



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to Bracknell Forest Borough Council

by Michael J Hetherington BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI MCIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 17th June 2013

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE BRACKNELL FOREST SITE
ALLOCATIONS**

LOCAL PLAN

Document submitted for examination on 29 June 2012

Examination hearings held on 7-8 November 2012, 11-14 December 2012 and 11-12 April 2013

File Ref: PINS/C0305/429/6

Abbreviations Used in this Report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
BFBC	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
BFBLP	Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (January 2002)
CS	Core Strategy
DPD	Development Plan Document
EH	English Heritage
GOSE	Government Office for the South East
HA	Highways Agency
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
MM	Main Modification
NE	Natural England
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
RS	Regional Strategy (the South East Plan)
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SALP	Site Allocations Local Plan
SAMM	Strategic Access Management and Monitoring
SANG	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SEP	South East Plan
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
TBH SPA DF	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework
TRL	Transport Research Laboratory (Crowthorne)
WBC	Wokingham Borough Council
WLMHT	West London Mental Health Trust

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Bracknell Forest Site Allocations Local Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Borough until 2026 providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan. The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable them to adopt the Plan.

The modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Inclusion of a policy to support sustainable development, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework);
- Introduction of settlement boundaries to define the proposed urban extensions, with additional policy references to Strategic and Local Gaps and greater separation between the TRL site (policy SA5) and Bracknell's built-up area;
- Amendment of the housing total from 10,780 to 11,139 dwellings in line with Core Strategy policy CS15
- Allocation of additional housing sites to provide greater flexibility in housing delivery;
- Inclusion of updated housing land supply data and windfall estimates;
- Addition of illustrative concept plans in respect of the urban extensions at Amen Corner South and land at Warfield;
- Clarification of the Council's intentions to develop policies in respect of traveller sites, in line with national policy;
- Deletion of Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (January 2002) policy E12 (employment sites outside settlement boundaries); and
- Introduction of additional safeguards to protect international nature conservation sites.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Bracknell Forest Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate, in recognition that there is no scope to remedy any failure in this regard. It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 182) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared; justified; effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for my examination is the November 2011 version of the Plan, which was the subject of a pre-submission consultation exercise.
3. My report deals with the main modifications that are needed to make the Plan sound and legally compliant. They are identified in bold in the report (**MM**). In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act, the Council has requested that I should make any modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound/not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. These main modifications are set out in the Appendix and attached Annex.
4. Following the main body of hearings, the Council produced a schedule of changes¹ in January 2013. This was the subject of public consultation and supplementary statements in respect of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)², as well as resumed examination hearing sessions in April 2013. A parallel consultation exercise was undertaken in respect of the Ministerial Statement on the partial revocation of the South East Plan (SEP) issued in February 2013. As a result of this statement, the Council withdrew a number of its previously-suggested changes, and issued a consolidated schedule of changes³.
5. The main modifications that go to soundness derive from this consolidated schedule of changes. I have taken the responses to the above-noted consultation exercises into account and have made a small number of additional changes that are explained in the main body of this report. These do not go materially beyond the scope of matters that have already been subject to public consultation, SA and HRA. The main modifications do not include changes proposed by the Council that I consider are not needed for soundness/legal compliance reasons. For the avoidance of doubt, the report makes no comment about the merits of any additional changes recommended by the Council that are not specifically mentioned.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

6. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council has complied with any duty imposed on them by section 33A of the 2004 Act

¹ Document BFBC/14.

² Documents SAL119 and SAL120 respectively.

³ Document BFBC/21.

in relation to the Plan's preparation. The Council comments on this duty in a topic paper⁴ which describes the activities that it has undertaken with other bodies in order to maximise the effectiveness of Plan preparation.

7. On submission, a number of neighbouring authorities⁵ stated that the Council had not satisfied this duty. Specific concerns related to the Plan's approach to transport and other infrastructure provision. However, further discussions between Bracknell Forest Borough Council (BFBC) and the authorities concerned, including explanation of the detailed traffic modelling in support of the SALP (a matter that I return to later in this report) has resulted in the agreement of statements of common ground in respect of this matter⁶. The objections in respect of failure to meet the duty to co-operate have been withdrawn.
8. As set out above, the duty to co-operate relates to activities undertaken during the preparation of the Plan. Any failure to satisfy this requirement cannot be remedied by retrospective actions. Nevertheless, it appears from the above that the concerns raised in respect of the duty related to matters of clarification rather than substantive failures of co-operation. As such, and taking into account the actions described in the Council's topic paper, I am satisfied that the duty has been complied with.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

9. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence, site visits and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, I have identified several main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. Representations on the Plan have been considered insofar as they relate to its soundness, but they are not in general reported on individually.

General Matters

Has the Plan been positively prepared and, overall, does it accord with the broad thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework?

10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) emphasises the importance of encouraging sustainable development through enabling economic growth and promoting housing development. The SALP's approach derives from the adopted Core Strategy (CS) which sets out positive policies for sustainable growth. Locational principles are established in CS policy CS2 and two specific areas (Amen Corner and Warfield) are identified for comprehensive mixed use development in policies CS4 and CS5 respectively.
11. The SALP seeks to provide for 10,780 dwellings over the Plan period (2006-2026) – a figure required by the submission version of the South East Plan (SEP) which was extant at the time of the CS's adoption. Subject to my comments below about the need to accommodate an outstanding shortfall, the 10,780 dwelling figure was the basis of the CS's approach. However, as finally

⁴ Document SAL73.

⁵ Hampshire CC, Rushmoor BC, Surrey Heath BC and Wokingham BC.

⁶ Documents SAL92 and SAL93.

approved, the SEP contained a higher housing requirement for the Borough (of 12,780 dwellings). Had the SEP's housing policies still been extant, the resulting difference would have raised concerns of general conformity – a matter that was explored as the examination progressed. Nevertheless, given that these policies have now been revoked, it is appropriate to consider the soundness of the SALP in the context of the adopted CS. Indeed, consistency with the CS is required by the 2012 Regulations⁷. I address this matter in more detail below. The Council proposes additional text to clarify this position, which is needed for reasons of effectiveness (**MM1**).

12. Many parties wish to revisit the underlying justification for the scale of housing that is proposed in the SALP (seeking either an increase or a reduction). However, given that the SALP has been prepared in the context of an adopted CS, such a review would represent a significant change to the Plan's role and purpose – which is to allocate sites in line with the CS. The objective assessment of housing needs in the Borough is more appropriately considered through the new Local Plan proposed in the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS)⁸ – with an expected submission date of March 2016. To delay the present examination for this purpose would be likely to delay the release of the sites that are now proposed for development. Bearing in mind that the land proposed for allocation in the SALP represents a significant part of the Borough's overall housing supply – and noting the Framework's emphasis on a genuinely plan-led system – such a delay would be counter-productive.
13. Nevertheless, there is a need for the Plan to include a policy that more specifically reflects the Framework's overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council accepts this and proposes to include additional wording within new policy CP1 (**MM2**). The intended wording of this policy differs slightly from that of the model policy published on the Planning Portal website. However, its objectives are in line with the Framework's intentions. Its inclusion is needed in order for the Plan to be consistent with national policy.
14. Subject to the above-noted changes, I conclude that the Plan has been positively prepared, and that, overall, it accords with the broad thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework. Nevertheless, several specific policy matters arising from the Framework are discussed later in this report: in some cases these have required additional changes to the Plan to be recommended.

Does the Plan provide satisfactorily for the amount and type of housing development that is proposed by the Core Strategy?

15. As already noted, the SALP seeks to deliver new housing in line with the target set out in the submission version of the SEP (10,780 dwellings). However, the Core Strategy (at policy CS15, as explained in CS paragraph 173), makes an additional allowance for a shortfall of 359 dwellings carried over from the period up to 2006, to be made up in the period up to 2017.
16. Advice received by BFBC from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) in October 2009⁹, stated that the SEP 2006 baseline figures – and, as

⁷ Regulation 8(4).

⁸ Document SAL105.

⁹ Appended to document BFBC/22.

such, the final SEP allocations – included an estimate for previous under-supply. It is the Council's case that specific provision for these 359 dwellings is not therefore required in the SALP. Nevertheless, as already noted, the SEP's final allocation (which was recommended by the Panel¹⁰) was 2,000 dwellings in excess of that contained in the submission version. The Panel Report¹¹ notes that its recommendation for an increased regional housing level was in part designed to give greater flexibility to assist in meeting the backlog.

17. In any event, the SEP's housing policies have now been revoked. CS paragraph 173 is clear that the 359 dwellings are in excess of the 10,780 housing figure: as such, policy CS15 sets a target of 11,139 dwellings. This remains part of the development plan with which the SALP must be consistent. I therefore accept the argument that the SALP's housing target should be increased to be consistent with this figure – in effect, increasing the 10,780 dwelling target to 11,139. This is proposed within **MM3**, with amendments to the supporting text and trajectory (**MM4-MM6**). These changes are needed for reasons of legal compliance and effectiveness.
18. The updated figures derive from further Council written comments that were submitted after the resumed hearings in response to matters raised at the first resumed hearing session¹². Although representing a material change to the Plan as submitted, the resulting housing target is substantially less than the 12,780 figure that formed the basis of the Council's post-submission public consultation, SA and HRA exercises. Indeed, it is somewhat less than the actual amount of housing proposed in the submission version of the SALP, which sought to exceed its 10,780 dwelling target by some 432 dwellings¹³. Taking into account updated completion information, a revised windfall estimate¹⁴ and the new and expanded housing allocations that are now proposed, this over-provision would increase to some 819 dwellings above the 10,780 figure (equating to 460 dwellings above the higher 11,139 target) during the Plan period.
19. The Council's assumptions about housing land supply are disputed by some representors. Specifically, concern is raised that assessments of the likely dwelling yield from some identified sites may be over-optimistic. A particular example cited is the redevelopment that is proposed on land north of Eastern Road, Bracknell. However, while a recent resolution to grant planning permission at that location could result in a lower density scheme on part of the site, other high density schemes have been approved in the locality. Bearing in mind the site's urban characteristics and the Council's design objectives for the area¹⁵, the suggested site capacity is not unreasonable. Similarly, the justification for other site capacities is set out in some detail in the evidence base¹⁶: this has taken account of changed expectations about housing density, as is described below in respect of policy SA8.

¹⁰ SEP Panel Report paragraph 21.94.

¹¹ SEP Panel Report paragraph 7.31.

¹² Documents BFBC/22 and BFBC/23. Written comments were also sought from other participants at that hearing session. These have been taken into account in this report.

¹³ SALP tables 1 and 2.

¹⁴ The justification for the windfall estimate (in line with paragraph 48 of the Framework) derives from the Housing Land Supply Update Topic Paper – Document SAL71.

¹⁵ Document SAL49 pages 81-84.

¹⁶ Notably in document SAL49.

20. It is therefore likely that the over-provision of housing resulting from the Council's proposed changes would more than accommodate the 359 dwelling shortfall described above. It would also provide some additional flexibility – for example if the number of dwellings proposed at Broadmoor (policy SA4) could not be justified in terms of that policy (see later in this report).
21. However, consideration also needs to be given to the proposed phasing of development. CS policy CS15 seeks to meet the 359 dwelling shortfall by 2017 rather than across the full Plan period. The Council considers that, even including this shortfall into the housing requirement¹⁷, a five-year land supply can be demonstrated at a base date of 1 April 2013¹⁸. This calculation also includes the 20% buffer required by the National Planning Policy Framework in cases where there has been a persistent under-delivery of housing. This represents a change from the position at a recent appeal in respect of the SALP site on land south of Foxley Lane and east of Murrell Hill Lane, Binfield¹⁹, where the Council accepted that a five year supply could not be demonstrated. However, the above-noted calculation takes account of updated completion data (albeit provisional at the time of writing) and the additional sites that are now proposed for inclusion in the SALP.
22. In reaching this conclusion, the Council has used a 'residual methodology' to calculate land supply. In essence, this assumes that the outstanding shortfall in delivery against the Plan requirement (increased to 11,139 dwellings, as described above) at the relevant base date should be spread throughout the Plan period rather than concentrated into the first 5 years of housing supply. However, if the data are recalculated on the basis that all of the outstanding shortfall (at April 2013) should be met within a five year period (as is suggested by several developers) then the 20% additional buffer cannot be fully provided for.
23. Both calculation methods have advantages and drawbacks. In the present case, it is clear that the SALP's delivery strategy involves larger sites that will require significant supporting infrastructure and that are likely to come forward at generally later stages during the Plan period. Seeking to meet the outstanding shortfall during a five year period would be inconsistent with that approach. Moreover, it would require an even greater rate of housing delivery during the first five year period than is shown in the present trajectory. Projected completions during some of these years already markedly exceed recent delivery rates. It would be unrealistic to expect an even higher rate to be achieved.
24. Given that the total amount of housing that is being planned for exceeds that required by the CS, and bearing in mind both that housing targets will be reviewed in the forthcoming Local Plan and that (as already noted) further delays to the present examination would be counter-productive, I am therefore satisfied on balance that the Council's approach is justified and that a five year housing land supply has been demonstrated. However, and for the avoidance of doubt, this requires that the Plan should be changed to include the additional allocations that the Council now proposes: these are discussed

¹⁷ i.e. adopting an annual requirement of 572 dwellings to 2017, rather than 539 dwellings.

¹⁸ Document BFBC/22 (Appendix 2) identifies a 5.8 year supply, including the 20% buffer.

¹⁹ Appeal ref. APP/R0335/A/12/2179560 – decision date 24 January 2013.

later in this report. Accordingly, further land releases over and above those now proposed are not required for reasons of soundness or legal compliance.

25. Concerns have also been raised about the SALP's provisions for particular housing types. The National Planning Policy Framework²⁰ requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on (among other matters) the needs of different groups in the community. The varied housing needs of the Borough are summarised in CS paragraph 184. However, calls for general policies supporting the development of specific housing types – such as park homes or housing for older people – are at odds with the SALP's purpose, which (as already stated) is to allocate sites. Although a Development Management DPD was envisaged at the time of the CS, the Council now intends to update development management policies in its forthcoming Local Plan. This will provide an opportunity to consider an appropriate Borough-wide policy approach in respect of these matters.
26. Older people are one of the groups identified by the Framework. The SALP makes specific provision for retirement apartments and a care home/nursing home on land at Broadmoor (policy SA4) and for a care home/nursing home at the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) site (policy SA5). This does not preclude specialist accommodation coming forward within other allocated sites or as 'windfall' schemes – as has been demonstrated in the past. Taking these factors together, additional allocations to meet particular models of housing provision (such as a retirement village) that have been suggested by representors are not therefore needed in order to make the Plan sound.
27. Park homes are part of the diverse mix of housing types referred to in CS paragraph 184 (a change that was recommended by the previous CS Inspector²¹). At the hearings, the Council queried the assertion that park homes amounted to low cost market housing: however, it is clear that the previous CS Inspector considered them to fall within that category (albeit with reference to national guidance that has now been superseded). Nevertheless, while national planning policies, notably the Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) set specific requirements for affordable housing and traveller sites respectively, there is no requirement that Local Plans should make special arrangements to provide for a particular type of low cost market housing. Although there is evidence of a demand for additional park homes at the Warfield Park site, this should be seen in the context of a wider need for housing within the Borough as a whole – as discussed above.
28. The specific circumstances of the Warfield Park site are addressed by saved policy EN11 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (January 2002) (BFBLP) and supporting text. While options for expansion were tested through the SALP preparation process, my own observations support the Council's view that development of the sites suggested²² would adversely affect the area's character and appearance and, in respect of site 247, result in a harmful loss of part of a local wildlife site and woodland subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Although an ecological/landscape consultancy has commented on these sites, such comments are in summary only and contain the caveat that

²⁰ National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 50.

²¹ Document SAL78 paragraph 224.

²² Notably SHLAA sites 246 and 247.

additional survey and assessment should be undertaken to confirm their suitability for development. Taking these matters together, the allocation of further land at Warfield Park is not needed in order to make the Plan sound.

29. The SALP was submitted several months after the publication of the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The CS includes a criteria-based policy (policy CS18) concerning travelling populations. This predates the PPTS and is inconsistent with some of the forward planning requirements set out in that document – notably the identification of a supply of deliverable and developable sites. The SALP makes no site allocations for this purpose.
30. The Council accepts that the PPTS requires a new assessment of need to be undertaken and is carrying out work jointly with a number of other local planning authorities to that effect. This is a matter that will require to be addressed in the forthcoming Local Plan. The Council proposes to amend the SALP to explain this position (**MM7**), a change that is needed (with minor amendments for clarity) in order to be consistent with national policy.
31. Subject to the above-noted main modifications and the comments about specific allocations in the remainder of this report, I conclude that the Plan provides satisfactorily for the amount and type of housing development that is proposed by the Core Strategy.

Has the site selection process been sufficiently clear and robust?

32. The site selection process was debated during the examination hearings. Following that discussion, the Council prepared a document²³ that clarifies the methodology that was used and relates the SALP preparation process to that of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. This paper explains the relevant sequence of events and allows the various (often lengthy) further documents to be placed in context.
33. As a starting point, it is clear from the discussion on housing numbers set out above – with reference to the evidence base including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA²⁴) – that the scale of development that is being planned for cannot be met solely through the two urban extensions proposed in the CS plus previously-developed land. The release of additional land through a subsequent Local Plan is accepted in principle both by CS policy CS15 and in the previous CS Inspector's report²⁵. CS policy CS2 sets out a sequential approach to such allocation. This approach is reflected by the structure of the SALP, which identifies: first, sites in defined settlements (policies SA1 and SA2), then edge of settlement sites (policy SA3), urban extensions (policies SA4-SA7) and detailed policies for the two major locations for growth identified in the CS (policies SA8 and SA9).
34. This sequential approach was used as a basis for categorising sites in the SHLAA, which also sieved out sites with particular constraints arising from flood risk and the presence/proximity of international nature conservation sites. Sites that adjoined existing settlements were grouped into clusters and eight broad areas (along with a number of other sites) were identified for

²³ Document BFBC/10.

²⁴ Document SAL12.

²⁵ Document SAL78 paragraph 213.

inclusion in the initial participation document²⁶.

35. Following this exercise, the eight broad areas were refined and reduced to the four that form the basis of SALP policies SA4-7. The rationale for this process, which has attracted some criticism, is set out in some detail in the background papers for both preferred option and submission stages of the SALP²⁷. Taking this into account (and subject to my detailed comments about specific sites later in this report), I am satisfied that the selection process was sufficiently robust. I summarise it below.
36. While Broad Area 8 (East of Bracknell) performed best in the SA exercise, it was ruled out at a later stage by a lack of availability. A central part of Broad Area 6 (North Warfield) was ruled out for similar reasons: along with further constraints, this precluded the development of a coherent and viable urban extension in this location and the option was not carried forward.
37. The deletion of Broad Area 1 (South West Sandhurst) was justified by its poor performance in the SA process, where it scored worst of the eight options. It is not well related to the settlement and has a high landscape character. The removal of the part of Broad Area 3 (North East Crowthorne) lying to the north of Nine Mile Ride was consistent with the need to safeguard the Strategic Gap (a matter discussed in more detail below). The remaining part of that Broad Area (the TRL site) comprises a significant area of previously-developed land, a factor that also supports Broad Area 2 (Broadmoor). These are carried forward into SALP policies SA4 (Broadmoor) and SA5 (the TRL site). Broad Area 4 (West Binfield) also performed well in the SA process, being located in close proximity to existing employment areas and services. This forms the basis of the Amen Corner North allocation (policy SA6), albeit with reduced housing numbers.
38. Broad Area 7 (Chavey Down, Longhill Road) scored more highly in the SA process than Broad Area 5 (East Binfield). However, the latter area was taken forward as an allocation (policy SA7, Land at Blue Mountain) in preference to the former. The justification for this was explained during the relevant examination hearing and is summarised in the SALP Background Paper²⁸. In summary, both areas were reviewed (along with the others) in terms of the potential for smaller areas of development to be identified in order to remedy concerns identified through the initial selection process. In the case of East Binfield, the potential to retain open land within the wider allocation, along with the possibility of accommodating a primary and secondary school within the site, resulted in a significantly improved score. The site is comparatively well related to the main urban area and Bracknell Town Centre. In contrast, Broad Area 7 has a more peripheral location and would extend a settlement that contains relatively few services and has poor public transport linkages. The reduction in scale needed to overcome landscape concerns would threaten the site's ability to provide for required infrastructure improvements. On the evidence, this approach appears justified.
39. As already noted, the additional sites proposed for allocation in the SALP have been classified in accordance with the hierarchy set out in CS policy CS2.

²⁶ Document SAL3.

²⁷ Document SAL24 pages 91-184 and Document SAL49 respectively.

²⁸ Document SAL49 – specifically paragraphs 2.8.24-2.8.28 and 2.8.31-2.8.32.

I comment on some of these later on in this report. However, in general terms I am satisfied that the underlying site identification methodology, which is also summarised in the SALP Background Paper²⁹, is adequately justified in line with policy CS2. Most of the additional sites that are now proposed for inclusion (Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road; Downside, Wildridings Road; South of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne; West of Alford Close, Sandhurst) were all considered to have potential for housing development in that document³⁰. The additional site at Wood Lane is closely associated with the Blue Mountain site, but was not available earlier in the process. As already noted, the relevant changes have been subject to public consultation, SA and HRA.

40. Given my conclusion above that further land releases (over and above those recommended in this report) are not required for reasons of soundness or legal compliance, I do not comment on the detailed merits of the alternatives put forward during the examination. However, it is clear from the above discussion that the Council's decision not to allocate sites within the Green Belt (which has been challenged by several representors) is justified. It is also consistent with the CS, which does not propose a Green Belt review.
41. Taking account of the additional material produced during the examination, I conclude that the site selection process has been sufficiently clear and robust.

Is the Plan's approach to the definition of settlement boundaries effective, justified and consistent with the Core Strategy?

42. As submitted, the SALP does not define settlement boundaries for the urban extensions allocated in policies SA4-9. This presents a number of problems that I raised with the Council at an early stage of the examination.
43. First, while the details of any large proposal will be clarified as the master-planning process evolves, the plan-led approach set out in the National Planning Policy Framework gives a legitimate expectation that the broad form of development – specifically the location and scale of new built-up areas and an indication of what land will remain outside settlements – is set out in a Local Plan. Although the Council states that settlement boundaries for these urban extensions will be contained in the forthcoming Local Plan, the adoption of that document may well post-date the intended start of development on a number of the sites concerned. As such, the definition of settlement boundaries would be retrospective and reactive rather than forward-looking.
44. Second, as will be discussed below, the lack of certainty about the intended position of the settlement limit creates a similar lack of certainty about the likely effect of some of the proposals on relevant constraints – most notably the Strategic and Local Gaps that are protected by CS policy CS9. It also means that, in planning policy terms, the new urban extensions would lie outside the settlement boundaries on the adopted policies map. This would be at odds with the restrictive approach to development outside settlements that is required by CS policy CS9 – creating a clear policy conflict.
45. Third, the lack of settlement boundaries for the Plan's urban extensions is

²⁹ Document SAL49.

³⁰ Document SAL49, section 2.10.

inconsistent with its approach to the new edge of settlement allocations (policy SA3), for which new settlement boundaries have been defined.

46. For these reasons, I do not share the Council's view that the detailed definition of settlement boundaries for the urban extensions can appropriately be delayed. They should be defined at the site allocation stage – i.e. in the SALP. The Council recognises this concern and proposes changes incorporating settlement boundaries for sites SA4-9. This change in approach (contained in **MM8-MM12**) is needed in order for the Plan to be effective. Subject to these changes and my more detailed comments on specific boundaries later in this report, the broad approach to the definition of settlement boundaries that is now proposed is effective, justified and consistent with the Core Strategy.

Has sufficient consideration been given to potential effects on sites of international nature conservation interest? Is the Plan in general conformity with policy NRM6 of the South East Plan and consistent with CS policy CS14?

47. The southern part of the Borough contains part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA), which has been designated as being of international importance – specifically by supporting breeding populations of three species (Nightjar, Woodlark and Dartford Warbler) that are protected by Annex 1 of the EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds. The potential effects of residential development on the SPA's integrity, notably as a result of increased disturbance arising from greater recreational pressures, has led to the development of a strategic framework for housing development in the wider TBH area. This includes policy NRM6 of the SEP (which has not been revoked), CS policy CS14, the TBH SPA Delivery Framework (TBH SPA DF)³¹ and the Council's TBH SPD³². Taken together, these form the background to the SALP's approach. Further details are set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment documents³³.
48. A number of particular issues have been raised by respondents in respect of this matter. Various nature conservation bodies, including Natural England (NE), suggest that the amount of housing proposed in sites lying close to the SPA (notably the TRL site, policy SA5) should be qualified to take account of any future project-level HRA³⁴. However, the housing figures for the sites concerned (including the 1,000 units proposed at the TRL site) have already been the subject of a plan-level HRA, of which NE is very supportive. Detailed proposals at the planning application stage would need to satisfy the Habitat Regulations (and relevant policies), while policies SA4 and SA5 require a package of measures to be put in place for that purpose. CS policy CS14 already makes it clear that development will not be permitted which, either alone or in combination, would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. As such, a further qualification on housing numbers within the SALP would be unnecessary.
49. Nevertheless, the Council proposes to add text in respect of the TRL site to clarify that its final layout will be influenced, among other matters, by a

³¹ Document SAL96.

³² Document SAL84.

³³ Notably documents SAL33 (main HRA) and SAL120 (HRA of proposed modifications).

³⁴ See Statement of Common Ground Document SAL103.

project-level HRA. Given that the involvement of NE is an established element of the TBH framework (and is already referred to in the SALP's urban extension site profiles), the Council also proposes to add references to the above-noted avoidance and mitigation measures being agreed with NE in policies SA4-SA9. Clarification of the 'in perpetuity' requirement is also proposed. All of these changes are needed for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with national policy. They are included in **MM26, MM34-MM36, MM39, MM42, MM45** and **MM47**.

50. Several developers have queried the detailed application of the TBH policy approach to SALP sites. Specific concerns are: first, that applying a 'blanket' policy requirement to contribute towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) is neither justified nor consistent with CS policy CS14; second, that provision should be made for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to count towards other open space provision; and, third, that an inconsistent approach has been taken towards the calculation of SANG requirements in the case of policies SA4 and SA5.
51. In respect of the first matter, SEP policy NRM6(iii) states that mitigation measures will be based on a combination of access management and the provision of SANG. While SAMM is not specifically mentioned in CS policy CS14, access management is considered by the CS TBH Technical Background Paper³⁵ that is referenced in that policy. Access management is also part of the suite of measures set out in the TBH SPA DF. Although there is scope for alternative mitigation measures to be agreed with NE (subject to the provision of further evidence) in line with SEP policy NRM6³⁶, the references to access management in the SALP are consistent with the established TBH policy framework.
52. In that context, I do not accept the view of some nature conservation bodies (excluding NE) that the reference to SAMM in policies SA4 and SA5 would be insufficient to deliver necessary access management measures. Irrespective of the details of the SAMM project, which is at a relatively early stage, both policies contain a requirement relating to any other measures needed to satisfy the Habitat Regulations and relevant policies. As already noted, this would need to be assessed in more detail at the project-level stage.
53. In respect of the use of SANG, SEP policy NRM6(iv) and the TBH SPA DF both accept that open space can carry out dual roles: existing open spaces can appropriately be used as SANG where existing patterns of use are taken into account and protected³⁷. The area's value as SANG is discounted based upon its existing usage: the methodology for doing this in Bracknell Forest is set out in the TBH SPD³⁸. While there is concern that the SALP is inconsistent with this approach, this relates to a phrase in the HRA³⁹ rather than the Plan itself. Subject to my comments on specific sites below, I am satisfied that the SALP's broad requirements for SANG and open space are justified and in accordance with the relevant policy framework. I see no reason why the established TBH policy approach would not be followed when schemes are considered at the

³⁵ Document SAL97.

³⁶ SEP policy NRM6, penultimate paragraph.

³⁷ Document SAL96, paragraph 5.8.

³⁸ Document SAL84, Appendix 4.

³⁹ Document SAL33, paragraph 5.11.

planning application stage. No change is needed to the SALP in this regard.

54. Policies SA4 and SA5 (relating to sites at Broadmoor and the TRL) both require the provision of on-site bespoke SANG significantly in excess of 8 hectares per 1000 population. This is a more onerous requirement than for the Plan's other urban extensions. However, it reflects both the scale and (particularly) the close proximity of both sites to the SPA boundary: indeed, both allocations include land within 400m of the SPA in which residential development is explicitly precluded. This precautionary approach is consistent with that taken to other large developments within the wider TBH area. It should be noted that the 8 hectare per 1,000 population standard is expressed as a minimum in SEP policy NRM6 and the TBH SPA DF. The latter document recognises that larger residential development proposals which, due to their scale and potential impact and ability to offer their own alternative avoidance measures, should be considered on a case-by-case basis.
55. A particular issue arose during the examination as a result of the Council's decision to introduce parking charges at The Look Out Discovery Centre to the south of Bracknell. NE raised a concern that this could cause adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA in combination with the proposals contained in the SALP. However, this matter has been the subject of further discussions between the Council and NE. A separate HRA has been undertaken and a statement of common ground agreed⁴⁰. Land has been reserved from the strategic SANG at Shepherds Meadow to be used as off-setting mitigation if displacement is shown to have occurred as a result of the parking charges. Although NE retains concerns about the introduction of parking charges, it is satisfied that this matter can be dealt with separately from the SALP.
56. Subject to the above-noted changes and the comments about specific sites in the remainder of this report, I conclude that sufficient consideration has been given to potential effects on sites of international nature conservation interest. The SALP is in general conformity with policy NRM6 of the South East Plan and consistent with CS policy CS14.

Does the Plan provide satisfactorily for the delivery of development and enable adequate monitoring of its effectiveness?

57. The Highways Agency (HA) and, as already noted, a number of neighbouring local planning authorities have raised concerns about the Plan's approach to transport and infrastructure provision. Broadly similar concerns have been raised by local residents.
58. Specific infrastructure requirements for particular sites are set out in relevant policies. However, these are not comprehensive, and reference is made to a supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP accompanying the SALP at submission was the November 2010 document (the Preferred Options Consultation Draft)⁴¹. This was replaced by an updated version during the examination⁴² reflecting comments from consultees and service providers, as well as updated evidence. However, it remains both a live and a non-statutory

⁴⁰ Documents SAL114a and SAL124 respectively.

⁴¹ Document SAL20.

⁴² Document SAL106. Key changes from the original IDP are summarised in Document SAL106b.

document: further reviews are anticipated.

59. The HA's concerns related to potential effects of SALP proposals (including improvements to the Coppid Beech Roundabout) on the strategic road network: specifically, evidence was required about likely impacts on junction 10 of the M4, along with any necessary mitigation. However, a statement of common ground has now been agreed between the Council and the HA⁴³. In addition to the updated IDP, this has involved the tabling of further data from the Council's transport modelling work. These outputs⁴⁴ supplement the main body of transport evidence supporting the Plan, which describes the multi-modal transport model's development, validation and assessment – as well as giving details of specific junction improvements and measures⁴⁵. On this basis, the HA is satisfied that the transport modelling that has been undertaken provides a robust evidence base for assessing the impact of the SALP on the strategic road network. The Council is committed to further working with the HA.
60. While similar concerns about transport were raised by neighbouring planning authorities, common ground has also been agreed on this matter⁴⁶. Concerns about the modelling exercise have been resolved and further clarification has been given about the possible scope and location of required transport improvements. Specifically, the updated IDP states that, if shown to be necessary by robust evidence, these would include improvements to roads and junctions outside the Borough. However, no changes are proposed (or required) to the SALP itself in this respect.
61. Statements of common ground with other planning authorities and Sport England⁴⁷ have also informed the provisions of the updated IDP with regard to other infrastructure needs. Costings have been updated, a revised statement on primary healthcare provision has been included and more detailed phasing information for educational and community infrastructure has been provided.
62. Some representors seek greater clarity in respect of infrastructure needs, raising concern that the requirements listed in specific SALP policies are not exhaustive. However, the Plan recognises⁴⁸ that there may be circumstances where flexibility of provision, including possible prioritisation of requirements, is needed: such flexibility would be agreed with reference to viability issues and assessment of the implications of any under-provision. This view is amplified by the updated IDP⁴⁹, which highlights the particular importance of education, transport and SPA avoidance measures in any such prioritisation exercise. The Council clarified at the examination hearings that, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, viability concerns are material considerations at the planning application stage.
63. In addition, the broad viability of the SALP's allocations have been tested in terms of their ability to deliver the Council's planning policy objectives, with

⁴³ Document SAL107.

⁴⁴ Document SAL113.

⁴⁵ Documents SAL38-41.

⁴⁶ Documents SAL92-94.

⁴⁷ Documents SAL94, SAL101 and SAL102.

⁴⁸ SALP para 6.0.5.

⁴⁹ Document SAL106, section 3.3.

reference to the timing and phasing of site delivery⁵⁰. While some of its assumptions have been challenged, the study's methodology appears sufficiently robust to support the level of detail that is provided for in the SALP. Indeed, the study itself accepts⁵¹ that detailed specific scheme-based review and discussions will inevitably be necessary. While the updated IDP has not been subject to similar viability testing, this would be inconsistent with the role and status of that document.

64. In principle, the SALP, supported by the IDP, therefore represents an appropriate balance between certainty (making infrastructure requirements clear) and flexibility (responding to changing circumstances). Further comments in respect of some specific proposals are set out later in this report.
65. Monitoring of CS objectives and indicators already takes place and is reported through the Council's monitoring reports. The Council proposes minor changes to reflect the amended provisions set out in the Localism Act 2011: it remains the Council's intention to publish monitoring information on at least an annual basis. Table 4 of the SALP provides a short schedule of key indicators that are relevant to the present Plan. Taken together with existing monitoring arrangements, this appears both adequate and proportionate. Subject to the comments about specific sites in the remainder of this report, I conclude that the Plan provides satisfactorily for the delivery of development and enables adequate monitoring of its effectiveness.

Site-specific Policies

66. Some of the Plan's site-specific policies and allocations are not referred to in this report. This is because the report focuses on those parts of the Plan where there may be soundness issues.

Are the Plan's site-specific policies in accordance with national guidance, consistent with the CS, justified and likely to be effective?

67. Policies SA1 to SA3 propose the allocation of housing sites excluding the urban extensions. Several respondents seek to amend the capacity figures for these sites. However, these figures are estimates only. Given that the final capacity of smaller sites can be particularly affected by site-based factors, this appears prudent. I see no substantive reason to adopt the less flexible approach of specifying either maximum or minimum capacities in respect of the policy SA1-SA3 sites.

Policy SA1 – Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements

68. The Council proposes some changes to the sites allocated in policy SA1. Two sites (The Iron Duke, High Street and School Hill, Crowthorne) now have planning permission: as they lie within defined settlements and do not involve settlement boundary changes, their allocation is no longer needed. New sites are proposed at Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road and Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell, with an extension to the site north of Eastern Road, Bracknell. For the reasons set out above, these changes (**MM13-MM18**) are adequately justified and necessary in order to make the Plan effective.

⁵⁰ Document SAL42.

⁵¹ Document SAL42 paragraph 3.32.6.

Policy SA2 – Other Land within Defined Settlements

69. The Council has reassessed the capacity of the site to the north of Peacock Lane, Bracknell, to reflect the inclusion of former business land within the developable area. This change (included in **MM19-MM20**) is needed in order to make the Plan effective.

Policy SA3 – Edge of Settlement Sites (excluding Urban Extensions)

70. Particular local concern has been raised about two policy SA3 sites located in Binfield. However, the position with respect to the site on land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage has been clarified by a recent grant of planning permission on appeal for a development (in outline) of up to 67 dwellings⁵². Given that this is an edge of settlement site, requiring an amendment to the settlement boundary, its retention in the Plan is justified.
71. The site at the junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield was the subject of a dismissed appeal in 2012⁵³. In reaching his decision, the Inspector referred to the scheme's conflict with development plan policies protecting land outside settlement boundaries. However, as already noted, the housing land supply position in the Borough requires that some greenfield allocations are made. The Inspector accepted that there was some strength in the argument that development of this site would constitute a rounding-off of the north-west settlement boundary of Binfield. I share that assessment, and agree with the Council's view that the site is appropriately allocated for development in the SALP. It is noted that the detailed profile for that site requires appropriate tree surveys, retention of important and protected trees and the carrying out of additional planting along existing roadsides to preserve the landscape setting and provide visual mitigation.
72. As already stated, the Council proposes to add three further sites to policy SA3: land at Wood Lane, Binfield; land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne; and land west of Alford Close, Sandhurst. For the reasons already discussed, these further allocations (**MM21-MM24**) are needed in order to make the Plan effective. Given that the CS identifies a Strategic Gap between Sandhurst and Yateley, and bearing in mind the importance of safeguarding the Blackwater Valley landscape and avoiding areas of flood risk, I agree with the Council that a substantial part of the site to the west of Alford Close should be excluded from development by imposing the settlement boundary that is proposed in the Council's changes. This derives from landscape analysis and is explained in the SALP background paper in more detail⁵⁴. Although resulting in an irregular boundary, this would not be at odds with the existing pattern of built development in the site's locality.
73. Concerns about the proximity of the site at Bog Lane to the Ascot Sewage Treatment Works have resulted in the Council proposing an additional requirement to ensure that an assessment is made of potential impacts in respect of existing odour, noise and lighting from that facility. This is needed for reasons of effectiveness (**MM25**).

⁵² Appeal ref. APP/R0335/A/12/2179560, dated 24 January 2013.

⁵³ Appeal ref. APP/R0335/A/12/2168199, dated 29 May 2012.

⁵⁴ Documents SAL35 (landscape analysis) and SAL49, paragraphs 2.10.45-81.

Policy SA4 – Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne

74. The identification of land at Broadmoor in the SALP arises as a result of the ongoing redevelopment of the site's secure hospital facility. Broadmoor was built specifically for use as a psychiatric hospital: the main hospital building is listed (grade II) and its surroundings are included on the register of historic parks and gardens (grade II). Planning permission has been granted for a replacement hospital, with a new access road and roundabout junction to the A3095 Foresters Way.
75. Redevelopment of the site is proposed to include up to 210 residential units (including affordable housing) within the walled garden lying below the hospital's main south-facing façade and a further 60 retirement apartments outside the walled garden. Some original hospital buildings falling within the curtilage of the listed hospital would be lost. English Heritage (EH) considers that this would substantially harm the significance of the site as a whole. However, it accepts that there are potentially substantial public benefits associated with the new hospital. Bearing in mind the work that was undertaken in assessing potential alternatives⁵⁵, I share that assessment. In line with paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I am satisfied both that the substantial harm is necessary in order for the redevelopment to take place and that the resulting public benefits (which are not in substantive dispute) are sufficient to outweigh the identified harm.
76. However, EH (along with a number of other representors) raises concerns about the proposed introduction of new housing into the walled garden. I have considered this matter carefully. While the garden is identified in the Council's Landscape Capacity Study⁵⁶ as having a moderate capacity for development, and although it is now crossed by substantial security fencing, the garden's largely undeveloped nature is an important part of its historical significance as a way of providing practical activities for hospital patients. Although lying at a substantially lower level than that of the main hospital buildings, its openness contributes significantly to the setting of the hospital's main south-facing façade. Albeit that the exact scale of development remains to be finalised, the introduction of new housing into that area would be likely to result in substantial harm to the registered historic park and garden.
77. Paragraph 133 of the Framework requires a similar balancing exercise to be undertaken in respect of this matter. As already stated, the public benefits arising for the hospital's redevelopment are not in dispute. However EH and others query whether the proposed housing in the walled garden is necessary to deliver this benefit: EH states that the housing would make a relatively small contribution to the costs of delivering the public benefit due to the requirement on the West London Mental Health Trust (WLMHT) to meet some of the cost of delivering the new hospital from capital receipts from the sale of surplus land. They also query the effect of the proposed housing on the viability of any new use for the retained hospital buildings – for example as a hotel.

⁵⁵ Summarised in BFBC Planning Committee report on application ref. 11/00743/FUL: attached as an Appendix to the hearing statement submitted on behalf of the West London Mental Health Trust (WLMHT).

⁵⁶ Document SAL14.

78. In respect of the first point, detailed financial information about the likely financial contribution of the new houses to the overall viability of the hospital redevelopment project has not been submitted. However, with reference both to current pressures on Government spending and its own obligations to ensure the best use of NHS resources, the WLMHT has identified a funding shortfall in respect of the project. I have no reason to doubt this assertion. Notwithstanding the comments of EH and others, I have not been made aware of other specific sources of available funding. Proximity to the SPA, as already discussed, precludes the re-use of the retained listed hospital buildings for residential purposes. The need to secure an appropriate use for these buildings is likely to place additional costs on the project over and above the provision of new hospital facilities.
79. Furthermore, policy SA4 requires that the final number of dwellings in the walled garden (and the retirement units) is subject to further consideration of the justification for the development. I am satisfied on balance that this requirement provides an adequate safeguard to ensure that the necessity of development is demonstrated in accordance with the Framework when a detailed scheme is being considered.
80. Substantive evidence has not been provided to support the assertion that housing in the walled garden would adversely affect the viability of re-using the retained buildings. As already noted, there is a significant difference in levels between the hospital and the walled garden. Notwithstanding the harm to the garden's historic significance (as already discussed), this would be sufficient to maintain the extensive view from the hospital buildings and main terrace. The illustrative concept plan (SALP Map 2) suggests that new housing could be set some distance down the hill, avoiding the stepped terraces that separate the walled garden from the main hospital buildings. The justification required by policy SA4 requires further consideration of the impacts on the site's heritage assets, including the submission of a conservation management plan. Taking these matters together, the wording of policy SA4 in respect of this matter is justified and in line with national policy.
81. The proposed Broadmoor allocation lies close to the TBH SPA. Although the SPA 400m separation distance is shown on the illustrative concept plan (map 2), policy SA4 does not contain an explicit presumption against locating new housing within this area. Given that the proposed settlement boundary would intrude into this zone and that the location of the retirement housing is not specified exactly, it is necessary for such clarification to be added. The Council accepts this and proposes a modification accordingly (**MM26**): this is needed for the Plan to be in general conformity with SEP policy NRM6.
82. As already discussed, the Council proposes to define a settlement boundary for the site. This reflects the location of existing and proposed hospital buildings and the extent of the walled garden. As such, it is appropriately justified. For the reasons discussed above, this change (included in **MM27-MM28**) is necessary for the Plan to be effective, consistent with the CS and in general conformity with SEP policy NRM6. Specifically, the boundary clarifies that development will not intrude into the southern and eastern parts of the site: these areas lie close to the SPA and extend into the Strategic Gap that the CS identifies between Sandhurst and Crowthorne.

83. A consequence of defining a settlement boundary for Broadmoor is that an area previously covered by saved BFBLP policy E12 (identified major employment sites) would be brought into the settlement. This employment designation is also proposed for deletion at the TRL site: as these are the only two sites covered by policy E12 notations, the Council proposes that this policy will be superseded by the SALP when adopted. These changes (**MM29-MM33**) are necessary for reasons of effectiveness.

Policy SA5 – Land at Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), Crowthorne

84. Notwithstanding the name used in the SALP, much of this site has been vacated by the TRL. It is occupied by the Crowthorne Business Estate. While it is intended to retain the relatively recent TRL headquarters building, it is common ground that other structures on the site (including testing facilities) have very limited potential for re-use. As such, the site represents a substantial resource of previously-developed land. Given its presently under-used nature, there is some local support for the principle of redevelopment. However, concerns are raised about the overall scale of development – particularly housing – that is now proposed. The site lies outside existing settlement boundaries and within the broad area of the Strategic Gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell identified by CS policy CS9.
85. In 2009 a scheme for up to 975 residential units, a business park, community buildings, ancillary uses, landscape and infrastructure was dismissed at appeal⁵⁷. Although relevant to this examination, that proposal related to a particular planning application rather than a Local Plan land allocation. Furthermore, the development had significant differences from the illustrative layout that is now suggested in the SALP – specifically in respect of the scale and location of employment uses and the width of SANG along the site's south-eastern boundary. As with the site at Forest Road/Foxley Lane Binfield, the appeal decision did not (and could not) take into account the particular context of the SALP, including the assessment of housing supply and site selection exercise described above. Nevertheless, in reaching his decision, the Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector's view that the conclusions reached about that proposal's effects on the integrity of the SPA did not necessarily preclude a substantial development including a large number of dwellings on the site, were it also to be deemed acceptable in other respects⁵⁸.
86. On the CS Key Diagram, the Strategic Gap symbol crosses the TRL site. This is an indicative notation rather than a precise definition. Nevertheless, there is a clear policy intention that a gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell should be retained. CS paragraph 120 explains that the purpose of identifying gaps is to protect the open and undeveloped character of the land concerned and to steer development away from those settlements where coalescence is a real threat.
87. The TRL site already contains substantial built structures – including sizeable office and commercial buildings. Part of the site is allocated for employment by BFBLP policy E12. The site and its surroundings have been considered by two landscape studies (2010 and 2011) in the context of the SALP⁵⁹. These

⁵⁷ Appeal ref. APP/R0335/A/08/2076543 – Document SAL108.

⁵⁸ Document SAL108 – paragraph 21 of Secretary of State's decision.

⁵⁹ Documents SAL14 and SAL35 respectively.

sub-divide the TRL site into three areas. Area B includes the TRL building, the Crowthorne Business Estate and the large central surfaced area of the test track. The 2010 report's view that this area has a high capacity to accommodate development (in landscape terms) is not substantially challenged. A 'high capacity' is defined as enabling typically up to 65% developable area in the landscape without significant effects on its character.

88. The 2010 report includes the remainder of the TRL site within areas C1 and C2. These areas predominantly comprise conifer plantations, but also include sections of test track and some other structures. They are identified as having a moderate to low landscape capacity (defined as enabling a minimal amount of development, typically up to 7% developable area, to be accommodated). Both landscape reports highlight the importance of retaining the existing wooded character of these areas as an important landscape feature of this part of the Borough and the Strategic Gap.
89. The illustrative concept plan contained in the SALP (Map 3) suggests that much of areas C1 and C2 would be retained. However, it shows development extending into the north-eastern section of area C2 – a part of the site that is particularly important given its proximity to the south-west corner of Bracknell's built up area. While earlier versions of this concept plan⁶⁰ largely restricted built development from this area, SALP Map 3 shows housing extending to a point some 500 metres from the nearest part of Bracknell's built up area (which is not shown on the map), with a relocated Council depot occupying some of the intervening land.
90. This 'pinch point' is an area of considerable visual sensitivity, as recognised by the previous appeal Inspector⁶¹. In that case, office development (potentially of a substantial scale) was proposed less than 500 metres from the junction of Nine Mile Ride with the A3095 – with an intervening car park⁶². The suggested location of the new Council depot would be closer to Bracknell's built-up area than these previously-proposed office buildings. While the detailed layout and design of any future proposal are yet to be finalised, I am not therefore satisfied that the illustrative arrangement shown in Map 3 would achieve an adequate visual separation between the new development and the urban area of Bracknell. The presence of substantial areas of open space elsewhere within the site (including SANG to the south and a landscape strip on the south side of Nine Mile Ride) would not over-ride this, as they would be well-separated from the 'pinch point' itself. Separation of settlements would not be achieved. This would fail the requirement to be consistent with the CS.
91. Furthermore, Map 3 is illustrative only. The boundary of the policy SA5 allocation adjoins Nine Mile Ride and extends to the Golden Retriever public house at the Nine Mile Ride/A3095 junction. A settlement boundary is not defined. Notwithstanding the Council's present intentions, the SALP contains little certainty that the illustrative layout would be put in place. Policy SA5 contains no requirement that the Strategic Gap would be maintained.
92. In response to the above concerns, which I raised during the examination, the Council proposes to amend the illustrative layout shown in Map 3. As already

⁶⁰ For example in the report to the Council's Executive (July 2010) – Document SAL8.

⁶¹ Document SAL108 – notably paragraphs 769 to 776 of Inspector's Report.

⁶² Document SAL108 – paragraph 769 of Inspector's Report.

discussed, it also proposes to include a settlement boundary to ensure that the edge of the urban extension is defined on the Policies Map. It suggests that the Council depot would be relocated to a less visually sensitive location. The new settlement boundary would lie at least 500 metres from the nearest part of Bracknell's urban area.

93. Although part of area C2 would fall within the potential development area, I am satisfied on balance that the resulting arrangement would allow the retention of sufficient woodland and open space to maintain both a physical gap and the perception of such a gap, particularly when viewed from Nine Mile Ride. The Council also proposes to add a reference to policy SA5 in respect of maintaining the separation between Crowthorne and Bracknell. This would provide an additional safeguard, although I share the view of some representors that the intended reference to a 'buffer' should be amended to 'gap'. I have altered the Council's suggested wording accordingly in order to be consistent with the CS (included in **MM35**).
94. Nevertheless, I do not accept the view of some local representors that that CS policy CS9 implies a wider degree of separation – for example in terms of access to services and facilities. This is outside the scope of Strategic Gaps, as already described. Indeed, the need to make efficient use of services and wider community integration implies that some services (for example hospital provision) will need to be shared within a larger geographical area.
95. Like the Broadmoor site, the TRL allocation closely adjoins the TBH SPA. I have commented above about the concerns raised by NE and other nature conservation bodies with regard to overall housing numbers at the site. As already noted, the Council proposes to add text to clarify that the final layout of the site's development will be influenced, among other matters, by a project-level HRA (included in **MM36**).
96. Some concerns have been raised about the intended location of SANG within the site. This is not specified by policy SA5, although the illustrative concept plan envisages SANG/open space being located mainly within the 400 metre SPA buffer between the developed area and Crowthorne Road. The suggested area would be wider than that suggested at the last appeal (which included an obvious 'pinch point'). Although adjoined by a well-used road, such proximity has not precluded the creation of SANG in other locations (for example at Shepherds Meadows). While the relocated depot would be likely to be sited next to part of the SANG, space for screening would be available. The suggested depot access route from Nine Mile Ride would be likely to flank, rather than bisect the SANG area. It is noted that NE has not objected to the Council's suggested modifications. In any event, as noted above, the final layout would be subject to a project-level HRA.
97. Matters such as potential interlinkages between the SANG and the SPA across Crowthorne Road (including the need for a barrier between the SANG and the SPA), the accessibility of the SANG from housing within the TRL site, the possible location of SANG car parking, the quality of the new SANG and the potential ecological discounting of SANG capacity can appropriately be addressed when the site's layout and proposed mitigation measures are finalised. The need for SANG in respect of this site to be of an exceptionally high standard is emphasised in the 2012 IDP.

98. As explained earlier in this report, the transport implications of this and other site allocations have been considered through traffic modelling work. Such work is ongoing, and as is made clear in the 2012 IDP, will inform on and off-site transport infrastructure requirements arising from the development. The updated IDP also states that the existing tennis courts that would be lost as part of the site's redevelopment should be re-provided elsewhere on the site. Proposals to replace the existing enterprise centre on-site are not being taken forward and the Council proposes changes to reflect this: these are needed for reasons of effectiveness.
99. Taking the above matters together, the Council's suggested changes (**MM35-MM38**), amended as described above to replace 'buffer' with 'gap', are needed for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with the CS.

Policy SA6 – Land at Amen Corner North, Binfield

100. The proposed allocation at Amen Corner North lies within the broad area of the Strategic Gap between Bracknell and Wokingham identified in the CS. Objections to the allocation have been made on that basis. As with the urban extensions already discussed, the Council now proposes to define a settlement boundary for this site. This will prevent development from extending to the western edge of the site (which abuts the boundary with Wokingham Borough) and will leave part of the London Road frontage undeveloped – in line with the recommendations of the 2011 landscape analysis⁶³.
101. In addition, the Council proposes to include a reference to maintaining separation between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell within policy SA6: as with policy SA5, I share the view of representors that this should refer to a 'gap' rather than a 'buffer'. Subject to these changes (**MM39-MM41**), which are needed for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with the CS, I am satisfied that an adequate gap would be maintained. I note in this context that land to the west of the site within Wokingham Borough is proposed for settlement separation rather than development in WBC's Managing Development Delivery Plan, which is being examined at the time of writing.
102. Several representors suggest that the location of the bespoke SANG that is required for this site by policy SA6 should be specified more exactly. The Council identifies two potential options for this – either on land to the west of the site (within Wokingham Borough) or to the north. As such, there is no evidence to suggest that sufficient SANG could not be put in place to support the development. A more precise indication of the likely SANG location is not therefore needed in order to make the Plan sound.

Policy SA7 – Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield

103. The allocation proposed at Blue Mountain, Binfield has attracted a particularly substantial amount of local opposition. The site mainly comprises golf course land. Although containing some built structures (including golf course facilities and a driving range), it has – as was recognised by the previous CS inspector – an open character. It is separated from residential development to the south by a distributor road (Temple Way). The development now intended would amount to an urban extension into presently open land; as such, the

⁶³ Document SAL35.

site's existing character would be substantially changed.

104. It is apparent from the site's planning history, notably the protection afforded by an extant planning agreement⁶⁴, that the present proposal represents a departure from the Council's previous approach to this land. Nevertheless, as already outlined, the SALP has been prepared in the context of the need to meet the CS housing requirement. Extensions to the urban area are not ruled out in principle. Such developments will inevitably change the character of the land involved. However, for the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the site selection methodology is sufficiently robust to justify the principle of development in this broad location.
105. The CS Key Diagram identifies the area as a Local Gap. As explained by the previous CS Inspector⁶⁵, this is intended to separate the two 'wings' of Binfield and to provide additional separation between both wings and the CS proposal (CS policy CS5) that is now being taken forward as SALP policy SA9 (land at Warfield). The purpose of the Local Gap is to ensure visual separation in order to maintain settlement identity and prevent coalescence.
106. In the present case, the SA7 site boundary would effectively straddle the full width of the Local Gap. However, it is intended that built development would be located towards the southern part of the site. Land to the north of the suggested educational buildings would remain open: although it is intended that this would be used partly as playing fields and partly as SANG/open space, such uses would be not dissimilar in character to the land's existing recreational nature. A clear visual separation would be maintained between the northern wing of Binfield and the northern edge of the urban extension.
107. While the relocated football ground (with associated practice pitches) is proposed to be sited to the west of the existing golf course buildings, the present golf driving range, with a clearly artificial landform and substantial fences, gives this part of the site a distinctly recreational character. The area of development would also be well set-back from the site's eastern boundary. Taking into account the adjoining land around Binfield Manor and the undeveloped western end of the policy SA9 allocation (see below), this would be sufficient to ensure a substantial degree of separation between Binfield and the development at Warfield (policy SA9). Further set-backs from this boundary would therefore be unnecessary.
108. Notwithstanding the above, the illustrative status of the concept plan does not provide sufficient certainty about the intended location of built development within the wider site allocation. However, as with the other urban extensions already discussed, a settlement boundary is now proposed. This change (contained in **MM42-MM44**) is needed for soundness reasons. In addition, the Council proposes to add a reference to maintaining separation in the wording of the policy: as with the preceding two sites, this should refer to a 'gap' rather than a 'buffer'.
109. The proposed allocation would result in the loss of the Blue Mountain Golf

⁶⁴ Document SAL116 – section 52 agreement dated 16 February 1990 relating to land at Park Farm/Jocks Lane, Bracknell.

⁶⁵ Document SAL78 paragraphs 120-122.

Course. The Council has commissioned a Golf Course Study⁶⁶ which concludes that the loss of the 18-hole course at Blue Mountain can on balance be justified in view of other facilities elsewhere in the catchment and their ability to absorb likely demand for golf over the next 15 years. While these findings are disputed by some local representors, I have no reason to depart from Sport England's assessment that the study shows that there is a sufficient supply of golf courses and driving ranges in and around Bracknell to meet demand.

110. However, I am unable to accept Sport England's view⁶⁷ that the SALP should require a planning agreement to be entered into to ensure that development initiatives undertaken at Blue Mountain are replicated at other facilities in the area: given that this would require action by other golf course providers, this would be unlikely to meet the tests required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 204) for planning obligations. I do not feel that failure to secure such provision is sufficient to outweigh the sporting advantages that would result from the site's allocation – notably the relocation of Bracknell Town Football Club and the provision of playing fields.

111. In particular, the football club's proposed relocation would enable the establishment of a single purpose-built community football facility including junior and practice pitches. This cannot be achieved at the club's current Larges Lane site. A site search exercise has been undertaken⁶⁸ that identifies the potential of the site at Blue Mountain. While formal approval for relocation would be required from the Football Association, I have seen no substantive reason why this could not be given. Relocation of the football club to this site would release a housing site in a central urban location (policy SA1).

112. Among policy SA7's infrastructure requirements are on-site primary and secondary schools, along with special educational needs places. Some local residents' groups object to the provision of a secondary school in this location. However, given the intended scale of development to the north of Bracknell, there is a clear and demonstrable need to provide additional school places in future years. The Council has undertaken a site search exercise accordingly. Although on the urban edge, the Blue Mountain site occupies a broadly central position between the developments at Amen Corner (North and South) and Warfield. It is also central to the relevant BFBC school places area. While a location near the Borough's boundary with Wokingham would offer the potential for school place sharing between local education authorities, there is no evidence that this would align with WBC's intentions. Cross-boundary educational infrastructure needs have been discussed between BFBC and WBC and are set out in an agreed statement of common ground between the two authorities⁶⁹.

113. The Council proposes to amend policy SA7 to clarify that land for the educational facilities is required within the allocation as well as financial contributions. Given that the potential to site these facilities in this location was (as noted earlier in this report) a factor supporting the identification of Blue Mountain compared to other broad areas, this change (included in

⁶⁶ Document SAL109.

⁶⁷ Statement of Common Ground between Sport England and BFBC, Document SAL101.

⁶⁸ Appended to Document SAL110.

⁶⁹ Document SAL102.

MM42) is needed for soundness reasons.

Allocation of land covered by Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS5

General comments

114. In contrast to the sites allocated by policies SA4-7, Amen Corner South and Warfield were both identified as broad locations for urban extensions in the CS. Neither was a formal CS allocation: the CS was prepared in the context of national planning policy (now superseded) which stated that core strategies should not identify individual sites⁷⁰. Although the Council originally envisaged the sites as being addressed through Area Action Plans, their allocation is now being carried forward in the SALP. SPDs were approved for Amen Corner South in 2010 and Warfield in 2012⁷¹.

115. Neither the Amen Corner South nor the Warfield allocations are supported by an illustrative concept plan. While such diagrams are contained in their respective SPDs, these do not form part of the development plan. In the case of Amen Corner South the SPD is somewhat out of date (see below). The absence of an illustrative concept plan for these sites is inconsistent with the treatment of other urban extensions, as already described. Notwithstanding their illustrative nature, such plans add to the clarity and understanding of the relevant proposals. The Council accepts this and proposes to include such plans, in respect of these allocations derived from the respective SPDs (updated as necessary): these changes (**MM46** and **MM48**) are needed for reasons of effectiveness.

Policy SA8 – Land at Amen Corner South, Binfield

116. The CS identifies the capacity of the Amen Corner South site as about 725 dwellings. The Council accepts that in view of current market demand there is now less likelihood of achieving the overall average housing density that was suggested for this site in the SPD. However, in the light of the Employment Land Review⁷² (which identifies an oversupply of office space in the Borough), it has decided not to carry forward the SPD's 35,000 square metres (gross) target of new employment development into the SALP. This creates some flexibility within the site, allowing a greater proportion to be developed for housing. As such, I have seen no substantive evidence that the 725 dwelling figure would not be deliverable in principle.

117. The Amen Corner South site lies within the broad area of the CS Strategic Gap between Bracknell and Wokingham. Like the site at Amen Corner North, the Council proposes to define a settlement boundary for this site and to include a policy reference to maintaining separation between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell: as previously discussed, this should refer to a 'gap' rather than a 'buffer'. The intended settlement boundary would abut the Borough boundary. However, open land would remain within Wokingham Borough between the site and the dual carriageway (the A329), which largely separates it from the remainder of that Borough. Given the location of this land, and noting that (as with the land to the west of the Amen Corner North site) it is proposed for

⁷⁰ Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks (2004), paragraph 2.12.

⁷¹ Documents SAL81 and SAL83 respectively.

⁷² Document SAL11.

settlement separation rather than development in WBC's submission Managing Development Delivery Plan, I am satisfied on balance that an adequate gap would be maintained. These changes (included in **MM41**, **MM45** and **MM46**) are required for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with the CS.

118. As with the Amen Corner North site, I see no evidence that there is a need to specify the location of required SANG in the SALP. The Council has identified a bespoke solution using a new SANG (Bigwood and Riggs Copse) with future maintenance provisions and a SMM contribution.

Policy SA9 – Land at Warfield

119. As already noted, the need to ensure that development in this broad location remained separate from Binfield was part of the justification for the Local Gap identified in the CS between Bracknell and Binfield. For similar reasons as described above in respect of the other urban extensions, the Council proposes to define a settlement boundary for the Warfield allocation. The proposed boundary is consistent with the arrangement of development suggested in the SPD (which has been subject to local consultation) and the supporting evidence base. It excludes a substantial part of the western section of the allocation from development, including the higher parts of Cabbage Hill, which is a prominent feature in the wider landscape. While two small settlements would effectively be joined to the main urban area, their separation from Bracknell is not a CS requirement and was not proposed in the SPD. I have seen no evidence that detailed issues of layout and design (such as the relationship of development to particular character areas or any potential effects on Great Crested Newts) cannot be appropriately considered at the master-planning stage. For these reasons, the new settlement boundary (included in **MM48-MM49**) is needed for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with the CS.

120. Given the scale of the policy SA9 allocation and the diversity of land ownerships within the site, I share the Council's view that provision is needed to allow schemes coming forward for parts of the site to be considered within its overall planning context. This change (included in **MM47**) is needed for reasons of effectiveness. I have made minor changes to the Council's suggested wording for reasons of clarity.

121. The Council also proposes changes aimed at giving more flexibility about the intended SANG location. However, given that policy SA9 only expresses a preference for the SANG to be sited at Cabbage Hill (rather than a definite requirement), such a change is not necessary for soundness reasons. I have not recommended that it should be made.

Conclusion on Site Specific Policies

122. Subject to the main modifications described in this section, I conclude that the Plan's site-specific policies are in accordance with national guidance, consistent with the CS, justified and likely to be effective.

Other Matters

123. In response to comments from the Environment Agency, the Council proposes to add references to the need for flood risk assessment for all sites in excess

of 1 hectare located in Flood Zone 1 (as defined in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework). Given that this is already a specific requirement of the Framework⁷³, these changes are not needed for soundness reasons.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

124. My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The October 2012 LDS identifies the SALP's submission date as June 2012. The content and timing of the SALP are compliant with the LDS.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) ⁷⁴ and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in July 2006 and consultation (including that on the Council's proposed changes) has been compliant with the requirements therein. While concerns have been raised about internal Council procedures and the arrangements to publicise the SALP, it is evident from the documents submitted by the Council, including the Regulation 22(1)(c) Statement ⁷⁵ , that relevant statutory requirements have been met.
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out, including SA of the Council's proposed changes, and is adequate.
Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	HRA has been carried out, including HRA of the Council's proposed changes, and is adequate.
National Policy	The SALP complies with national policy except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Regional Strategy (RS)	The SALP is in general conformity with the South East Plan, insofar as this remains extant.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations.	The SALP complies with the Act and the Regulations.

⁷³ National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103 and footnote.

⁷⁴ Document SAL75.

⁷⁵ Document SAL62.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

125. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness and/or legal compliance for the reasons set out above which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

126. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix and attached Annex the Bracknell Forest Site Allocations Local Plan satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

M J Hetherington

INSPECTOR

This report is accompanied by the Appendix and an attached Annex containing the Main Modifications

Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM1	2	Para 1.2.6	<p>1.2.6 The South East Plan sets out the regional planning policies for the South East. It was approved in 2009 and provides the vision for planning for the region up to 2026. Whilst this document currently forms part of the development plan, the Government has clearly stated its intention to revoke Regional Strategies. The Localism Act Bill will allow this to happen and is currently progressing through Parliament. It is possible that Royal Assent will be in April 2012. It is unlikely that the South East Plan will form part of the development plan on adoption of the SADPD.</p> <p><u>1.2.6 Following the partial revocation of the South East Plan the Council is using the housing figures in the adopted Core Strategy for the purposes of calculating the five year housing land supply, producing a housing trajectory and monitoring. The Core Strategy target will remain in use for these purposes until such time as a full objective assessment of housing needs for the Borough has been finalised and published. Adoption of the Site Allocations Local Plan is considered the most effective means of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Achieving a plan led approach to development in the Borough</u> • <u>Achieving the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework</u> • <u>Identifying a five year supply of housing land and:</u> • <u>Adopting an up to date plan to enable the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy.</u>
MM2	2	Section 1.2	<p><u>Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</u></p> <p><u>The presumption in favour of sustainable development is central to the Government's approach to planning as expressed by the National Planning Policy Framework. Core Policy CP1 below embeds this policy in the development plan.</u></p> <p><u>Policy CP1</u></p> <p><u>Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</u></p> <p><u>A positive approach to considering development proposals will be taken that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><u>National Planning Policy Framework. Where appropriate, the Council will work proactively with applicants jointly to seek solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions within the area.</u></p> <p><u>The development plan is the statutory starting point for decision making. Planning applications that accord with the policies in the development plan for Bracknell Forest (including, where relevant, policies in neighbourhood development plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</u></p> <p><u>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then permission will be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</u> • <u>Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</u>
MM3	7	Paras 2.1.1 to 2.1.3	<p>2.1.1 The Council's adopted Core Strategy⁽¹²⁾ identifies that 11,139^{10,780⁽¹³⁾} dwellings are needed in the Borough for the period 2006 - 2026. This is a locally-derived requirement. In dealing with how this requirement is to be met, the Council is required by Government to identify and maintain a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable sites. The SADPDL is an important means of implementing the Core Strategy. Any a Additional requirements resulting from changes to national planning policy (in the emerging Draft National Planning Policy Framework) or other recent evidence will be dealt with through a review of the Core Strategy <u>New Local Plan</u>⁽¹⁴⁾.</p> <p>2.1.2 The 10,780 At submission, six years of the plan period had already passed. new homes are required between 2006 and 2026. This means that we are already into the sixth year of the plan period. Account therefore needs to be taken of the homes already built and as well as those planned since all which will contribute to meeting the requirement. 11,139 new homes are required between 2006 and 2026. This means subtracting from the Core Strategy figure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • homes already completed from 1st April 2006 to 30th September 2011 (1,953) 31st March 2012 (2,098); • homes with planning permission (commitments) on small, medium and large sites at 30th September 2011 31st March 2012 and including the number that were

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification																										
			<p>under construction or yet to be started (2,317) (<u>2,230</u>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> homes accepted in principle including the homes which are already planned on sites identified in the Core Strategy at Amen Corner and Warfield (2,926) (<u>2,925</u>). <p>2.1.3 These sources amount to 7,316 <u>7,253</u> homes. When these are subtracted from the total requirement, it leaves sites for a further 3,464 <u>3,886</u> homes to be found by 2026. These figures are summarised in the <u>figure table</u> below, and in Appendix 2: 'Housing Trajectory' relating to land supply data.</p> <p>Table 1 How will the Housing Requirement be met?</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1,953 <u>2,098</u></td> <td>Homes completed between 2006 and 2011 <u>2012</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,317 <u>2,230</u></td> <td>Homes with planning permission, (small, medium & large sites) at 31st March 2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,926 <u>2,925</u></td> <td>Homes accepted in principle and homes planned at Amen Corner and Warfield</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3,464 <u>3,886</u></td> <td>Remaining to be found</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10,780 <u>11,139</u></td> <td>Total ⁽¹⁾</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1. All figures are net</p> <p>Table 2 Where we are proposing to build the rest</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>150 <u>280</u></td> <td>Small windfall allowance (30 per year, last 5 years only) <u>Small windfall allowance (20 per year over 14 years)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,635</td> <td>Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>361</td> <td>Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,442</td> <td>Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>198</td> <td>Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,070</td> <td>Homes on extensions to Bracknell or other larger settlements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3,896 <u>4,346</u></td> <td><u>Total Homes on possible SALP sites⁽¹⁾</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>460</td> <td><u>Number above 11,139 requirement</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1. All figures are net.</p>	1,953 <u>2,098</u>	Homes completed between 2006 and 2011 <u>2012</u>	2,317 <u>2,230</u>	Homes with planning permission, (small, medium & large sites) at 31st March 2012	2,926 <u>2,925</u>	Homes accepted in principle and homes planned at Amen Corner and Warfield	3,464 <u>3,886</u>	Remaining to be found	10,780 <u>11,139</u>	Total ⁽¹⁾	150 <u>280</u>	Small windfall allowance (30 per year, last 5 years only) <u>Small windfall allowance (20 per year over 14 years)</u>	1,635	Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)	361	Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements	1,442	Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)	198	Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements	2,070	Homes on extensions to Bracknell or other larger settlements	3,896 <u>4,346</u>	<u>Total Homes on possible SALP sites⁽¹⁾</u>	460	<u>Number above 11,139 requirement</u>
1,953 <u>2,098</u>	Homes completed between 2006 and 2011 <u>2012</u>																												
2,317 <u>2,230</u>	Homes with planning permission, (small, medium & large sites) at 31st March 2012																												
2,926 <u>2,925</u>	Homes accepted in principle and homes planned at Amen Corner and Warfield																												
3,464 <u>3,886</u>	Remaining to be found																												
10,780 <u>11,139</u>	Total ⁽¹⁾																												
150 <u>280</u>	Small windfall allowance (30 per year, last 5 years only) <u>Small windfall allowance (20 per year over 14 years)</u>																												
1,635	Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)																												
361	Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements																												
1,442	Homes on land in existing settlements (previously developed land and other)																												
198	Homes on small sites on the edge of settlements																												
2,070	Homes on extensions to Bracknell or other larger settlements																												
3,896 <u>4,346</u>	<u>Total Homes on possible SALP sites⁽¹⁾</u>																												
460	<u>Number above 11,139 requirement</u>																												

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM4	47	Para 6.0.6	<p>An important element of delivery is to ensure that there is a continuous supply of land available for housing. In identifying the likely phasing <u>delivery</u> of sites (see supporting text to housing policies), account has been taken of the likely timescale for delivery bearing in mind availability of land and the need for any supporting infrastructure. and the need to prioritise previously developed land as far as is practicable in line with the Core Strategy. The rate of building will also be affected by market conditions and other external factors such as the number of developers involved in developing a site.</p> <p>Consideration has also been given to the need to to ensure that all sites are developable and to include a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable sites and to ensure that all sites are developable. <u>(including an appropriate buffer) until such time as a new Local Plan is adopted. The position on housing land supply will be re-assessed during the production of the new Local Plan.</u></p>
MM5	10	Map 1	<i>Replace Map 1 with amended version in Appendix A of attached Annex.</i>
MM6	66-73	Appendix 2	<i>Replace Appendix 2 with amended version in Appendix F of attached Annex.</i>
MM7	2	New para after 1.2.3	<u>Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework refers to the need for Local Plans to address the need for all types of housing and a cross reference is made to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). Following the publication of the PPTS, the Council is carrying out an assessment of travellers' accommodation needs. Relevant targets and the allocation of any required sites will be dealt with in the new Local Plan that is programmed in the Council's Local Development Scheme.</u>
MM8	38	Para 5.2.1	<p>To support the policies in the Site Allocations LPDPD, a number of amendments have been made to the settlement boundaries. <u>These amendments involve:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>housing sites previously located on the edge of settlement (see Policy SA3);</u> • <u>urban extensions; and,</u> • <u>the incorporation of a number of school buildings that were previously not considered part of the settlement but which in reality relate well to the built up area</u> <p>In particular, these include amendments to incorporate housing sites previously located on the edge of settlements (see Policy SA3). Additional amendments to the settlement boundaries include the incorporation of a number of school buildings that were previously not considered part of the settlement but which in reality relate well to the built up area</p>
MM9	38	Para 5.2.2	<p>To support the allocation of land for urban extensions, boundaries have been added to the Proposals Maps for the following sites:</p> <p><u>In addition to defining settlement boundaries for urban extensions that reflect the likely extent of buildings, the extent</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification																														
			<p>of land to be allocated has been added to the Policies Map for the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne (Policy SA4) • Land at Transport Research Laboratory <u>Laboratory</u>, Crowthorne (Policy SA5) • Land at Amen Corner North, Binfield (Policy SA6) • Land at Blue Mountain , Binfield (Policy SA7) 																														
MM10	38	Para 5.2.3	<p>Due to lack of detail about the precise location of buildings, it has not been possible to define settlement boundaries for these sites at this stage. This will be done through a future Development Plan Document.</p>																														
MM11	44	Policy SA13 (3)	<p>addition of allocated urban extension sites, <u>including associated settlement boundaries</u></p>																														
MM12	42	Table 3 Section 3	<p>3. Addition of boundaries marking the extent of land allocated as urban extensions <u>and amendments to settlement boundaries as a consequence of the allocation</u></p>																														
MM13	11	Policy SA1	<p>Policy SA1 Previously Developed Land in Defined Settlements</p> <p>The following sites (as shown on the <u>Policies Proposals Map</u>), are identified allocated for housing and should be developed in accordance with the requirements identified in respect of each site and all general policy considerations.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Address</th> <th>Estimated capacity (net dwellings)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road, Binfield</u></td> <td><u>33</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adastron House, Crowthorne Road, Bracknell</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Garth Hill School, Sandy Lane, Bracknell</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Depot (Commercial Centre), Bracknell Land West, Bracknell</td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Albert Road Car Park, Bracknell</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land north of Eastern Road, Bracknell</td> <td>325 <u>432</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Old Bracknell Lane West, Bracknell</td> <td>203</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chiltern House and the Redwood Building, Broad Lane, Bracknell</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell</u></td> <td><u>18</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Battle Bridge House, Warfield House and garage Forest Road, Warfield</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Iron Duke, Waterloo Place, Old Bakehouse Court, High Street, Crowthorne</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at School hill, Crowthorne (this was previously an SA2 site)</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td>983 <u>1,105</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)	Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield	65	<u>Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road, Binfield</u>	<u>33</u>	Adastron House, Crowthorne Road, Bracknell	18	Garth Hill School, Sandy Lane, Bracknell	100	The Depot (Commercial Centre), Bracknell Land West, Bracknell	115	Albert Road Car Park, Bracknell	40	Land north of Eastern Road, Bracknell	325 <u>432</u>	Land at Old Bracknell Lane West, Bracknell	203	Chiltern House and the Redwood Building, Broad Lane, Bracknell	71	<u>Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell</u>	<u>18</u>	Land at Battle Bridge House, Warfield House and garage Forest Road, Warfield	10	The Iron Duke, Waterloo Place, Old Bakehouse Court, High Street, Crowthorne	16	Land at School hill, Crowthorne (this was previously an SA2 site)	20	TOTAL	983 <u>1,105</u>
Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)																																
Farley Hall, London Road, Binfield	65																																
<u>Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road, Binfield</u>	<u>33</u>																																
Adastron House, Crowthorne Road, Bracknell	18																																
Garth Hill School, Sandy Lane, Bracknell	100																																
The Depot (Commercial Centre), Bracknell Land West, Bracknell	115																																
Albert Road Car Park, Bracknell	40																																
Land north of Eastern Road, Bracknell	325 <u>432</u>																																
Land at Old Bracknell Lane West, Bracknell	203																																
Chiltern House and the Redwood Building, Broad Lane, Bracknell	71																																
<u>Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell</u>	<u>18</u>																																
Land at Battle Bridge House, Warfield House and garage Forest Road, Warfield	10																																
The Iron Duke, Waterloo Place, Old Bakehouse Court, High Street, Crowthorne	16																																
Land at School hill, Crowthorne (this was previously an SA2 site)	20																																
TOTAL	983 <u>1,105</u>																																
MM14	41	Table 3 Section 2b	<p>Remove the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Iron Duke, Waterloo Place, Old Bakehouse Court, 																														

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification																
			<p>High Street, Crowthorne (SHLAA ref 286)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at School Hill, Crowthorne (SHLAA ref 113) 																
MM15	41	Table 3 Section 2b	<p>Add the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road, Binfield (SHLAA ref 319) Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell (SHLAA ref:320) 																
MM16	80,88	Appendix 3	Delete profiles and location plans for sites at Land at School Hill and Iron Duke Crowthorne																
MM17	90	Appendix 3	<p>Amend profile of site at land north of Eastern Road as follows:</p> <p>Capacity: 325 <u>432</u> net (based on 160dph) Site Area: 2.9ha <u>3.86ha</u> Developable Area: 2.03ha <u>2.7ha</u> for residential (as the site area is between 2-5ha, provision of some on-site open space is required, therefore 70% developable area)</p> <p>Replace plan with amended version in Appendix B of attached Annex.</p>																
MM18		Appendix 3	Add new site profiles for land at Binfield Nursery, Terrace Road, Binfield and Downside, Wildridings Road, Bracknell as shown in Appendix B of attached Annex.																
MM19	13	Policy SA2	<p>Policy SA2 Other Land within Defined Settlements</p> <p>The following sites (as shown on the Policies Proposals Map), are identified <u>allocated</u> for housing and should be developed in accordance with the requirements identified in respect of each site and all general policy considerations.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Address</th> <th>Estimated capacity (net dwellings)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Popeswood Garage, Hillcrest and Sundial Cottage, London Road, Binfield</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land north of Peacock Lane, Bracknell (Binfield Parish)</td> <td>147 <u>182</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Football Ground, Largess Lane, Bracknell</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land north of Cain Road, Binfield</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne</td> <td>145</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at 152 New Road, Winkfield</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td>495 <u>530</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)	Popeswood Garage, Hillcrest and Sundial Cottage, London Road, Binfield	14	Land north of Peacock Lane, Bracknell (Binfield Parish)	147 <u>182</u>	The Football Ground, Largess Lane, Bracknell	102	Land north of Cain Road, Binfield	75	Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne	145	Land at 152 New Road, Winkfield	12	TOTAL	495 <u>530</u>
Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)																		
Popeswood Garage, Hillcrest and Sundial Cottage, London Road, Binfield	14																		
Land north of Peacock Lane, Bracknell (Binfield Parish)	147 <u>182</u>																		
The Football Ground, Largess Lane, Bracknell	102																		
Land north of Cain Road, Binfield	75																		
Land at Cricket Field Grove, Crowthorne	145																		
Land at 152 New Road, Winkfield	12																		
TOTAL	495 <u>530</u>																		
MM20	106	Appendix 4	<p>Amend profile of site at land north of Peacock Lane as follows:</p> <p>Capacity: 147 <u>182</u> net (based on 70dph 160dph) Site Area: Gross site area us 2.6ha Developable Area: <u>2.6ha</u> 2.1ha There is a need to safeguard 0.5ha of land for small business units. Ordinarily, there would be a requirement for on-site open space, however, given the proximity of the site to the Jennetts Park country park (and given that the wider Jennetts Park is under delivering by 150 units: 1,350 instead of up to 1500), it is considered that the</p>																

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification																				
			country park would provide mitigation in terms of open space provision, therefore, 100% of the developable area can be assumed.																				
MM21	14	Policy SA3	<p>Policy SA3 Edge of Settlement Sites</p> <p>The following sites (as shown on the <u>Policies Proposals Map</u>), are identified <u>allocated</u> for housing and should be developed in accordance with the requirements identified in respect of each site and all general policy considerations.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Address</th> <th>Estimated capacity (net dwellings)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Land at Wood Lane, Binfield</u></td> <td><u>20</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne</u></td> <td><u>23</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Land West of Alford Close, Sandhurst</u></td> <td><u>120</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sandbanks, Longhill Road and Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Winkfield</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bog Lane, Winkfield</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td><u>198 361</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)	Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield	67	Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield	26	<u>Land at Wood Lane, Binfield</u>	<u>20</u>	White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne	16	<u>Land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>Land West of Alford Close, Sandhurst</u>	<u>120</u>	Sandbanks, Longhill Road and Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Winkfield	49	Bog Lane, Winkfield	40	TOTAL	<u>198 361</u>
Address	Estimated capacity (net dwellings)																						
Land east of Murrell Hill Lane, south of Foxley Lane and north of September Cottage, Binfield	67																						
Land at junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane, Binfield	26																						
<u>Land at Wood Lane, Binfield</u>	<u>20</u>																						
White Cairn, Dukes Ride, Crowthorne	16																						
<u>Land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne</u>	<u>23</u>																						
<u>Land West of Alford Close, Sandhurst</u>	<u>120</u>																						
Sandbanks, Longhill Road and Dolyhir, Fern Bungalow and Palm Hills Estate, London Road, Winkfield	49																						
Bog Lane, Winkfield	40																						
TOTAL	<u>198 361</u>																						
MM22	41	Table 3 Section 1b and 2a	<p><i>Add the following sites:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Land at Wood Lane, Binfield (SHLAA ref 20)</u> • <u>Land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne (SHLAA ref. 302)</u> • <u>Land west of Alford Close, Sandhurst (SHLAA ref 315)</u> 																				
MM23		Appendix 5	<i>Add new site profiles for: land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne; land west of Alford Close, Sandhurst; and land at Wood Lane, Binfield as shown in Appendix C of attached Annex.</i>																				
MM24		Appendix 7	<i>Add new settlement boundaries for: land south of Dukes Ride, Crowthorne; land west of Alford Close, Sandhurst; and land at Wood Lane, Binfield as shown in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>																				
MM25	116	Appendix 5	<p><i>Include the following additional bullet point to the list of requirements in Bog Lane site profile:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Potential impacts on amenity for future occupiers of proposed development must be considered and assessed, including an appraisal of existing odour, noise and lighting from Ascot Sewage Treatment Works and its potential impact on future occupiers of the proposed development.</u> 																				
MM26	15	Policy SA4 3 rd and 13 th bullets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>60 retirement apartments (including affordable housing) outside the walled garden and outside the 400m buffer to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection area (SPA) (the final number to be subject to further consideration of the impacts on the heritage assets of the site and the justification for the</u> 																				

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>development including the needs of the Listed Building).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), in agreement with the Council and Natural England. This will include provision in perpetuity of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on-site bespoke SANG significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 new population; a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring; and any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths (SPA) SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance
MM27	17	Map 2	<i>Delete Map 2 and replace with version in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i>
MM28	128	Appendix 7 Map 32	<i>Delete Map 32 and replace with version in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>
MM29	35	Section 3.3	<p><i>New paragraphs to be added after paragraph 3.3.1:</i></p> <p><u>The Broadmoor Hospital site was also one such designation, but the designation is now being removed from the site, due to the inclusion of the area within Policy SA4 allocating the site as an urban extension for mixed use development. The part of the site which related to Policy E12 will now be included within the defined settlement area. The site will therefore retain an employment designation but it will be under Core Strategy Policies CS19 and CS20 which apply within settlements.</u></p> <p><u>As a result of the Policy E12 designation being removed from both the TRL and Broadmoor sites, Policy E12 is superseded by the SALP, as the only Policy E12 notations on the Policies Map relate to Crowthorne Business Estate and Broadmoor.</u></p>
MM30	39	Para 5.2.5	<p>To support the delivery of housing and to reflect evidence of an over supply of offices, a number of changes have been made to the boundaries of defined employment areas and one identified major employment sites. (Crowthorne Business Estate) has been deleted. <u>As the identified major employment area for Broadmoor is now shown within the defined settlement, the notation for an 'identified major employment site' has been removed and replaced with a 'defined employment area' designation.</u> A new policy boundary is shown for the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst (to support Policy SA11).</p>
MM31	43	Table 3 Section 4	<p><i>Add the following:</i></p> <p><u>Broadmoor (to take account of the allocation in Policy SA4, and reflect that the employment area is now located within the defined settlement)</u></p>
MM32	43	Table 3 Section 5	<p><i>Add the following:</i></p> <p><u>Broadmoor – removal of designation as an 'Identified Major</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification						
			<u>Employment site' (Policies Map 4)</u>						
MM33	64	Appendix 1	<p><i>Delete Appendix 1 and add the following:</i></p> <p><u>Replacement of Policies in Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan by Site Allocations Policies:</u></p> <p><u>The following table identifies which previously saved policies in the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan 2002 have been replaced by Policies in the Site Allocations Local Plan:</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="620 616 1495 878"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="620 616 1059 683"><u>Local Plan Policy to be replaced</u></th> <th data-bbox="1059 616 1495 683"><u>Relevant SALP Policy</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="620 683 1059 750"><u>E12 - identified major employment sites</u></td> <td data-bbox="1059 683 1495 750"><u>SA4 - Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="620 750 1059 878"></td> <td data-bbox="1059 750 1495 878"><u>SA5 - Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Local Plan Policy to be replaced</u>	<u>Relevant SALP Policy</u>	<u>E12 - identified major employment sites</u>	<u>SA4 - Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne</u>		<u>SA5 - Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne</u>
<u>Local Plan Policy to be replaced</u>	<u>Relevant SALP Policy</u>								
<u>E12 - identified major employment sites</u>	<u>SA4 - Land at Broadmoor, Crowthorne</u>								
	<u>SA5 - Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne</u>								
MM34	4	Para 1.2.14	<p>Developments of less than 109 (net) dwellings will be required to make financial contributions towards existing SANG and SAMP and take any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitats Regulations, the Council's Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance. Developments of 109 (net) dwellings or more will be required to provide a bespoke SANG in perpetuity of at least 8ha per 1,000 new population as well as the other measures identified above. A bespoke SANG must be in place and available for use for the occupants of the new development before the first new dwelling is occupied. Where a scheme is developed in phases, each phase of SANG would need to meet quantitative and qualitative criteria as set out in the Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. <u>Bespoke SANG packages will need to be agreed with the Council and Natural England.</u></p>						
MM35	19	Policy SA5	<p>Policy SA 5 Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne</p> <p>Land at the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), Crowthorne as shown on the Policies Proposals-Map and illustrative Concept Plan is identified <u>allocated</u> for a comprehensive well designed mixed-use development that maintains a buffer gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1,000 residential units (including affordable housing) located outside of the 400m buffer to the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). ○ Neighbourhood centre. ○ Primary School. ○ Multi-functional community hub. ○ Care home/nursing home. ○ A replacement for the existing enterprise centre for small and new businesses, (unless a better alternative site can be 						

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>found elsewhere)-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A depot site (to enable the redevelopment of the Council's existing depot site in Bracknell). o Provision of green routes along Nine Mile Ride and Old Wokingham Road o On-site open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). o <u>Maintenance of a gap between Crowthorne and Bracknell (comprising on-site open space and/or SANG)</u> <p>The infrastructure required to support this development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A comprehensive package of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. o On-site in-kind provision of waste recycling facilities. o On-site in-kind provision of a Primary School, on sufficient land to allow expansion. o Financial contributions towards the provision of Secondary School and Special Educational Needs places. o On-site in-kind provision of a multi-functional community hub, on sufficient land to allow expansion. o Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath <u>SPA Special Protection Area (SPA), in agreement with the Council and Natural England</u>. This will include provision in perpetuity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of on-site bespoke SANG significantly in excess of 8ha per 1,000 new population; • a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring; and • any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance. o A comprehensive package of on-site, in-kind Open Space of Public Value, in accordance with standards. o Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way. o Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems. o Provision of Green Infrastructure (in addition to elements listed above). <p>The above is not a comprehensive list of requirements. Further details of other mitigation required can be found in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
MM36	21	Map 3	<p><i>Delete Map 3 and replace with version in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i></p> <p><i>Add the following text below Map 3:</i></p> <p><u>Note: The final layout of the site will be influenced, amongst other matters, by a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment.</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM37	129	Appendix 7 Map 33	<i>Delete Map 33 and replace with version in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>
MM38	49	Table 4	Land at Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne Provision of an Enterprise Centre Completion of Development in line with agreed phasing plan and conditions of planning permission.
MM39	23	Policy SA6	<p>Policy SA6 Land at Amen Corner North, Binfield</p> <p>Land at Amen Corner North as shown on the <u>Policies Proposals Map and Illustrative Concept Plan</u> is identified <u>allocated</u> for a comprehensive well designed development that maintains a <u>buffer gap</u> between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 400 residential units (including affordable housing). • On-site open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). • <u>Maintenance of a gap between Binfield, Wokingham and Bracknell (comprising on-site open space and/or SANG)</u> <p>The infrastructure required to support this development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. • On-site in-kind provision of a waste recycling facility. • Financial contributions towards the provision of Primary School, Secondary School and Special Educational Needs places. • Off-site in-kind provision or financial contributions towards a multi-functional community hub. • Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), <u>in agreement with the Council and Natural England</u>. This will include provision in perpetuity of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a bespoke SANG of at least 8ha per 1,000 new population; ▪ a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring; and ▪ any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance. • A comprehensive package of on-site, in-kind Open Space of Public Value, in accordance with standards. • Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way. • Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems. • Provision of Green Infrastructure (in addition to elements listed above). <p>The above is not a comprehensive list of requirements. Further details of other mitigation required can be found in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM40	24	Map 4	<i>Delete Map 4 and replace with version in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i>
MM41	130	Appendix 7 Map 34	<i>Delete Map 34 and replace with version in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>
MM42	26	Policy SA7	<p>Policy SA7 Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield</p> <p>Land at Blue Mountain Binfield as shown on the proposals <u>Policies Map and Illustrative Concept Plan</u> is identified <u>allocated</u> for a comprehensive well designed mixed-use development that maintains a <u>buffer gap</u> between Binfield and Bracknell, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 400 residential units (including affordable housing). • Land for a range of educational facilities, include Primary, Secondary and Special • Education Needs. • Multi-functional community hub. • A new football ground. • <u>Maintenance of a gap between Binfield and Bracknell (comprising on-site open space and/or SANG)</u> • On-site open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). <p>The infrastructure required to support this development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. • On-site in-kind provision of a waste recycling facility. • <u>Provision of land and F-financial contributions towards on-site Primary School, Secondary School and Special Educational Needs places.</u> • In-kind provision, or financial contributions towards an on-site multi-functional community hub, including land set aside for the delivery of a Full Daycare Nursery. • Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), <u>in agreement with the Council and Natural England</u>. This will include provision in perpetuity of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ on-site bespoke SANG of at least 8ha per 1,000 new population; 7 ○ a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring; and ○ any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance. • A comprehensive package of on-site, in-kind Open Space of Public Value, in accordance with standards. • Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way. • Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems. • Provision of Green Infrastructure (in addition to elements

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>listed above)</p> <p>The above is not a comprehensive list of requirements. Further details of other mitigation required can be found in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
MM43	28	Map 5	<i>Delete Map 5 and replace with version in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i>
MM44	131	Appendix 7 Map 35	<i>Delete Map 35 and replace with version in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>
MM45	30-31	Policy SA8	<p>Policy SA8 Land at Amen Corner (south) Binfield</p> <p>Land at Amen Corner South, Binfield as shown on the Proposals Policies <u>Map</u> is identified <u>allocated</u> for a comprehensive well designed mixed-use development <u>that maintains a gap between Wokingham and Bracknell</u>, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 725 residential units (including affordable housing). • Employment. • Neighbourhood Centre. • Primary School. • On-site open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). <p>The infrastructure required to support this development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on- and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. • A new spine road linking London Road and the Beehive Road/John Nike Way junction to provide a single access for all the development allocated in this policy. • On-site in-kind provision of a waste recycling facility. • On-site in-kind provision of a Primary School, on sufficient land to allow expansion. Financial contributions towards the provision of Secondary School and Special Educational Needs places. • In-kind provision or financial contributions towards the enhancement and expansion of the Farley Wood community centre into a multi-functional community hub. • Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), <u>in agreement with the Council and Natural England</u>. This will include provision in perpetuity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of on-site and off-site bespoke SANG of at least 8ha per 1,000 new population; <u>7</u> • a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring; <u>and</u> • any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on-site, in-kind Open Space of Public Value, in accordance with standards. • Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way. • Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems. • Provision of Green Infrastructure (in addition to elements listed above). <p>The above is not a comprehensive list of requirements. Further details of other matters including mitigation required can be found in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Amen Corner Supplementary Planning Document and/or any other relevant guidance.</p>
MM46		Section 2.5	<i>Add new Map 6 as set out in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i>
MM47	32	Policy SA9	<p>Policy SA9 Land at Warfield</p> <p>Land at Warfield, as shown on the Proposals <u>Policies</u> Map is identified <u>allocated</u> for a comprehensive well designed mixed-use development, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,200 residential units (including affordable housing). • Employment. • Neighbourhood centre. • Two Primary Schools. • Multi-functional community hub. • On-site open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). <p>The infrastructure required to support this development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. • A new north-south spine road linking the Quelm Park roundabout and the Three Legged Cross junction, unless an alternative solution is agreed with the Council. • On-site in-kind provision of waste recycling facilities. • On-site in-kind provision of two Primary Schools. • Financial contributions towards the provision of Secondary School and Special Educational Needs places. • On-site in-kind provision of a multi-functional community hub, including land set aside for the delivery of a Full Daycare Nursery • Measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), <u>in agreement with the Council and Natural England</u>. This will include provision in perpetuity of on-site bespoke SANG of at least 8ha per 1,000 new population. The preferred solution is for a SANG at Cabbage Hill. Part of the solution could be off-site subject to agreement with the Council <u>and</u> Natural England, <u>and</u> passing an Appropriate Assessment. Further <u>in perpetuity</u> requirements include a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring and any other measures that are required to

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>satisfy Habitat Regulations, the Council's Thames Basins Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive package of on-site, in-kind Open Space of Public Value, in accordance with standards. • Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way • Integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems. • Provision of Green Infrastructure (in addition to elements listed above). <p>The above is not a comprehensive list of requirements. Further details of other <u>matters including</u> mitigation required can be found in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Warfield Supplementary Planning Document and/or any other relevant guidance.</p> <p><u>Prior to the submission of a planning application for any part of the site, masterplans will be prepared by the developer(s) and agreed with the Council in accordance with the requirements of Policy SA9, Core Strategy Policy CS5 and the Warfield Supplementary Planning Document unless otherwise agreed with the Council. Once agreed by the Council they will be an important material planning consideration in the determination of subsequent planning applications.</u></p>
MM48		Section 2.5	<i>Add new Map 7 as set out in Appendix D of attached Annex.</i>
MM49	132	Appendix 7 Map 36	<i>Delete Map 36 and replace with version in Appendix E of attached Annex.</i>