospect of residential development on BIN4 and noted it should have been a proposed allocation, removing the requirement for BIN5 and 6 as proposed allocations.
Gladman Developments Ltd (ID031)	Continue to support the inclusion of Cluster 5 in policy LP6, with the view to accelerate the start date set out within the housing trajectory.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	<p>Owner of SAND3 Land south of Ambarrow Lane, west of Wokingham Road, and east of Lower Sandhurst Road</p> <p>BIN16, 18 and 19 are within a defined employment area covered by an Article 4 designation which suggests the land has continued value for employment use. The proposed allocation of these sites goes against the Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) recommendations to protect existing employment areas and introduce new ones, with no supporting evidence for this deviation. This is not due to lack of end user/occupier appetite; rather it is a result of residential values exceeding commercial values.</p>
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Unlikely to meet identified housing need; to do this further mid-sized greenfield sites must be allocated, including SAND3 which is the only site suitable for sustainable development within Sandhurst, a town that needs further housing. A planning application is being prepared seeking to build 150 homes alongside the required amenities. SAND3 could provide homes quickly with the required amenities due to its lack of constraints, and over time the development could be extended to provide 400-500 dwellings.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Paragraph 3.5 of the consultation document refers to paragraph 120 of the revised NPPF (2018); this does not alleviate BFC's requirement to assess the viability of an existing allocation, especially when the allocated land meets employment need.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Not certain whether the tennis courts at BIN16 are disused, or whether they would need to be replaced, which suggests the site may not be available. BIN16 should be regarded as a community or sports facility. Not evidenced how the loss of sports/community facilities would be reconciled if necessary, or how the proposed allocation of this site aligns with the findings of the Play Open Space and Sports Study (2017).
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Regional impacts of the expansion of Heathrow, Crossrail and western rail access have not been considered within the local plan, allowing BFC to ignore the lack of new employment land and see existing employment land lost to residential.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Duty to cooperate concerns have not been addressed since last consultation. Requirements for Local Authorities within the East Berks (inc. S Bucks) may have potential duty to cooperate implications for Bracknell Forest and Reading 'underbounded' nature and capacity to meet its own need have not been considered.
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	<p>Owner of BIN16 Land at 3M, Cain Road, Binfield</p>

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	Supports the allocation of BIN16, as it will be effective use of PDL within the settlement area (refers to paragraph 118 of NPPF 2018), preferable to greenfield land, and is suitable for housing, highly sustainable and consistent with the spatial strategy.
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	Tree constraints, along with other Development Management issues, can be addressed in the course of a planning application, which should not delay or significantly reduce BIN16's capacity (note Strategic Housing Economic Land Available Assessment states whole site is developable).
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	Highlights BIN16 was not previously used for landfill like BIN19.
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	Currently working to involve a housebuilder promptly. Committed to develop the site faster than the period suggested in the trajectory; good prospect of new homes being delivered within 5 years.
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	BIN16 does not have a recreational use, instead being incidental to the employment use. Facilities were not publically accessible, and not an essential part of the 3M business development. Further work will demonstrate that residential development will meet the provisions of the NPPF 2018 (paragraph 97).
Nexus on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	Infrastructure Development Plan Addendum notes due to the scale of the development a standalone infrastructure delivery scheme will not be required; this is consistent with the emerging Local Plan. Contributions towards local infrastructure will be secured through Community Infrastructure Levy as per the Regulation 123 list.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	<p>Owner of BIN5 and BIN6 Land south of Forest Road and east of Cheney Close, and Land south of Emmets Park and east of Cressex Close</p> <p>Supportive of proposal to allocate land to meet housing need; this provision should not be restricted by a maximum figure if there is an opportunity for sustainable development to meet local need.</p>
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	Densities of new developments should make optimum use of available land (NPPF Section 11 (2018)).
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	The Council has struggled to achieve a 5 year housing land supply and may need to provide assistance to neighbouring boroughs; therefore sufficient land, and a range of sites, must be allocated to deliver homes in the short term.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	3M and HP sites include recreational land; development on these must include open space and not lead to net loss in this or recreation land.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	BIN16, 18 and 19 are located over or near landfill sites; further remediation and mitigation details may be required. Draft allocations should consider how costs of remediation could impact the viability of schemes on these sites, affecting deliverability.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	BIN 5 and 6 are sustainably located, with close proximity to existing local amenities as well as future facilities that form part of the Blue Mountain development. Bus services to Bracknell centre and beyond are regular.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	Despite objections BIN5 and 6 were included within the original Blue Mountain allocation in Policy SA7 of the Sites Allocations Local Plan (2013), thus the principle of development is already established.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	In response to objections, assessments relating to the access and drainage of BIN5 and 6 have been undertaken, finding both can accommodate safe vehicular and pedestrian access with minimum effect on traffic flows of the main highway network. BIN5 and 6 are at low risk and very low risk of flooding respectively, with the small areas at risk suited to mitigation by SuDs. Physical constraints to development on said sites can be fully

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	mitigated in line with the NPPF's requirements.
Boyer on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd (ID040)	Following masterplanning and initial assessments, the capacities of BIN5 and 6 shown within Policy LP3 should be increased to 60 and 52 respectively in order to provide further homes and affordable housing within the early plan period, made possible as the sites are in single ownership.
Turley on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Limited (ID048)	<p>Owner of BRA1 Land at Parkview Farm, Old Wokingham Road</p> <p>BIN16, 18 and 19 fall within a defined employment area subject to an Article 4 designation. Concerned that the Local Plan will not meet the required employment land identified within the EDNA, with the loss of these sites to housing exacerbating the issue; therefore supportive evidence may be required. The effects of the expansion of Heathrow, Crossrail and Western Rail access also have not been considered.</p>
Turley on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Limited (ID048)	BFC needs to be more ambitious in its economic strategy to meet the housing requirement and build a strong competitive economy as required by the NPPF.
Turley on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Limited (ID048)	Little progress in addressing the duty to cooperate concerns mentioned at last consultation, as only the housing need arising from the West Berks Housing Market Area is currently required to be addressed; other areas, such as Slough and Bucks, should be considered. BFC has also not progressed Statement of Common Ground as required by the NPPF.
Turley on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Limited (ID048)	BIN16, 18 and 19's allocation would not result in the council having a five year housing supply against the requirement currently envisaged within the plan, as they are not likely to come forward within 5 years. Therefore BRA1 should be allocated, as it would be possible to complete a large number of homes, required amenities, and employment space quickly, contributing to the five year supply. Additionally BRA1 is sustainable in comparison to BIN16, 18 and 19.
Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon Homes Thames Valley (ID049)	<p>Owner of WAR4 and 5 Land east of Binfield Road, and Land south of Forest Road, and east of Binfield Road</p> <p>BIN18 and BIN19 should be retained for their designated employment use, not allocated for development. Development would lead to a loss in employment space, lost opportunity to secure the economic clusters in to the future, reduction in sustainability, and would set a precedent for further losses. If these sites are allocated the Local Plan will be found unsound as it would be in conflict with NPPF paragraph 81.</p>
Barton Willmore on behalf of Syngenta (ID051)	<p>Owner of WAR3 Jealotts Hill International Research Centre, and land at Jealotts Hill, Maidenhead Road</p> <p>Supports the commissioning of additional research into the conclusions of the EDNA and market demand for further employment space, especially following the proposed allocation of BIN18 and 19 which would result in the loss of employment land. Once the study becomes available, further comments can be made.</p>
Barton Willmore on behalf of Syngenta (ID051)	BF lacks employment facilities in desirable locations attractive specific industry sectors, of which there is a demand; WAR3 could provide such an environment. Recommend BFC's employment study explore the underlying reasons for driving employment floor space development.
Barton Willmore on behalf of Syngenta (ID051)	The proposed Sustainable Science Community at WAR3 would provide employment space, facilities and affordable housing, helping BFC reach the employment floor space targets the EDNA identifies. Said facilities will improve employment floor space demand for the borough to counteract the

Responses to Section: 4.4. Revised Policy LP3 – Sites allocated for residential/mixed use development

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	apparent lack of market appetite, and attract compatible, high-value businesses. WAR3 is well located within Europe's largest technology cluster, and would bring a significant contribution to Bracknell's and Berkshire's wider economy.
Barton Willmore on behalf of Syngenta (ID051)	References the NPPF's weight for supporting economic growth and productivity, particularly for driving innovation. Local Plans must ensure employment floor space needs are accounted for, where possible in locational clusters of knowledge and data-driven industries. Syngenta's proposal supports this.
Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) (ID052)	<p>Owner of WINK22 Land to south of London Road, east of Bog Lane and west of Swinley Road (Whitmoor Forest)</p> <p>Supportive of consultation document's approach for identifying housing need set out in Table 4.1. Despite the reduced number of households projected the overall requirement has increased to 673 dwelling per annum due to the new affordability ratio mentioned within the consultation, plus the need to accommodate shortfall from neighbouring Local Authorities.</p>
Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) (ID052)	Support the continued inclusion of WINK22 in Policies LP3 and LP5.
Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) (ID052)	Although there is a buffer in the drafted Local Plan for the minimum amount of housing delivered, it remains important that all sites maximise the amount of housing built in a sustainable manner.
Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) (ID052)	If capacity for development is amended due to further technical evidence, WINK22, following significant technical work, can accommodate at least 450 dwellings whilst addressing site constraints; therefore the capacity should not be amended down.
Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) (ID052)	Though PDL and within the settlement boundary, BIN16, 18 and 19 are located within a defined employment area, thus should be considered carefully given the considerable need for future employment land (EDNA, 2016).

Responses to Section: 4.7/Policy LPX - Land at Hewlett Packard, Cain Road, Binfield.

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
STATUTORY CONSULTEE/DUTY TO CO-OPERATE BODY	
Sport England (ID004)	In principle supports contributions to a multi-functional hub, but it is too vague and should be supported in the emerging playing pitch strategy.
Thames Water (ID035)	The scale of this development is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network and treatment works. Recommend the developer and BFC liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development.
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
Fenner (ID001)	Oppose allocation as roads are already blocked and unsafe for children and animals, and community services (schools, doctors etc.) are oversubscribed; further residences will worsen these issues.
Smith (ID002)	Questions the appropriateness of the location of proposed development within business park and whether there will adequate amenities for this and Amen Corner South development.
Maidens Green Society (ID003)	Development is sustainable with low impact on surroundings (being an already large campus), apart from change of use, and will not merge settlements or change the area's character.
Smith (ID007)	Object to the allocations as there should not be further housing development within Binfield or Warfield.
Smith (ID007)	The sizing of the development is unsuitable, as it is out of character of the local area, which is light industrial with greenspaces and small scale development.
Smith (ID007), Pegden (ID009)	Transport links are insufficient. Developments will bring further traffic to the already congested road network (highlights over capacity London Road and A329, and the potential congestion on Cain Road), increasing noise and pollution levels on main and residential roads.
Smith (ID007)	Lack of rail station and early morning/evening local buses will cause higher car dependency.
Smith (ID007)	Lack of nearby shops, GPs and schools will lead new residents to access services by car. Experience shows that developers will promise amenities but won't be held accountable in the longer term.
Smith (ID007)	Lower quality of life as local residents have had to put up with non-stop development over the last few years whilst there still is no reasonably priced local housing. Developers are making profits from building expensive housing, not affordable enough for local people, so that BFC can state enough housing has been built.
Smith (ID007)	Proposals take no account of local objections, which are routinely ignored.
Pegden (ID009)	Current Binfield and Warfield developments satisfy area's housing need.
Pegden (ID009)	Business centre and residential area are separated with established vegetation, forming a natural barrier which should remain.
Pegden (ID009)	Proposed developments are an intrusion on people's work life balance only happening so the companies can make money.
Pegden (ID009)	Application should not be granted as it has previously been rejected.
McMullen (ID037)	Site is within the SPA, and is supposed to be protected as a result of the

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	important wildlife living there. Not wise to destroy UK priority habitat and there is not land on site to provide SANG.
Stewart (ID054)	Approve of allocation in view of housing shortage and over supply of offices.
Reed (ID055)	Murrell Hill Lane and Foxley Lane were identified by the planning inspector in his appeal judgement for Foxley Oaks as "rural in character" and unsuitable for urbanisation. Strategic Transport assessment Policy 51 notes there will be improvements to these lanes. Retain their rural character by not developing the road verges.
DEVELOPERS/PROMOTERS OF SITES	
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	<p>Owner of WAR25 Land north and east of Steeple View, Gibbins Lane, Warfield</p> <p>This allocation is not justified and contradicts previous stances by BFC, as the site is a large, long-standing, important employment site within an employment area, and needs to be retained for this purpose as evidenced by the Article 4 direction and its justification. Accepts the need for housing development, but there are more suitable sites available which won't reduce employment within Bracknell (suggests WAR25). Allocating site will cause jobs to be exported elsewhere due to lack of suitable office accommodation. Therefore there is no need for this policy within the Local Plan and the site should not be allocated.</p>
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	Site location is not ideal for housing, being surrounded by commercial, office and leisure uses, and noise and traffic will disturb new residents and cause complaints.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	<p>Owner of BIN18 and BIN19 Land at Hewlett Packard, Cain Road, Binfield</p> <p>Support the allocation of these sites as they no longer meet their operational and locational requirements, and their allocation meets the requirements posed by NPPF paragraphs 117, 118, 120, 122, 174 and 175 (d). BIN19 is no longer suitable or viable for office development, with the lack of demand for offices in peripheral locations. Support focus to attract and support office development within the town centre.</p>
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	In consideration of the findings summarised within pages 49 to 55 of Appendix C, there are no technical constraints to residential development that could not be addressed using appropriate mitigation. CBRE's commissioned technical reports (transport, ecology, heritage and archaeology, arboriculture, surface water and flood risk, and contaminated land) which show no known technical impediments that would prevent delivery of the proposed allocations.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	Unclear how the developable area of BIN 19, at 5.34ha, has been calculated, as only 1 ha out of the 7.24ha (13.6%) is said to be at risk of surface water flooding (1 in 1,000 year event) with no mitigation measures (for example, the removal of substantial amounts of hardstanding). This limit should be removed or amended.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	Appendix C notes the site could be delivered across the second and third 5 year period of the new plan. Consider that a phased release could enable delivery commencing in 2020 through to 2021 when the site (under a single ownership) will be vacated. Delivery of the majority of the 400 housing units across the Island Site and the Main Site could therefore occur during the first five-year period of the plan.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	BIN19 is adjacent to Amen Corner South, which has outline planning permission, and the Island site, which has already been allocated. Despite the findings of the EDNA (2016), BIN19 is not suitable for alternative

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	employment uses as it would have negative impacts on the future residents of Amen Corner South and the Island site, as industrial or warehousing would not be compatible with residential, education or office uses.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	Suggested amendments to Policy LP3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be clear that the final capacity of sites is subject to implications of further technical evidence (includes suggestions on how this could be worded). • Reference to the number of affordable homes, which currently implies Policy LP24 will not be considered in each case, should be removed as this is more appropriately dealt with wholly within Policy LP24.
CBRE Group on behalf of Hewlett Packard Enterprise (ID021)	Suggested amendments to Policy LPX: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First bullet should confirm that all residential units will be delivered on previously developed site. • Second bullet point should reference Open Space of Public Value (OSPV) and SANG, the latter is required to mitigate the impact of development on the SPA. This would avoid the SANG requirement being duplicated. • The subsequent bullet points are not necessary as the list is not a comprehensive list of requirements; these should be required as part of BFC's validation checklist.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	Owner of SAND3 Land south of Ambarrow Lane, west of Wokingham Road, and east of Lower Sandhurst Road BIN18 and 19 are within a defined employment area covered by an Article 4 designation which suggests the land has continued value for employment use. The proposed allocation of these sites goes against the EDNA's recommendations to protect existing employment areas and introduce new ones, with no supporting evidence for this deviation. This is not due to lack of end user/occupier appetite; it is a result of residential values exceeding commercial values.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	No indication that BIN18 and 19 are no longer viable for employment use, it is indicated that tenancies could end in 2021 suggesting the site is viable for such.
Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes (ID034)	BIN18 and 19 will not help the Council achieve a 5 year housing supply, due to physical constraints that could prevent the sites being brought forward and will limit the developable areas. Sites are not presently available for development.
Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon Homes Thames Valley (ID049)	Owner of WAR4 and 5 Land north of Binfield Road, at Temple Park Roundabout, south west extremity of Cabbage Hill BIN18 and 19 should be retained for their designated employment use, not allocated for development. Development would lead to a loss in employment space, lost opportunity to secure the economic clusters in the future, reduction in sustainability, and would set a precedent for further losses. If these sites are allocated the Local Plan will be found unsound as it would be in conflict with NPPF paragraph 81.
Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon Homes Thames Valley (ID049)	Report included as part of comment. Report concludes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting employment sites for housing, as housing need may be currently greater than employment need, is highly simplistic; it should be done on a case by case basis following analysis of which sites are most important. It may lead to future erosion of other important employment sites.

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HP sites are a key component of Bracknell's successful economic infrastructure. One company departing from the site does not indicate the site is not required for future employment uses; such turnover is normal and may allow smaller firms to use the site in future. Also the uncertainty caused by Brexit may have a temporary effect. • The HP sites may support nearby housing developments by providing locally accessible employment sites, in doing so reducing car use, supporting sustainability and air quality objectives. • The EDNA forecast based on past completions is flawed, since 2005/6-14/15 was a time of marked employment growth, rather than the reverse, that the loss of floorspace indicated. Therefore this forecast shouldn't be used as a basis for reducing or reallocating employment sites. The other EDNA forecasts suggest there is a need for further employment space. • Employment clusters have been more resilient during challenging economic times, further reason to retain the site for employment.

Appendix C: Housing Background Papers Profiles

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
STATUTORY CONSULTEE/DUTY TO CO-OPERATE BODY	
Sport England (ID004)	Reiterates land previously used for sport should be either retained or replaced, or if there is a loss of sports facilities this must be justified (para. 97 NPPF).
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
Fenner (ID001)	Opposes housing development as area is overpopulated, leading to further congestion and the potential loss of longstanding residents, whilst some may not be able to afford to move.
Fenner (ID001)	Submissions were not publicised enough, thus should be rejected.
Cooper (ID008)	Automatic detection traffic lights should be used at Shoulder of Mutton Junction rather than stopping right turning, as the latter would greatly inconvenience residents.
Cooper (ID008)	Bus gate across Beehive Road, which is narrow with parked cars along it, should remain to prevent congestion from new developments and existing offices, as before it was installed the road was used as a 'rat run' preventing residents accessing/leaving their homes. Additionally there are very old houses along the road that shake with increased traffic. Access to development should be via Cain Road and John Nike Way instead.
Pegden (ID009)	Business centre and residential area are separated with established vegetation, forming a natural barrier which should remain.
Pegden (ID009)	Current Binfield and Warfield developments satisfy the area's housing need.
Pegden (ID009)	Congestion is already at its maximum and would worsen. Noise pollution is high and would get worse.
Pegden (ID009)	The proposed developments are an intrusion on people's work life balance only happening so the companies can make money.
Pegden (ID009)	Application should not be granted as it has previously been rejected.
DEVELOPERS/PROMOTERS OF SITES	
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	<p>Owner of WAR25 Land north and east of Steeple View, Gibbins Lane, Warfield</p> <p>WAR25's profile within the housing background paper should be amended for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted development to the south and east will reduce WAR25's sensitivity in landscape impact terms. The Landscape Character Assessment does not take this into the account, thus further work will be undertaken to ensure it is. • The ecological assessment is insufficient, being based on a brief visit by an ecologist, and has not established definitively the presence of protected species; rather it has identified potential risk. Therefore there is not sufficient evidence to block development. Further surveys will be undertaken to establish what wildlife is present and how to mitigate the impact of development on it. • Indicated flood risk can be easily mitigated by appropriate mitigation measures. Further investigation of these measures will be undertaken and submitted to BFC in due course. • Though not within the woodland habitat network, BFC has decided that all trees and hedgerows on the site must be retained, preventing development. It will be possible to develop around the most important hedgerows and trees; a detailed survey will be

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
	<p>undertaken to establish the best trees and hedgerows. These will then be incorporated into a suitable and implementable development scheme.</p> <p>Notes that BIN16, 18 and 19 also have issues with surface water flood risk, trees (including ancient woodland), and other issues including ground contamination and road noise.</p> <p>Therefore the four objections made do not justify rejection of the site, and the paper should be changed to conclude that the Council should allocate site for up to 44 dwellings.</p>
<p>Nexus Planning on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)</p>	<p>Owner of BIN16 Land between Cain Road and Turnpike Road</p> <p>Supports the findings of the background paper, and notes that they compare well with BIN18 and 19.</p>
<p>Nexus Planning on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)</p>	<p>Is actively engaged with property agents in order to involve a housebuilder as soon as possible. Is committed to deliver new homes quickly with the possibility of delivering them within 5 years rather than years 6-10 of the plan period.</p>
<p>Nexus Planning on behalf of 3M United Kingdom PLC (ID038)</p>	<p>Agrees with the SHELAA that the whole site is developable as constraints can be addressed in the course of the planning application.</p>

LP/Ev/1b: Sustainability Appraisal

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
STATUTORY CONSULTEE/DUTY TO CO-OPERATE BODY	
Environment Agency (ID036)	Noted the pollution and wastewater constraints are highlighted in Sustainability Appraisal requiring local upgrades.
Environment Agency (ID036)	Full comments can only be provided when new allocations have been considered by the Water Cycle Study to determine impact on water quality and wastewater provision.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (CPRE Berkshire) (ID041)	Supports the allocation of small/medium sites to reduce the impact of large sites with slow delivery.
Campaign to Protect Rural England Berkshire Branch (CPRE Berkshire) (ID041)	East Bracknell draft site allocations identified as having unresolved flooding issues.
Binfield Parish Council (ID053)	Highlights the sustainability of BIN16, 18 and 19 due to their proximity to local facilities.
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
Fenner (ID001)	Opposes housing development as area is overpopulated, leading to further congestion and the potential loss of longstanding residents, whilst some may not be able to afford to.
Fenner (ID001)	Submissions were not publicised enough, thus should be rejected.
Pegden (ID009)	There is over subscription for schools in this area; building more housing makes the situation worse.
DEVELOPERS/PROMOTERS OF SITES	
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	<p>Owner of WAR25 Land north and east of Steeple View, Gibbins Lane, Warfield</p> <p>WAR25 scores well in table 13a. There are 5 questionable “negative” impacts, which should be changed to “neutral” for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA3 Biodiversity – part of the site is grassland, which “could” provide a wildlife corridor. This is not a strong objection. • SA4a Landscape – the impact of development on the landscape will be significantly reduced once adjoining developments to the east and south are implemented. • SA6b Pollution (wastewater) – not clear why this is a negative score. It is inevitable that some sites, including PDL sites, will have limited, or no drainage facilities prior to development. All new developments will need to have a new drainage system installed. Prior to permission being granted a scheme will be designed ensure pollution of ground water and the local environment does not occur because of new development. • SA7a Resource use (other) – The concern developing greenfield sites will reduce agricultural and grazing land is unnecessary, as there is no shortage of this land in Berkshire. The need for housing, especially affordable housing, outweighs the argument for retaining low-quality grazing land in this case. • SA18 Land Use – Disagrees with system scoring greenfield sites negatively compared to brownfield sites as this prevents any greenfield sites being allocated. <p>These changes would increase site’s SA scoring.</p>
Nexus Planning on behalf of 3M	Owner of BIN16

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
United Kingdom PLC (ID038)	<p>Land between Cain Road and Turnpike Road</p> <p>Notes BIN16 mostly scores well within the SA Addendum, and when this is not the case it mostly scores better than BIN18 and BIN19.</p>

Other comments

RESPONDENT (NAME/ORGANISATION & OBJECTIVE REFERENCE ID)	COMMENTS RECEIVED (SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED)
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
Fenner (ID001)	Opposes housing development as area is overpopulated, leading to further congestion and the potential loss of longstanding residents, whilst some may not be able to afford to.
Fenner (ID001)	Submissions were not publicised enough and should be rejected. Hopes submissions will be blocked, though believes decisions already made.
Maidens Green Society (ID003)	Larger sites (such as WAR3) are more designable and sustainable than previously allocated sites (CLUSTER 7, WAR22 and CLUSTER 5), which are surrounded by inadequate infrastructure, and will degrade character and cause coalescence in order to meet housing requirements.
Smith (ID007)	Argues that if the Council rejects the planning permission, it simply gets overruled by higher authority.
Pegden (ID009)	Business centre and residential area are separated with an established tree lined bushed area, forming a natural barrier which should remain.
Pegden (ID009)	Current Binfield and Warfield developments satisfy area's housing need.
Pegden (ID009)	Congestion is already at its maximum and would worsen. Noise pollution is high and would get worse
Pegden (ID009)	The proposed developments are an intrusion on people's work life balance only happening so the companies can make money.
Pegden (ID009)	Application should not be granted as it has previously been rejected.
McMullen (ID037)	New ONS figures projecting fewer new households has led to recent reports that the Government's housing target is too high. Empty homes at highest recorded levels in 20 years. Countryside should not be required for new developments, instead land such as car parks, and sites with planning permission granted should be focused on.
DEVELOPERS/PROMOTERS OF SITES	
Pegasus Group on behalf of Hatcher (ID006)	<p>Owner of WAR25 Land north and east of Steeple View, Gibbins Lane, Warfield</p> <p>Assessment of the new sites is flawed. WAR25 has been considerably under-scored, as the raised issues can be easily mitigated as part of the development process.</p> <p>The assessment has been unfairly skewed in favour of the Brownfield sites, despite the Article 4 designation and their allocation leading to the loss of employment opportunities in the Borough. Greenfield sites, such as WAR25, could deliver new homes in sustainable locations within a short timescale, alleviating the 5-year housing land supply problem.</p> <p>Therefore BIN19 should not be allocated to protect jobs, while site WAR25 should be allocated, as it meets the NPPF's requirements.</p>