

Response from Binfield Village Protection Society to the Bracknell Forest LDF CS SADPD Preferred Options Stage 3, 17th January, 2011.

Submitted by:

E. Margaret Foster, Southfield, St Mark's Rd., Binfield, Bracknell, Berks., RG43 4AT

Introduction.

I write on behalf of the Committee and Members of the Binfield Village Protection Society and on behalf of myself as the BVPS Chairperson. Many of our present Members and some of our Committee members have been associated with the BVPS since its inception in 1975.

The BVPS is a small pressure group which was established to protect the rural setting of the community of Binfield: to prevent where possible large inappropriate developments both within the established settlement and outside the settlement boundary in the countryside: and to keep the identity of the village distinct by preventing urban sprawl and the coalescence of Binfield Village and Bracknell Town. In recent times even the strategic gaps between Bracknell, which includes Binfield, and Wokingham has been under threat from within the Borough boundary at Amen Corner, now known as Amen Corner South and without the boundary with the late processing of Wokingham Borough Council's Local Development Framework.

All these objectives underlie all our objections to every part of the BFC LDF CS Site Allocations Development Plan Document Preferred Options which refer to the settlement areas in the parish of Binfield and the countryside around the settlement areas within the Bracknell Forest Council boundary.

Objections to Bracknell Forest LDFCS SADPDPO Stage 3 January, 2011.

1.1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose and structure of the document

1.1.1., 1.1.2., 1.1.3., 1.1.4., Noted.

1.2. Objectives and sub-objectives

Binfield Village Protection Society cannot see enough appropriate options in the Stage 3 SADPDPO to identify sufficient possible trade offs for the benefit of the Binfield residents. Cutting areas of possible development out of the original Stage1 document by half, doubles the impact of all the proposals put forward for Binfield with no room or alternatives elsewhere in the Borough for mitigation, because "elsewhere in the Borough" has been kept out of the Stage 3 document.

Binfield Village Protection Society

2.1 Approach to housing.

2.1.1., 2.1.2., 2.1.3., 2.1.4., 2.1.5.,

Binfield Village Protection Society has always been aware that former governments and previous legislation have expected the identification of five years land supply for housing building from (all) Boroughs. The present consultation paper appears to have confused this requirement with some very questionable numbers. These numbers are based on old and rapidly changing social conditions and needs, (size of families, numbers of known immigrants, previous economic conditions of easy borrowing of money and full employment) All statistics such as for example population changes, including in this locality, an increasingly larger group of ageing citizens, employment opportunities, economic growth, and all other infrastructure such as schools, transport and health facilities need addressing and figures and requirements need updating to give any validity to the number of houses required for now and the future in the Bracknell Forest Borough. The unsolved economic downturn, the new government and the new proposals for planning legislation must have some bearing on the proposed housing numbers from now until 2026.

2.2 Sites in defined settlements **SADPDPO Policy SA1 and SA2**

All these sites, p.5 and p.6 appear suitable for development

2.3 Edge of settlement sites. **SADPDPO Policy SA3**

There are two proposed edge of settlement sites in this SADPDPO. Both proposals give cause for concern to the Binfield Village Protection Society and the residents.

There are many objections to each site.

1. Land East of Murrell Hill Lane, South of Foxley Lane and North of September Cottage, Binfield.

- This site is outside the settlement boundary abutting open countryside of gentle sloping fields, copses, woods and well-wooded hedgerows. There is a well-established public footpath in the countryside opposite and the landowner opens up the woodland and copses when the bluebells appear
- There is a variety of flora and fauna in this setting. There will be badgers but their whereabouts and setts are not known to the general public. Deer, grazing and resting in the fields that make up this site, add to the natural beauty of this site.
- In 1998 Murrell Hill Lane was converted to pedestrian and cycle ways only. It is now part of the Bracknell Horse Riders and Walkers circular route way.
- There is access to Popes Meadow from Murrell Hill Lane. Popes Meadow is a popular dog-walking parkland for people through-out the Borough.
- Popes Meadow is on a long-term lease from the owners of Popes Manor which is one of the many listed buildings in Binfield and which stands at the entrance to Murrell Hill Lane at the London Road junction. To turn into Murrell Hill Lane at this junction is a joy. Mature trees from the parkland of Popes Manor to the

Binfield Village Protection Society

east of the lane and open grassland with black sheep grazing to the southwest of the lane are landmarks of the countryside which must be protected from urbanization for the rest of this century.

(No pavements, no intrusive "signing" !)

- Development on this site would severely harm the visual character of this area. There would be a significant loss of green space which the implementation of SANGS could never come anywhere near to replacing
- The BVPS has thought for some time that this small and understated amenity could be put forward as part of a potential conservation area of Binfield Village and the Borough.
- There have been a number of applications to build on this site since 1957. The last one in 1999/ 2000 was dismissed on appeal when the Inspector, T.J. Wright, ARICS, in May 2000, stated that "development of houses ... would amount to a harmful extension of the village of Binfield into the rural surroundings."
- In some documents the site is regarded as sustainable with good access to services. It isn't. The two class-entry village school has four classes (two year groups) in terrapins. The Surgery needs a car journey. The main road is congested at rush hour and a possible exit for cars into Foxley Lane would need extensive and costly improvements. The station is in the middle of Bracknell (four miles away) and the Bus Service has had a chequered history
- Development on this site would contribute to the erosion of the countryside between Bracknell and Wokingham and add to the threat of the elimination of the Strategic Gap between Bracknell (and Binfield) and Wokingham.
- There is a threat of flooding owing to the preponderance of clay on either side of Murrell Hill Lane and the gently sloping landscape of the fields. The lane runs down from Foxley Lane and up to the London Road. House building on this site would exacerbate the possibility of flooding.
- In a copy of an e-mail to Max Baker on 30th March 2010, Ref: LH278533 Natural England, wrote, amongst very specific guidance on open space and the importance of conserving, protecting and enhancing green spaces in urban areas, "regards the need to consider delivery of open spaces as an essential part of the development proposal process." Using open space for building is contrary to this advice and guidance.
- The Inspector, Richard E. Hollox in Volume II, Chapter 7 (Recreation, Leisure and Tourism) of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan at the Inquiry in Public in October 1999, 7.1 Policy R1 Loss of Open Space of Public Value.

"Inspector's Conclusions. 7.1.1., 7.1.2., 7.1.3., 7.1.4., and 7.1.5. and through to the final recommendation 7.1.17. ... its public value derives from its contribution to the recreational needs of the community and /or from that which its openness makes to character and appearance of the locality, and hence to the quality of urban life. "

Where ever it lies, in town or countryside this site should be protected from development and should not be included in any Preferred Options of Site Allocations of the BFC LDF CS Stage4.

Binfield Village Protection Society

Legislation with strong policies on development in rural areas can be found in

- **The Berkshire Structure Plan 2005 Policy DP6 Land outside Settlements : 1 Land outside settlements will be safeguarded for its own sake as a non-renewable natural resource**
- **Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan Jan. 2002 Policy EN 8**
- **BFBC LDF Core Strategy CS9**
- **BFBC Character Area Assessment of Binfield 2010**
- **BFBC Possible Nominee for a Binfield Conservation Area. 2010/11**

Somewhere in this consultative process, residents were asked for alternative opinions and ideas (for sites). This may have been for housing only but BVPS have always thought that if sufficient monies could be found this site could be made available for a new Park for the village - Monies for example from 106 that other areas of development had gained but were never allowed to use; BFC reserves and SANGS; Parish Council grants, CABE sources, Natural England, Access to Nature grants, other lottery grants. And so on.

2. Land at the junction of Forest Road and Foxley Lane. SA3 cont.

It is now widely known that a planning application to building 22 dwellings on this site was placed in the Planning and Transport section of the Bracknell Forest Council Environment, Culture and Communities at the same time as this site was included in the BFC LDF CS SADPDPO by the Spatial Policy Development Plan Team to be considered as a Preferred Options site. This would be a similar outline plan but for 33 houses. Both plans would include Affordable Housing

The proposal of the Planning Application, ref 10/0070/OUT was for an outline application for the erection of 22 dwellings with associated garages, access roads, footpaths and open spaces. Exits would be for cars on to the Forest Road and for Pedestrians only on to the cul-de-sac in Foxley Fields clearly marked as Roughgrove Copse.

Nearly 50 letters (by e-mail) were sent to BFC objecting to the first planning application and that included the Parish Council, BVPS, village residents who were members of NAAG, all the residents in Roughgrove Copse and others from Foxley Fields and Foxley Lane.

BVPS wrote with the Parish Council that it was thought that the first application was premature. In due course the Officers in Planning and Transportation let it be known that any objections received before the closing date of the SADPDPO consultation period i.e. 17.01. 2011., would be considered as valid for purposes of public consultation of the SADPDPO Stage3, which was a welcome decision.

Nevertheless BVPS wishes its objections be also noted in this submission to the consultation on Stage 3 of BFC LDF CS SADPDPO.

Binfield Village Protection Society

"I write on behalf of the members of the Binfield Village Protection Society with several objections to this application to build on this site, formerly referred to as Three Firs.

"This application is premature to the end of the BFC LDF SADPD Preferred Option public consultation and the publication of the document that comes out of this consultation process. It has been put forward in the Site Allocations document and this proposal should not be considered as a normal application seeking approval during the consultation process. Obviously it is useful to the Development Plan Team working towards the development of BFC Spatial Policy to know that a developer is interested in this site but if the officers of the Planning and Transport Team and the elected members of BFC accept this application at this point in time it undermines the Senior Planning Officer's long held principle of planning-led development not developer-led development. This cannot be an appropriate time to consider this application and it should be refused."

The letter continues ...

"In order to ensure that this application is given adequate consideration before it is refused, I wish to put forward several objections.

A previous Outline Application for this Location, known at the time as "Three Firs", was rejected at Appeal in January 1997 and I refer you to the response of the Planning Inspector dated 6th January 1997 : reference T/APP/C0305/A/96/268217/P7. The grounds for the Inspector's dismissal are valid today and this application should be refused on those grounds. The Inspector confirmed that "the site was outside the settlement boundary and that Bracknell Forest Borough Council was correct in refusing the application."

In 1997 the rural aspect of this part of the approach into Binfield was regarded as important and the Inspector said that "the building of houses would give a hard edge to the outline of the village." The tree-softened rural edge is still present and should be maintained. In paragraph 6 and 10 of the Inspector's decision in 1997 is ... "The proposal would not only harm the local rural character but, in my judgement, would particularly spoil the relationship between the settlement and the landscape".

On 18th June 2003 BFBC refused an application (03/00420/OUT) by Beaulieu Homes to build on land adjacent to this site, at Crix, Forest Rd., Binfield, because it was also outside the settlement boundary. When the applicant went to appeal on this decision the Inspector upheld the refusal of BFBC to this application."

Objections put forward in May/June 2003 by the Parish Council over Crix **are pertinent for today's proposal** that the "Three Firs" site on land between Forest Road (wets) and Foxley Lane, Binfield is a preferred options site in the SADPD Stage 3 and **support the BVPS' proposal that it should not be included in the Stage 4 public consultation of of the BFC LDF CS SADPD in the Spring of 2011.**

- This property is outside the settlement boundaries and the proposed development satisfies none of the permitted development in the BFBLP Saved Policy EN 8. Development would affect the character and appearance of the land.

Binfield Village Protection Society

- New dwellings are considered under BFBCLP Saved Policy H5 and this development satisfies none of the exceptions listed, especially (ii) " it would result in no environmental damage, or any inconvenience or danger on the public highway"
- The Forest Rd is a pleasantly rural entrance to that part of Binfield (West) and indeed to Bracknell. It is straight and mostly quiet. However it is not always that safe. Exits off the proposed site on to Forest Rd., could be dangerous and would have to be carefully created and speed controls implemented which once again affects the rural aspect of this entrance to Bracknell. "The placing of any exit from this site would be close to the junction with Foxley Lane and outside the restricted zone. "
- There would be considerable impact on residents in the properties to the rear of the site in Roughgrove Copse. Recent designs of modern housing have been built as "two-and-an-half storey" houses and if these were included in a development of this nature they overlook neighbours front entrances in an already secluded cul-de-sac: or the back gardens in a well designed and long established housing development.
- There would be pressure on the medical and educational services with no mitigation from this development to enhance these services. The chequered history of public transport in Binfield gives little hope that the infrastructure around the development on this site will add little to its sustainability.
- T.P.O.s should be placed on the trees in this site immediately.
- It is important to add to this consultation response in January 2011, the comments of Inspector, Mr T.J. Wright ARICS, in January, 1997 when he turned down the appeal to the refusal of BFBC to the original application:

"10. Insofar as Policy H4 of the North Bracknell Local Plan is nevertheless to be reckoned with, I am not convinced that the appeal proposal fulfils its criteria in relation to its rounding off outside settlement boundaries. The proposals would not only harm the local rural character but in my judgement would particularly spoil the relationship between the settlement and the landscape. I say this because, as the Council point out, the sight presents a soft edge to the settlement in its undeveloped state, when viewed from Foxley Lane and Forest Road., which would be hardened by ..." the housing development envisaged in the years ahead. (2014 - 2026)"

- I commend to this consultation a document of a resident, Mr C.'s i.e. an objection letter of 29.11.2010 which provides personal evidence of constant and irritating flooding in and near his property in Foxley Lane.

Including this site in a future Stage 4 of another SADPDPO may be accordance with the BFBC LDF Core Strategy CS16 and CS17 i.e. the Housing Needs of the Community, it is, however, at odds with the policies CS6 and CS7. Developing this site for housing is contrary to the Bracknell Forest Core Strategy **CS1, sustainability; CS2 Location principles; CS6 Limiting the impact of development: and CS7 Design and Policy CS23 where the application does not increase the safety of transport.**

Planning legislation listed on page 4 above have some importance when considering this site as a preferred option in the next consultation Stage 4

2.4 New urban extensions

2.4.1. There are four new urban extensions proposed in the BFBC LDF CS SADPDPO December 2010 – January 2011. Two are in Binfield. BVPS objects strongly to both sites being put forward as preferred options in the latest consultation process of the SADPD.

Amen Corner North, Binfield.

SADPDPO, POLICY SA6.

The proposal by Bracknell Forest Council in the consultation document, SADPDPO, Stage 3, to put new development i.e. 400 houses, on the land now called Amen Corner North, **does not conform with the BFC LDF Core Strategy.**

On page 24 of the BFC Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Adopted in February 2008 as part of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Development Framework has four paragraphs extolling the function of **GAPS and their importance in planning policies.**

"One of the functions of the countryside is to help preserve the physical and visual separation of settlements by protecting the rural elements between them. The more effective of these areas, those which prevent the coalescence of significant settlements with particular identities, are called Gaps." BFC LDF CS paragraph 119, page 24

The importance, recognition and significance of the Strategic Gap between Bracknell and Wokingham and between Wokingham and Binfield has been part of the Berkshire Structure Plan since its inception. Following the review of the Berkshire Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 and its adoption in July 2005 **Policy DP7: Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges** stated:-

1. The councils will preserve the setting and separate identity of settlements and protected areas of open countryside which penetrates urban areas and provides access to the countryside for residents of urban areas. These will be achieved by the identification and maintenance of Gaps and Green Wedges.

2. Local Gaps will be identified in Local Plans where there is a need:
(i) to protect the setting and identity of settlements and avoid their coalescence

...

(iii) to retain the openness of an area

...

This appears to the BVPS to confirm paragraphs 119, 120, 121, ..., 123 in Policy CS9 of Core Strategy Development Plan Document as said above. As seen, this land, now known as Amen Corner North, Binfield, prevents coalescence of the settlements, Binfield, Bracknell and Wokingham and is open countryside which should be retained "just because it is there". It is interesting that a small, local, voluntary pressure group

Binfield Village Protection Society

should be defending the countryside after 37 years. Binfield Village Protection Society is still prepared to defend the countryside by rigorously objecting to inappropriate development, on sound planning grounds.:- **BSP 2005; BFBLP 2002; BFBC LDF CS 2008**

An indication of how important the proposed site of open countryside was in preventing coalescence between settlements was seen when in 1994 when the business enterprise, **Terry Adams Ltd., appealed** in front of the Inspector against Bracknell Forest Borough Council's refusal to allow " an application to extract soft sand and soft sand and gravel followed by land filling ... with progressive restoration to pastureland " , **the appeal was turned down.**

The Inspector, Robert Neil Parry, BA DIPTP MRTPI, wrote :-

"38. Having considered carefully the evidence and submissions ... Mr Parry had to consider whether or not there was any justification in "disturbing a stretch of sensitive countryside which numerous policies in the development plan and other emerging documents aim to protect. In effect this is the exercise anticipated in Policy M5 in the RSPB and Policy 7 in the DRMLP ". " ... the fact that the appeal site is located in a strategic gap is not the only matter to weigh against the proposal." However " Other concerns ... and other matters ..." " are subservient to the "need" relative to the strategic gap issue." "... with these points uppermost in my mind I am not persuaded that the benefit of obtaining aggregate justifies disturbing the strategic gap separating Wokingham from Bracknell and Binfield contrary to well established planning policies. I would add that in my view the protection of the strategic gap is an interest of acknowledged importance which should not be set aside lightly" The appeal was dismissed. The Strategic Gap between Wokingham and Bracknell and Wokingham and Binfield can still not be "set aside lightly "

The present possibility of the coalescence of Bracknell Forest Borough and Wokingham Borough is exacerbated by the late processing of Wokingham Borough's processing and adoption of their Local Development Framework Core Strategy which has placed 2000+ house right up to the boundaries of the two Boroughs. BVPS are of the opinion that the professional planners of Bracknell Forest Council should have been aware of this recent and tardy execution of the planning process by a neighbouring Borough and should have warned the elected members of the BFC of the possible result and advised immediate consultation with all the bodies associated with this process in the two Boroughs in order that these oppressive and inappropriate proposals should not be approved or allowed. Modification at least to equal Bracknell's proposals should have been considered and discussed at length.

BVPS has been assured that the MPs of Wokingham, Bracknell and Windsor and Maidenhead have all expressed concern about this possible coalescence out of this process of Local Development Frameworks and that it has been discussed for some time. Sadly there is a lot of "shutting the stable door ... " over this issue and leads to very strong objections to this site being considered for housing development by the Binfield Village Protection Society. It should be left out of Stage 4 of the BFC LDF CS SADPDPO.

BVPS includes in this submission the recommendations of the Executive Summary of **Entac** who in their Final Report in August 2006 to BFBC said :-

Binfield Village Protection Society

- Further and more detailed analysis is required of individual applications to access the landscape and visual effects.
- Consideration should be given to the preparation of guidance about how development may be best accommodated in each of the character areas
- **Opportunity for wider consultation should be harnessed as appropriate** and
- Care should be taken that capacity assessment should not preclude appropriate, well designed development that would strengthen the character of a landscape.

BVPS was not going to enter into a discussion about the total appropriateness the public participation of the LGF from the beginning and the successful execution of this Stage of the SADPDPO in this submission; however somewhere BFBC asks for alternative suggestions to the proposals put. This might be the time to suggest alternative ideas and BVPS considered that **the last point of ENTAC's recommendations** might have some value in future consultations

In these early discussion documents there is no indication of what these developments will look like. BVPS members **find it difficult to imagine 400 houses improving the openness of the landscape** of the area now called the Amen Corner North, Binfield proposed site i.e. **SA 6**. 400 houses can only destroy the open characteristics' of this part of Binfield's surrounding countryside. Perhaps architects' drawings should be included with the detailed infrastructure items and the Illustrative Concept Plan in a consultation document of this nature.

Not that it would dissuade the BVPS from objecting to this particular proposal.

The highlighted **Item 3** in the **Entac** recommendations above is supporting BVPS comments in the previous two paragraphs above and could lead to better alternative sites or at least prevent huge inappropriate development as may yet occur in Wokingham up to Bracknell Forest's boundary creating coalescence of settlements and erosion of simple but sensitive countryside.

Infrastructure:

Many of the items of the proposed infrastructure listed on page 14 of the SADPDPO, Stage 3, reflect, interestingly those already set down in the allocation of Amen Corner (South) (CS Policy CS4) Urban Extension Policy SA8 which the BVPS supported and to a certain extent, enhanced. BVPS notified the Spatial Policy Planning Team of the day of the omissions of some very well established footpaths and of the inappropriateness of the size of primary school proposed. BVPS suggested in discussion that a Children's Centre should be considered and Item 9 in this SADPDPO **SA6** is "A bespoke Children's Centre for Early Years. " An interesting conclusion.

- Unfortunately Item I Infrastructure of Policy SA 6 has a **"High risk of not proceeding "**. (**Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options (Consultation Draft) (6.3 Amen Corner North, Binfield. p.151)**)

Binfield Village Protection Society

- The requirement of delivering improved Local Road Networks is critical (now) and has a low risk of not proceeding (p.151 of the document above.)
- Improved Public Transport which is seen as "necessary" has a medium risk of not proceeding but the "preferred" Community Transport has a high risk of not proceeding.
- It is hoped that having gone to the trouble and expense of an IDP that the Bracknell Forest Borough Council will be guided by their own deliberations and not include this policy, **Policy SA 6** in Stage 4 consultations.
- Most ,if not all , the items listed as necessary items of infrastructure must be welcomed as part of a planning-led development: sadly this particular plan is not appropriate for this part of the Borough and alternative sites for 400 houses must be found elsewhere.

As said on page 2 of this submission, the unsolved economic downturn, the new aims and objectives of a Coalition government and the new proposals for planning legislation must have some bearing on the proposed housing numbers and this level of development should not proceed until all these issues are resolved.

New Urban Extensions continued

Land at Blue Mountain, Binfield. SADPDPO SA 7

Single ownership of the land at Blue Mountain may be the most important factor to persuade BFBC to put this site forward for inclusion in the BFBC LDF Core Strategy SADPDPO Stage 3 consultation period which is now: 2011. It is a swift and easily arranged contribution to the **required land bank**, referred to at the start of this submission.

The site is in a swath of green countryside which means that the Borough does not start to build on before the third phase of the BFBC LDF CS i.e. 2017/18 – 2021-2022. This makes it **a premature proposal**. As has already been said a great deal of re-assessment is required on house numbers owing to the depressed economy, the apparent lack of money to purchase new homes, the insecure job market because of the lack funding facilities for business development, the changes in population and changes in the requirements of housing owing to changing social habits (one-parent families, divorce, longer living elderly members of the community) and the "age " of the statistics available to the planners in 2010/2011 **all contributes to a premature proposal**.

However the proposal is in the document and must be addressed.

Firstly BVPS considers this proposal contrary to the BFBC LDF Core Strategy, adopted February 2008 and to the Proposals Map adopted in April 2010. Never referred to in the Stage 1 public participation of the SADPD it has been included in Stage 3. as SA7 which the BFBC claim will maintain a **GAP** between Binfield and Bracknell.

Surely 400 new homes, a range of educational provision that includes primary, secondary and Special Educational Needs facilities, a new primary school (does that mean two primary schools?) and a new ground for Bracknell Football ground will **fill**

Binfield Village Protection Society

the GAP between Binfield and Bracknell, not maintain it. Are Binfield residents being obtuse or is there another agenda somewhere that has not yet been unearthed.?

Binfield Village Protection Society has the following objections to this proposal of a possible site for development in 2016 – 2026.

- There is conflict with adopted planning policy (CS and Proposal Map)
- There is significant loss of open green space of public value (Proposals Map April 2010)
- There is significant loss of open countryside which creates a gap between the settlement of Binfield village and Bracknell Town. Coalescence in such a small space would be an inevitable outcome of this kind of development
- A small local gap of this nature provides a now generally accepted appropriate green “lung” between settlements which should not be “absorbed ” by development
- Development will be outside of those two distinct settlements which does not conform with policies in the Berkshire Structure Plan 2005, The Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2002, the BFBC LDF Core Strategy 2008 and the Proposals Map 2010.
- There would be adverse impact on the character of Binfield and on all the other smaller neighbourhoods and communities with these changes and loss of community cohesion and identity.
- This site is adjacent to listed buildings, conservation areas and wild life sites.
- There are a number of Badger sites and they will always be disturbed whenever building begins. Badgers will move on as soon as they begin to be disturbed although we and they are fortunate to supervised carefully by the Binfield Badger Group. Badgers are a protected species.
- The site is within the 5km SPA buffer zone and the residents would have to know how much mitigation there would be through SANGS before they acquired a secure feeling about the rural amenity which was replacing the present green field site.
- The item which gives the greatest concern to residents is the proposal that Bracknell Town Football Club will move to a new football ground on the Blue Mountain site
- BVPS objects to this proposal because there are already two Football Clubs in the village. There is very poor public transport access and the transport pollution and congestion on match days will be unacceptable Light and air pollution will gross. Road improvements have only a “medium” chance of occurring.
- Everyone who has suddenly come across this information such as Binfield Village’s own highly successful Football Club have indicated their concern to all the protest groups who are addressing this issue. They have been advised to address their concerns to the Development Plan Team. With a membership of at least 200 residents BVPS use these numbers in this submission to protest against this particular proposal and to object very strongly to its inclusion in this Site Allocations Development Plan Document Preferred Options..

Binfield Village Protection Society

This submission is sent in response to the Bracknell Forest Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Site Allocations Development Plan Document Preferred Options by Margaret Foster, bvpsChairperson, on behalf of the Committee and Members of [Binfield Village Protection Society](#) on Monday, 17th January, 2011.