

<b>Policy 1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish</b>		
<p>The Parish will continue to be defined by the urban area in the south of the Parish, the 'countryside gap' and the Metropolitan Green Belt. Development that is suited to an urban setting will therefore only be appropriate within the urban area defined by the boundary of the Warfield extension (SA9) and Whitegrove, Quelm Park, Lawrence Hill and Warfield Park.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan amends the Hayley Green Settlement Boundary. Proposals for development within the new boundary will be supported, provided they accord with the design and development principles of policy WNP Policy 2 (Hayley Green) and other policies of the development plan and neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Proposals for limited infill development inside the existing defined settlement boundaries of Newell Green and Warfield Street will be supported, provide they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are in keeping with the character of the local dwellings and landscape features,</li> <li>- Promote high quality design and demonstrate how Policy 3 (Promoting Good Design in the Parish) has been applied,</li> <li>- Are proportionate in scale to existing buildings in the close proximity; and,</li> <li>- do not prejudice the implementation of the Green Infrastructure Network</li> </ul> <p>Development proposals on land outside these defined settlements will only be appropriate where they do not undermine the openness of the countryside gap, the delivery of the green infrastructure network and the permanent openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p>		
<p>Support: 24,      Neutral: 18,      Object: 44</p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	I believe a tougher stance should be employed on the 'infill development'. If the development plan is fulfilling 10% over that of the SALP, the amenity destroying cul de sac, profiteering developments therefore have no place and should be rejected; they do not form part of the Spatial Plan a good case against any appeal.	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.
Object	Warfield Parish and it's villages are not able to support BFBC in it's drive to become a metropolis.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object	I couldn't actually understand the plan - the map should allow people to zoom in- it's too high level. However, I do object to the unsustainable levels of housebuilding in the area and that the houses are so ugly and built so closely together - they are hideous eyesores. For example that housing estate where the farm used to be - as you drive past Quelm Park on your left - that's one of the most ugly housing estates I have ever seen - the houses are jammed together and are too intrusive to the road - they should have been built back from the road and hidden with trees.	We will improve the definition of all maps in the final version of the plan.  We have included a policy on 'Promoting Good Design in the Parish' to ensure that any new builds respect and reflect the character settlement area that they are in (or adjacent to).
Support	Warfield street area residents are utterly opposed to cul-de-sac developments at the edge of/beyond defined settlement. As the SHELA shows, this is BFBC's strategy to build out Warfield Street, causing encirclement. Please emphasise total opposition.	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Support	<p>Support.</p> <p>Barton Willmore make the following representations on behalf of Syngenta who operate a major employment site at Jealott's Hill, within Warfield Parish.</p> <p>Draft Policy 1 (Spatial Policy) has taken account of the distribution of development within Warfield Parish, including Syngenta's site at Jealott's Hill. Jealott's Hill is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and as such any new development at the site would be subject to the relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) concerning the Green Belt.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8, in setting the context to the draft Warfield Neighbourhood Plan (WNP), states that:</p> <p>“Further to the north are Green Belt villages and hamlets of Tickleback Row, Moss End, Nuptown, Brockhill, Hawthorn Hill and Jealott's Hill. The latter is the home of the Syngenta International Research Centre, a major developed site in the Green Belt, and the company's largest R&amp;D site employing over 800 people.”</p> <p>Syngenta's agricultural technology research and development site at Jealott's Hill represents a significant major developed site within the Green Belt. Whilst the facility is located within the Green Belt, it sits within a wider landscape that is well visually contained by surrounding topography and mature tree belts. Syngenta welcome the recognition that the draft WNP places on the significant contribution made by the facility at Jealott's Hill towards employment within the Warfield Parish area, Bracknell and the surrounding region.</p> <p>In reinforcing this recognition of Syngenta's significant economic contribution and importance to the area, it is welcomed that the draft WNP makes reference, at paragraph 2.40, to Policy GB5 of the Bracknell Forest Council Local Plan, which supports the limited infilling of the site for employment purposes. Paragraph 2.40 of the draft WNP states:</p> <p>“There is one major developed site within the Green Belt, the Syngenta site at Jealott's Hill. Policy GB5 of the BFC Local Plan is specific to this site and supports limited infilling of the site for employment purposes within the existing site boundary.”</p> <p>Syngenta also support the draft vision statement (paragraph 5.1) for the Warfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan area up to 2036 and welcome the importance placed on the success and continued commercial health of Syngenta by the local community as encapsulated within the draft vision, reflective of the contribution that its presence at Jealott's Hill makes to the local economy.</p> <p>It is further welcomed that the draft WNP supports the need for Syngenta to have opportunity to enhance existing economic activity at Jealott's Hill as stated within paragraph 5.56. This ability to improve the facilities at Jealott's Hill is crucial to Syngenta's future aspirations.</p> <p>Finally, Syngenta have no comments to make concerning the proposed Policies Map.</p>	
Support		
Object	<p>At 59 pages long the Local Plan is really inaccessible. Its a dense and turgid document that is off putting. I would like an easily accessible version</p> <p>With the amount of housing development that is going on in warfield I cant see how you will retain the feel of the parish. The whole area will be very different when there are thousands of more people living and driving through warfield every day</p>	<p>If you focus on Policies 1 - 11 that is the main content - the proposal - of the plan. The remaining sections are for reference and guidance.</p> <p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils</p>
Support	Policy 1 and Policy 2 are confused. The need to be more clearly defined and seperated	
Support		
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	There is no policy to control the disruption during development of the area. I live in Quelm park and the mess that has been made of Harvest Ride during the Woodhurst development as well as Temple Way, is unacceptable. A proper programme to manage the development of a road system is needed. All utilities, dropped curbs, cycle ways, signage, lighting, traffic lights, crossing islands, drain heights, access roads should be in place before the road is surfaced. This should ensure that there are no breaks in the road surface, and that the road is open without regular traffic controls being put in place as the work is done ad hoc.  <del>Unsanitary Developer advertising should be discouraged.</del>	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot dictate the build process of a development.
Object	Too many new houses are already being built spoiling the area with bad house design and layout being built on green belt land and protected green golf courses. The towns roads are becoming more congested and noise is becoming a big problem.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object	Roads not built for increase in Traffic the paths we have now are only just safe to walk on Roads like Forest road which is a busy road now is not able to be widened and the traffic will cause more traffic holdHayley green is a small hamlet which again is not equipped up's.	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.
Neutral		
Support	We do not support large-scale housing tagged onto the ends of cul-de-sacs which will prove extremely unpleasant for current residents. Also, any development needs to avoid new housing being next to current residents - overlooking their properties.	
Neutral		
Object	Yet another example of BFC wanting to put concrete on every piece of green space it possibly can. The area is semi-rural and I want it to stay that way. In addition the infrastructure is already creaking at the seams at times as they is not enough space for cars and lorries let alone conflicts with bikes and horses (assuming any will be left)	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Support		
Object	There is overbuilding planned within the parish which will change the whole character of the parish, cause increased traffic congestion on northern village roads that are already overcrowded due to recent developments around Bracknell. Where dwellings have been built but no improvements made to the road network or other supporting infrastructure.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>I have objected for several reasons: (1)The new buildings that have recently been constructed alongside Harvest Ride near the Binfield Rd roundabout and those behind the Three Legged Cross are definitely not sympathetic with their surroundings. They are obtrusive and tower above their surroundings. The new block at the Three Legged Cross looks imposing because trees that would have hidden it were removed. The new houses on Harvest Ride (Sorrel Drive?) tower over the road in an obtrusive manner. Three storey buildings should not have been accepted on an embankment directly over the road. Neither site has been developed in keeping with Policy 1 points I and III. So what steps will be taken to ensure that it does not continue to happen within the proposed new sites?</p> <p>(2) The proposals seem to ignore the fact that traffic will be significantly increased and should outline improvements to the road infrastructure to cope with it. Many existing road junctions already pose difficulties in entering the main flow of traffic and need to be improved to make them safer.</p> <p>(3) There is no reference to retailers. If the number of dwellings increases by 2000 from the current figure of 4100, Tesco (the only retail shop in Warfield) will have inadequate car parking space, inadequate filling station provisions, and will not be in a position to cope with the increase in customers in the store at peak times. WHY HAS THIS BEEN IGNORED? More shops are needed.</p>	<p>Whilst we cannot affect the already-approved 2,200 SALP new builds in The Neighbourhood Plan, We have included a policy on 'Promoting Good Design in the Parish' to ensure that any future new builds respect and reflect the character settlement area that they are in (or adjacent to).</p> <p>One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.</p> <p>Within the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan, local residents were consulted with regards to 'Community Buildings'. The majority of residents voted against a building of any such kind (be it village hall; retail; business etc).</p>
Object	<p>Neighbourhood plan had no consultation of local opinion at early stage</p> <p>Rural feel should be paramount , small infills more desirable than larger developments which should only access onto roads away from existing dwellings</p>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p> <p>One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable</p>
Support	<p>Parts of the parish are clearly more urban than others. It is important to preserve the open nature of the northern area so that there is countryside for everyone to enjoy.</p>	
Neutral		
Object	<p>I am very concerned at the growth and building of new housing in and around where I live. Changing will wipe away the lovely countryside and add congested roads</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	The plan will include a change in the character of Hayley Green which will lead to encirclement and increased urbanisation of what is considered a semi-rural area.	We have included a policy on 'Promoting Good Design in the Parish' to ensure that any new builds respect and reflect the character settlement area that they are in (or adjacent to).
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support	common sense approach	
Object	The proposed plan to build at least 235 new houses at Hayley Green is totally inappropriate for this area. Winkfield St Marys primary school is already fully subscribed as is the only one within walking distance of this proposed development. This together with the lack of shops will place a greater burden on the local road infrastructure e.g Forest Road which already has inadequate road lighting and narrow pavements.	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.
Object	Over development  increased traffic	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Support	I support a co-ordinated planning system, but do not believe the proposed Hayley Green expansion achieves that	
Support		
Object	This development would undermine the local character and amenity of Hayley Green. The fields are the jewel in the crown of Hayley Green and the only remaining green fields along the Forest Road in Warfield. They are an important feature to local people.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Support		
Object	You have not left enough "green" gaps between developments. Massive developments of 100+ houses are not welcome at all, why not build smaller developments and space them out across the Parish.	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.
Object		
Neutral	Traffic and pollution is increasing. New roads and cut throughs to larger roads need to be created. Slow down traffic to 30 mph on Harvest Ride, build speed barriers if needed. Developers must build homes with enough parking. Also, what is happening with the allotments at Quelm Park? <u>Will 35 allotments be enough for the ever increasing population of Warfield?</u>	
Neutral	Think it will destroy the character of the area	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	You keep building the villages will soon become part of the town. There is already too much rubbish, traffic and city folk who have no respect in the area. We certainly do not need more!!	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Support		
Neutral		
Object		
Object	Firstly I acknowledge to a degree that the Neighbourhood planning team's approach is honourable in terms of wanting to propose to BFC specific areas for future development, rather than a more disagreeable plan being imposed on Warfield. However, I cannot begin to tell you how strongly I feel that this committee and indeed WPC SHOULD be saying to BFC that the building of 2200 dwellings has been already imposed on one small semi rural area that was completely separate of the Bracknell urban sprawl, which is changing the character of the village forever more, something which is mentioned on many occasions in the NP as something to be protected. Further development will only erode the character and beauty of Warfield still further in terms of light and noise pollution, loss of countryside and and increase in traffic and I am strongly opposed to ANY FURTHER development being proposed by the NP or by WPC because I dont feel that you are REALLY AND TRULY supporting the interests of Warfield residents or the retaining of the village character. PLEASE FIND A BACKBONE AND PUSH BACK ON BFC AND THE GOVERNMENT.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object	All the local Hayley Green buildings are bungalows or chalet bungalows. The building styles mentioned in the plan do not refer to buildings of this style or type. It is extremely unlikely that developers would even consider bungalows in any development plans  <del>Plans to develop the greenfield sites selected contradicts the infrastructure network</del>	Noted - we will reference the original bungalows along Forest Road. However, many of these dwellings have since been extended and renovated, setting a precedence for change
Object	I understand and support the aims to preserve the identify of Warfield however do not agree that any further development beyond the 2200 homes already allocated to the Warfield area can possibly "not undermine local character" (5.12) It can only "undermine the openness of the countryside gap". I am against any further development beyond the current 2200 houses and therefore feel that I need to "object" <del>otherwise where can I express this view</del>	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Support		
Object	It will eliminate consulting residents particularly those residents affected directly with decision made by Parish Council.	The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan will be put to an Independent Government Inspector and then face a public referendum. The Parish Council do not have a <del>deciding vote in the final plan</del>
Neutral		
Support	Statement 5.12 is of particular importance to us. We object to the "creeping extension" of the settlement boundary via the over-development of proposed cul-de-sac plots that make the boundary hard to sustain. We would like to see strong opposition to this tactic, favoured by developers.	
Object	Please see the covering letter	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object		
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	This part of the policy will change the village in a negative way by reducing green areas.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	I feel that this policy will erode the identity of village and leave no green areas and consider that there is no need to amend the current settlement boundary	Comment noted
Object	<p>Change the look and feel of the village.</p> <p>Squeezing in housing estates where ever planners can find spare land is not how you create and build solid and sustainable communities.</p> <p>Will damage the current living environment</p>	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Neutral	<p>There are some parts of this Spatial Plan that I agree with and some I disagree with.</p> <p>I agree that it is better to have a development plan than not to have one, and I can see that you have recognized that the local community has reached the end of their tether with regards to developments on greenfield sites, therefore I strongly disagree with the conclusion you have reached to the redefine the Hayley Green Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>In my opinion, a greater supply of housing in South East of England will just attract more people to the region, in the same way that building the M25 only encouraged people to travel and commute greater distances. Huge numbers of houses have been built in the region in the past thirty years, particularly in Bracknell, we have lost lots of green fields, but are we any better off? I don't think so.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst I appreciate Warfield Parish Councils approach to minimise development, I think the only correct response is to inform BFC that there are no further sites in Warfield suitable for large or medium scale development. As you point out, 2,200 homes will be built in the parish between 2015 &amp; 2026. Enough is enough.</p>	
Neutral		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>1. It is impossible to support this policy without transparency on the other land that was considered prior to determine that amending the Hayley Green settlement boundary was the most appropriate course of action. No information had been forthcoming despite requests from the community. Equally no information is available on underlying strategy and, importantly, the criteria for site selection. Hayley Green is the only part of the Parish to carry the burden of extra housing. What other land options were considered and against what criteria were they assessed. There should have been a community wide consultation on all potential sites to establish the community's preferred site strategy and allocation. Not to do so denies meaningful consultation and community choice.</p> <p>2. The 4 principles for infill in Newell Green and Warfield Street should equally apply to Hayley Green.</p> <p>3. Amending the settlement boundary for Hayley Green will be highly detrimental to the character and rural nature of the village; and detrimental to the local flora and fauna. Amending the boundary is in direct conflict with point 5.12</p> <p>4. There is insufficient explanation of the need to accommodate 235 new homes and why all these must be in Hayley Green. This is above the 10% specified and takes no account of infill and smaller developments. In original information shared by the NOD team the number was 220 which would be 10%. It is arguable that Warfield has already absorbed a disproportionate amount of housing in Bracknell.</p>	<p>1. The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p> <p>2. Within the existing settlement boundary for Hayley Green, they equally apply.</p> <p>3. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p> <p>4. Whilst it is arguable that Warfield has absorbed a disproportionate amount of housing, more is required and the owners of the Hayley Green site have come forward to develop it.</p>
Neutral	None to make	
Support		
Object		
Object		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	
Support		
Object	There should be NO infill development to the north of Warfield Street as this would contravene previous ratified Local Planning documents, which aim to respect and retain the rural character of Warfield Street, especially to the north, and would set a precedent.	Comment noted.

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Policy 1 "A Spatial Plan for the Parish (Objection)</p> <p>This policy seeks to give the countryside gap, which is the area of designated countryside between the Green Belt to the north of the parish and the built-up area to the south, an equal level of protection from development as the area designated as Green Belt. This is not a sound approach to land use planning.</p> <p>The current Green Belt boundaries in Bracknell Forest were designated in the Central Berkshire Structure Plan (CBSP) in April 1980. A Green Belt Local Plan for Berkshire (GBLP) was adopted in April 1985. Prior to the adoption of this plan, the area called 'countryside gap', as well as an area surrounding the town of Bracknell, was designated as 'Interim Green Belt'. The extent of Interim and Approved Green Belt in 1978-80 is shown on the plan below:</p> <p>The Secretary of State's approval of the Green Belt boundary, rejected the proposed extension of the designation to include the Interim Green Belt, to the west of its current extent, because it would effectively close options that have yet to be examined by the County Council in consultation with District Councils for the accommodation of longer term development after 1983.</p> <p>Clearly, the Secretary of State found that the 'countryside gap' area did not fulfill all the functions of Green Belt, which are listed in paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</li> <li>To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;</li> <li>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</li> <li>To assist in safeguarding the setting and special character of historic towns; and</li> <li>To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</li> </ul> <p>Since 1980, Bracknell Forest Council has had numerous opportunities to re-classify the 'countryside gap' as Green Belt, but it has taken none of them. Clearly, therefore, the land within the 'countryside gap' cannot be said to meet all the defined functions of Green Belt. The approach of policy 1, which is to effectively give the 'countryside gap' equal planning policy status to the Green Belt, is flawed and not in compliance with policies in the NPPF.</p> <p>These representations are submitted on behalf of the Whitaker family, who are the owners of land to the north of Newhurst Gardens. An outline planning application for around 50 dwellings (16/01004/OUT) was recommended for approval by planning officers, but refused by the planning committee in March 2017. An appeal has recently been submitted to the Secretary of State. We consider that the proposal complies with policy 1, because it will not undermine the openness of the countryside gap, the delivery of the green infrastructure network and the permanent openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt. At the appeal, it will be strongly argued that the proposal will not harm the 'countryside gap' or the Green Belt, whilst the council's continued lack of a 5-year housing land supply renders all policies, which seek to prevent the development, out-of-date and of significantly reduced effectiveness.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.12 of the NP states that 'development through cul-de-sac plots on the edge of settlements is no more welcomed by the community than building on the Green Belt'. This comment, in the supporting text of the NP, appears to apply to the Newhurst Gardens development proposed by the Whitaker family. However, it is a very 'broad-brush' approach and one size does not fit all. Each proposal should be considered on its merits and in this case, the merits of the proposed development are considerable. Over 50% of the development site will be designated as open space, which will considerably enhance the amenities and ecological value of the local area. Officers recommended approval, because they said it would not harm the setting of the settlement, the openness of the countryside or the setting of local heritage assets. Contrary to the members view, the site does lie in a sustainable location, as it is situated no further by foot and cycle from local amenities than the Hayley Green site, which is proposed for allocation in the NP, or the recently approved housing development at The Limes.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.13 of the NP states that one of the objectives of the plan is to 'reduce the risk that development proposals in the parish will be granted in a piecemeal way through appeal' because of the current lack of a 5-year housing land supply in the Borough. One of the central objectives of the NP, appears to be to block any development, which isn't identified in the NP. The Written Ministerial Statement of December 2016, states that development plan policies will not be deemed out-of-date and appeals will not be allowed where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ministerial statement is less than 2 years old or the neighbourhood plan has been part of the development plan for 2 years or less;</li> <li>The neighbourhood plan allocates sites for housing; and</li> <li>The local planning authority can demonstrate a 3-year supply of deliverable housing sites.</li> </ul> <p>It seems that the purpose of the NP is more to frustrate development, by complying with the WMS's list of criteria, than to create an environment of good planning to regulate land use. It is considered that the Hayley Green development proposal is fundamentally flawed and it probably will not go ahead. It is just a mechanism to make it look like the Parish is complying with the Government's wish for local plan-making, when in fact, it is a tool to be used to block and prevent development, which would otherwise be considered acceptable and deliverable.</p> <p>The wording of policy 1 should be amended so that schemes, such as land north of Newhurst Gardens, located on the edges of settlements, in sustainable locations, can be supported, to bring forward smaller developments. This approach would help to reduce the significant shortfall in housing land supply in Bracknell Borough</p>	<p>The policy is being updated to provide greater clarity to the "countryside gap"</p>
Support		
Support		
Support		
Object	<p>There should be NO infill development to the north of Warfield Street as this would contravene previous ratified Local Planning documents, which aim to respect and retain the rural character of Warfield Street, especially to the north, and would set a precedent.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
Neutral		
Object	<p>Not in keeping with the villiage. No communication with residents</p>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter</p>
Object	<p>Warfield residents spent a lot of time and money moving to Warfield, because they valued the village atmosphere and open green field spaces as opposed to Bracknell. They wanted peace and quiet and no traffic. Bracknell Forest Council have now turned Warfield into an estate satellite extension to Bracknell destroying the Warfield Individual village atmosphere. Without good consultation with residents.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object		
Object	No more traffic please, they create jams. Danger to wildlife and humans	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is <del>not applicable</del> .
Object	The roads in the parish will not support even more commuter traffic	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is <del>not applicable</del> .
Object	Firstly we were not kept informed about the emerging plan for Hayley Green or able to make our views known throughout the process. Secondly I object most strongly to Hayley Green losing its identity as a village. The council is trying very hard to urbanize this semi rural area. Why is Hayley Green the only area affected by the Neighbourhood Plan?	The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.  The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and <del>planning principles</del> .
Object		
Object	cause the erosion of Hayley Green's identity as a village - it would become a housing estate with no visible green gaps. There is no need for the WNP to amend the Hayley Green settlement boundary. The WNP proposal for Hayley Green destroys the separate identities between the neighbouring villages.	The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green 'buffer' is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to <del>Strawberry Hill in the South</del> .
Object	It is not sustainable to continue development in the "urban" area in the south of the parish. Some development is inevitable in the countryside and green belt. The process of urbanisation is not pleasant with the size of development that is planned	At present it is not possible to propose new development in the Green Belt.

<b>Policy 2: Hayley Green</b>		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land at Hayley Green (as shown on the policies map) for a comprehensive mixed use allocation of approximately 235 dwellings containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Open market, starter, intermediate and affordable rented homes;</li> <li>- A designated local green space for public use and informal 'wild' play;</li> <li>- A new business use/community use/community hub;</li> <li>- A safe and convenient cycle and pedestrian connection onto Hayley Green and the B3034 Forest Road to Westmorland Park and Edmunds Lane to link to the existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and connect to the retail and employment areas at Whitegrove;</li> <li>- Appropriate capacity and safety improvements to the local highway network</li> <li>- A footpath linking Hayley Green (road) and the Cricketers Public House across the local green space</li> </ul> <p>Proposals must be made as part of a comprehensive outline planning application for the whole site and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an illustrative masterplan that secures comprehensive development and defines the land uses and key development principles for access, layout and design, and principles of phasing and implementation;</li> </ul> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan that demonstrates the contribution of each landowner towards the deliverability of infrastructure in line with the illustrative masterplan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A housing mix which favours 1, 2 and 3 bed family and starter homes and homes designed for older people,</li> <li>- A landscape strategy to demonstrate how any effects on the local landscape character will be satisfactorily mitigated;</li> <li>- A heritage statement which considers the setting of listed buildings nearby</li> <li>- An ecology, green infrastructure and boundary treatment strategy to demonstrate how existing environmental assets will be protected and enhanced and green space will be integrated into the built development;</li> <li>- A flood risk assessment and sustainable drainage strategy to demonstrate how the scheme will not increase surface water flood risk on any adjoining land;</li> <li>- A drainage connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity</li> <li>- A transport strategy to demonstrate how the scheme will manage its traffic effects on the road network and how it will encourage and enable walking and cycling to community facilities and employment areas in the parish;</li> <li>- An Archaeological Assessment and Evaluation to provide information on which a decision on the need for mitigation can be made.</li> <li>- Details of street sections and the appearance and elevation of buildings having regard to the Streetscene Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>- A planning obligation to secure all necessary supporting infrastructure (including land) and other community benefits following planning consent</li> </ul> <p>Development shall include measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) in agreement with the Council and Natural England. This will include the provision of a bespoke SANG, a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring and any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitats Regulations, the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance.</p>		
<p>Support: 20,      Neutral: 10,      Object: 56</p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>1. With reference to section 4.17. This resident would still prefer this plan and has been squashed out of this Pre-submission. A green space at the start of the Village would be aesthetically better and give the location an identity.</p> <p>2. Hayley Green is really not a place to develop. By design it is a Hamlet, shoe horning housing into this triangle is not practical.</p> <p>3. The Pre-submission does not make any reference to the existing land owners who's sites are designated as part of the plan</p>	<p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>I cannot possibly agree to a development on the only remaining green in Hayley Green, such an increase in the current 106 houses to 341 is poorly thought out and will destroy the Wildlife and Village community. People will leave the village and its history and charm will leave with them.</p> <p>Should you decide to proceed even with such objection how will you justify all of the amenities and benefits being given to new villagers rather than looking after your existing population.</p>	<p>One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.</p> <p>Within the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan, local residents were consulted with regards to 'Community Buildings'. The majority of residents voted against a building of any such kind (be it village hall; retail; business etc).</p>
Object	Didn't understand it.	
Support	We accept this as a well thought out integrated master plan causing least detriment to the least number of existing Warfield residents. We do not want ad hoc piecemeal development.	
Neutral	No comment.	
Support		
Support	the attention to the nature trails in the new estate, Woodhurst Park, is commendable - I just hope that not all the fields will be built upon.	
Support	I cant see any affordable homes with prices starting at almost £300k and going up to almost £900k	
Support	The terms Village, Hamlet and Settlement are muddled and their use throughout the report is very inconsistent and confusing. Warfield is the Village, all the other areas are either Hamlets or settlements. Para 5.22 Table 1 & 2 are not in the report	
Object	Why does the Parish Council feel it necessary to 'offer' to deliver more than the agreed 2200 homes?	<p>The decisions on the Warfield extension (2,200 new homes) have already been made, and the neighbourhood plan can't change this, but BFC must find more land for housing to meet its 5-year land supply requirement, and they are in the process of doing this.</p> <p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p>
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral		
Object	I see know benefit to the area or community other than lining developers pockets. There is no need for all these new houses.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object	Hayley Green is a small Hamlet and again will not be able to cope with the increase in facilities and traffic	In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.". All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.
Object	<p>There is no obvious provision for improvements to the B3022 to cope with the resulting traffic that will empty on to the road - particularly during rush hours. The accesses on to the B3022 are poorly sighted, being on the inside of a long bend, and without improvements to the B3022 these may well become accident black spots - like the cross roads with Malt Hill/Haley Green. The speed of traffic on the B3022 out of rush hours also needs to be addressed - there being scant regard for the 40mph speed limit.</p> <p>A further concern that is not addressed is the potential for worse flooding of the B3022 from The Cut. Presumably surface water from this development will go into The Cut which already had such a poor rate of flow in wet weather that it regularly spills on to the B3022 and Cricketers Lane. I believe that there have been a number of accidents caused by a combination of speeding and water on the B3022, whilst the depth of water in Cricketers Lane can be sufficient to strand cars. Either the level of both roads need to raised, or flow along The Cut needs to be improved considerably.</p>	In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.". All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.
Neutral	I understand we do need development and I understand that this has been put forward as the best possible option. I see that the development has been kept away from existing housing - it is good to leave a green gap to protect current residents.	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Yet more houses on green belt , in this area the roads and services are stretched to the limit, destroying the countryside and lining the pockets of developers and landowners instead of brown belt is not the way forward,nor is the lack of consultation on the select of sites for development. Increased noise and pollution and loss of wildlife.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>Please note that Hayley Green is not 'Green Belt'. No development is proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan on Green Belt land.</p>
Object	<p>Yet another example of BFC wanting to put concrete on every piece of green space it possibly can. The area is semi-rural and I want it to stay that way. In addition the infrastructure is already creaking at the seams at times as they is not enough space for cars and lorries let alone conflicts with bikes and horses (assuming any will be left)</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>
Support	<p>Support in principle but query the need for a community hub here given the proximity to Carnation Hall, Charlotte Pratt Hall and Tesco facilities including the parish office, library and community centre. Viability could be an issue. Social housing below intermediate rents is also needed, starter homes has not progressed through government and should be taken out here. Include custom and self build instead.</p>	
Object	<p>The proposal to build 235 dwellings on green belt land at Hayley Green is opposed as it radically changes the nature of the village which is LOW density housing. Has its own nature reserve and the basic infrastructure is already insufficient - for example the majority of rainwater drainage is by soak-away which are already at maximum capacity. The SA9 plan doesn't include Hayley Green which is supposed to be a countryside gap</p>	<p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green 'buffer' is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p>
Support	<p>I have no overall objection to the proposals as long as the character of the existing area (in particular Cricketers Lane) is not destroyed. However, as a walker, I can tell you that steps need to be taken to: (a) Ensure that traffic on Forest Road through Hayley Green abides with the 30mph speed limit. The majority of drivers currently ignore it, and some race along that stretch of road. (b) The pavement needs to be significantly improved along that stretch of road. It is too narrow and speeding cars often pass within inches of pedestrians. (c) The junction with Strawberry Hill is dangerous and needs to be improved since there will be a significant increase in traffic. These steps need to be taken before any building commences due to the increase in large vehicles delivering building materials to the construction sites.</p>	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>The neighbourhood plan should not front onto the Forest road or Cricketers lane but access onto the Bracknell road only to preserve the rural feel ,infill should be allowed</p> <p>to keep large sites over a hundred houses to a minimum</p>	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>There are already traffic issues. Cricketers Lane is far too narrow to take more traffic. Forest Road also suffers from speeding motorists ignoring the 30mph limit.</p> <p>Why is Hayley Green the only area affected.</p>	<p>"In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation."</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>
Object	<p>The plan to build 235 new house in Hayley green is very concerning. This development will change the whole area and effect the small settlement there. The proposed development is too near the current houses and a small county road, For example the new development at Woodhurst Park does not impact on any residents and is a perfect place to plan new housing - fronting a development onto Forest Road DOES make a bit difference and I do not think this should go ahead. Whilst I live in winkfield Parish, I travel most days through Warfield Parish and another development will cause further congestion to our countryside. Perhaps a smaller development beyond the Cricketers Pub would be acceptable.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>As has been stated in the plan, the proximity to the Green Belt boundary combined with the growth proposed in the emerging Comprehensive Local Plan period (2026 – 2036) could lead to the character and appearance of the area, and the settlements within it, being greatly diminished.</p>	<p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>
Support		
Object	<p>Several grounds for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We were not kept informed about the emerging plan for Hayley Green or encouraged to comment on it since the draft version of the NDP was released. If it weren't for I and a couple of other residents, who encouraged the council to publish a flyer on the development, it seems likely that there would have been no widespread notification to Warfield residents that a development proposal was underway.</li> <li>2. Furthermore, I have consulted with a member of CPRE Berkshire who said that when compared to other NDP's in the local area, the Warfield NDP has not been supported by consultation between residents and the council on suitable site selection. In this very comment form, we are only able to object to the Hayley Green Plan or support it. We are not able to suggest where we think suitable sites might be available or whether the housing could be spread across the parish, which would be much fairer to Hayley Green residents, who are the only people directly affected by the NDP.</li> <li>3. 235 new homes in such a small village would put a massive strain on already inadequate roads. I know other residents also have concerns about the sewage system which already struggles with the current housing. Any measures to alleviate this are not outlined in the NDP.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</li> <li>2. The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix A, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</li> </ol> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. All development will undergo full review by the relevant authorities and utilities governing bodies at the time the planning applications are submitted (outside of the Neighbourhood Plan).</li> </ol>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>This proposal will deliver houses that aren't in line with the area. This is a historic area and new houses are not appropriate and soulless in my opinion. It will also make these small roads around Hayley Green much busier causing more accidents, more pollution and making the area less safe for children walking to parks and school. What is the rationale for building here rather than in less already populated areas, losing local residents the small amount of green space we have.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>
Object	<p>No opportunity to comment on site selection process on the form. The proposal removes another large green space from the neighbourhood. Further investments would be required for roads as our country roads are not suitable for increased traffic. This would add volume of traffic and no doubt increased speed- something that has been an issue for the community - Forest Road is a 30 miles per hour road.... This is a rural community and this proposal would take that away. Bracknell town has multiple buildings that stand empty maybe investment to change these from business to residential would be move beneficial</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Support	sensible forward thinking	
Object	see above	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Over development</p> <p>Increased Traffic</p>	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Object	<p>Local Road &amp; services infra-structure is completely inadequate. The local roads are already busy &amp; as regular walkers the footpaths along Forest Road &amp; Bracknell Road are inadequate even before any expansion</p>	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Neutral		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>There has been no communication regarding choice of plots - Hayley Green land has been allocated without any consultation with the Warfield residents. It was presented to the residents of Hayley Green at a meeting in October 2016 as a fete accompli. Indeed we were threatened with "worse" if we did not agree to the proposal.</p> <p>We were not informed about the emerging plan for Hayley Green or able to make our views known at any stage in the process. There was no consultation in the year long process leading to the site allocation and concept plan. There is no explanation as to how the preferred option was chosen, or the criteria used in this choice. The scale of development would constitute a significant change in the size and character of Hayley Green - virtually tripling the number of homes!</p>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p>
Object	<p>Quite simply Haley Green should be left alone. 235 dwellings is far too many</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>We moved in to the area because of the "green" spaces. We were not asked if it was ok to build 235 houses nearby, why not? We would have objected if asked. The local infrastructure will not support so many houses and indeed the area will be "trashed" eg too many cars not enough roads, too many people not enough footpaths or local amenities. All the local roads are tiny. The nearby traffic lights are already subject to queues of traffic in the rush hour, adding another probable 500 cars will cause bedlam in the area.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Object		
Support	<p>Yes definitely develop and expand the Hayley Green area. A new community center across from the Brownlow Hall, should be built for the RESIDENTS, not some large super market chain. Please keep the Brownlow hall for everybody and do not sell to developers in some under cut deal. Please develop HG to serve the greater population, an outdoor/indoor swimmingpool would be a beautiful enhancement serving the community</p>	
Neutral	<p>Concerned about the specific mix of housing type here</p>	
Object	<p>You keep building the villages will soon become part of the town. There is already too much rubbish, traffic and city folk who have no respect in the area. We certainly do not need more!!</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>
Support	<p>I absolutely approve of the Master Plan for Hayley Green</p>	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>The number of houses being proposed for Hayley Green around the Cricketers area will have a considerable and negative impact on the current infrastructure and lead to excessive traffic along Forest Road between Winkfield Row and Warfield, and throughout the area.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Object		
Object	<p>Please see my overarching comments for policy 1 which are applicable here also and I feel for Hayley Green residents should the 235 further dwellings be imposed on them at some stage.</p>	
Object	<p>The suggested open green space is out of proportion to the designated housing areas shown. The space should be reduced to permit more houses.</p> <p>The space divides rather than integrates the housing space.</p> <p>The cycle routes shown on Forest road and HG lane have inadequate lane widths to meet current legislation.</p> <p>Pedestrians are already at risk walking on the poorly maintained sidewalks with the volume of road traffic.</p> <p>Local roads are already at capacity. Safety aspects should be improved before considering more junctions and roundabouts.</p> <p>People will always get to the Cricketers, whether there is a footpath or not.</p>	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>I understand and fully support the aims to preserve the identify of Warfield but no not support further development beyond 2200 homes so am unsure how i can "support" this policy.</p> <p>To increase the size of Hayley green and use Green field land to do this will completely alter the character of the area due to increased traffic, light and noise pollution and the destruction of valuable countryside. The Warfield area has already been impacted too much by the current 2200 new homes.</p> <p>Warfield Street and Hayley Green are fundanmentally small settlements/villages/communities and their character is why local people live there! There should be no "infill" development as this will change the character completely</p>	<p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>
Object	<p>to section on" appropriate capacity and safety improvements to local roads network.". What concerns me is the double access off Bracknell Road already incredibly busy and there are no adequate traffic calming measures . There are also real issues with localised flooding . There is no public transport in this area . how will people who need that get around ?. we are talking even more cars on the roads .</p>	<p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>This is a major change and proposal made without consulting residents of Hayley Green.</p> <p>The development eliminates land between settlement and green belt.</p> <p>Parish Council objected outline-planning application for 28 houses on Grove Garden that is only 200m West of Hayley Green proposed development. Parish Council stated said proposal creates more accident on junction of Bracknell Road-Forest Road-Jigs Lane North and Warfield Street. What will be the situation if beside to said 28 houses more than 235 houses built on Hayley Green, 19 houses on North Lodge Farm and another hundreds houses in Strawberry Hill? Driving in above 4 roads will be like driving in Piccadilly London. This area will not have rural character any more.</p> <p>It is interesting to notice width of Bracknell Road and Forest Road is same as it was fifty years ago. Before start of developments speed limit in Forest Road &amp; Bracknell Road was 60 miles per hour. Now it is 30 mile per hour in Forest Road. Speed limit in Bracknell Road is 40 mile per hour in Hayley Green area and 30 mile thereafter. With above developments it speed limit will be 5 mile per hour or less.</p>	<p>1. The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p> <p>2. The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Apendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>I will not comment on the issues concerning the apparent lack of information given to Hayley Green residents about the proposal.</p> <p>My main concern relates to the effect of the Hayley Green proposal when seen in the context of possible sites for building in neighbouring Winkfield. Although the site allocation in Winkfield is not yet public, it is evident that there are plans to build a large number of houses (c. 1,000+) in land immediately to the east of Hayley Green, namely the Winfield Triangle and Somerton Farm/House to the north of it. I think it makes no sense to look at the Hayley Green proposal in isolation from the Winkfield plans. If all the houses proposed were actually built the village of Winkfield Row, where I live and c 600 homes, would effectively cease to exist as an entity. The immediate Hayley Green 'neighbourhood' is, in fact, Winkfield Row, making nonsense of the proposal being about the Warfield neighbourhood.</p> <p>The issue with the Hayley Green/Winkfield Row proposals seen in aggregate are, essentially, about infrastructure. The infrastructure as it currently exists cannot support another 1200 - 1300 houses, coming as they will with 4-5,000 people and 2-3,000 cars.</p> <p>The roads are at capacity at peak times. Try to go north/south or east/west in the rush hour and see how long it takes. Forest Road with its T junction at the east end and Lock's ride crossroads are bottlenecks. Add in yet more cars and they will not only be more congested but more dangerous. Combine this with the Chavey Down/Maiden's Green rat run from the M3 to the M4 and the school run at St, Mary's and Lambrook and you get even more problems. I think someone needs to conduct a feasibility study for the anticipated traffic at peak times to see if the additional volume can actually be sustained.</p> <p>Sewage/drainage is already at capacity. From what Thames Water seem to be saying, they can't cope with more housing and sewage without rethinking all the drainage in the Winkfield Row./Hayley Green area.</p> <p>Schools. The non-private schools are already at capacity. St Mary's already has temporary prefabricated classrooms. How is it going to cope with the additional influx? Where else will the children go? Is there a plan?</p> <p>Medical. There is only one GP surgery serving the whole of Winkfield - Green Meadows in North Ascot. You can't book an appointment in advance because there aren't any. You ring at 8.00 am and get told you are 32nd in the queue. While the surgery is brilliant, there are only so many additional patients they can possibly accommodate. Where are they going to go?</p> <p>I am sure there are other issues related to infrastructure that would bear examination. I am not sufficiently well informed to discuss them.</p> <p>While I recognise the need for more housing I cannot see that it makes any sense to decide on the Hayley Green proposal without taking the nearby Winkfield plans into account. I realise the timescales do not gel, but that's because the idea of 'neighbourhoods' on which these plans are based are themselves archaic, founded on ecclesiastical parishes from the Saxon era and bearing no relation to the current situation.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements."</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Neutral		
Object	Please see covering letter	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>235 new houses in Hayley green is too large a development for local infrastructure and local small roads. Green "gap" space is key to maintain given the large development close by with 2200 homes. We should preserve the open rural space for wildlife and to keep the local character and charm of the village.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p> <p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green 'buffer' is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p>
Object	<p>The main issue with this development is the significant increase in traffic in the surrounding area. The access roads are particularly narrow, especially Hayley Green, and the junctions at Hayley Green/Forest Road, Hayley Green/Bracknell Road, and Forest Road/Cricketers Lane will become increasingly dangerous with the increasing volume of traffic. The report refers to 'proposed' improvement to these junctions, although it is unclear what will actually happen, but the installation of traffic lights will cause significant congestion up, especially during busy periods. Drivers heading for Chavey Down en route to the south (M3, Bagshot area etc) will use Carnation Drive as a thoroughfare to avoid the lights in Winkfield Row; this already happens to some degree but increased traffic will make the estate very hazardous. One of the reasons the development in Locks Ride (only 88 houses) was rejected was because of traffic issues (bottle necks and dangerous junctions); this development of 235 dwellings is likely to be significantly worse.</p>	<p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan puts development on virgin fields in Hayley Green, fields which are essential to the rural character of the village</li> <li>- Warfield Residents indicated a strong aversion to building on green fields in the Jan/Feb 2015 Residents Questionnaire: 72% Against</li> <li>- Information about this plan was not forthcoming until October 2016, and residents were not informed about the site selection process either before this date, nor until July 2017. A Neighbourhood plan is supposed to be consultative about site selection (as in the case of Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale this year, and also Stratfield Mortimer also this year)</li> <li>- Approx 70% of Hayley Green households are against this plan (HGRG survey being presented to Bracknell forest council September 2017)</li> <li>- Inadequate attention has been given to traffic and to other infrastructure questions</li> <li>- There is a preference among many Hayley Green residents and others who visit the area for green space to be visible along Cricketers Lane and all of the green fields to continue to 'front' as they currently do on Forest Road and back for at least 100m.</li> <li>- Once the fields are gone, they will be gone forever</li> </ul>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage.</p>
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	This is excessive and would bring unacceptable levels of pollution and traffic.	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Object	This seems very excessive bringing higher levels of pollution and traffic to the local roads. The policy seems seems to bring no benefit to current residents and I feel that brownfield sites would make a better option for building on.	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>No benefit to current residents</p> <p>Stinks of a money making project and not one considering local environments</p> <p>An excessive number of houses on a small site</p> <p>Damaging to all surrounding infrastructure</p> <p>Ill-considered and ill-thought out plans.</p>	<p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p>
Object	<p>Cricketers Lane is beautiful country lane bordered by mature oak trees and hedgerows. It has a country pub, and has countryside / fields to the west.</p> <p>It would be a tragedy if this idyllic countryside scene was destroyed for ever.</p> <p>Please do not put this in the final Plan.</p>	<p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral	<p>1. Warfield Parish Council recommended refusal of a planning application for a curling rink generating relatively small numbers of traffic movements off and onto Bracknell Road, on the opposite side of the road to the proposed development, for the reason of 'traffic issues on Bracknell Road' and yet supports the development of 235 new dwellings, many of which require access from Bracknell Road and will therefore generate many more traffic movements off and onto Bracknell Road than the proposed curling rink. Road improvements will therefore be essential.</p> <p>2. Does a development of 235 homes really merit its own community hub? Surely it will be very small and therefore not justifiable/affordable?</p>	
Object	<p>1. As above it is unclear why Hayley Green is the sole part of the Parish accommodating new housing or why "approximately" 235 new homes is the appropriate number.</p> <p>2. I do accept that some development in Hayley Green is almost certainly necessary, but the current proposal and policy is inadequate. For example:</p> <p>A. Why does it say nothing about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- any development being in keeping with the character of local dwellings and landscape features</li> <li>- any development proportionate to existing buildings in close vicinity. This is important for those living in bungalows on forest road.</li> </ul> <p>B. There should be explicit reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Screening the development from existing dwellings</li> <li>- The style of layout to give a spacious feel and variability eg a mix of informal courtyard, news and squares; avoiding uniform house types, heights and plot sizes.</li> <li>- Adoption of energy management technology.</li> <li>- Innovative designs which reflect and are in sympathy with the sympathy with the rural vision of Hayley Green.</li> <li>- Dwellings design shall be no more than 2 storeys in height, or 3 storeys where roof space is utilised.</li> <li>- A superfast broadband strategy.</li> <li>- Development design and layout being informed by a full and detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</li> <li>- An extended phase 1 habitat survey together with further detailed surveys arising from that as necessary. Appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures.</li> <li>- Avoidance of light pollution and intrusion (specific to this site), for eg no street lighting unless for safety reasons; low level lighting eg bollards for pedestrians if it avoids light pollution.</li> <li>- Internal road design eg speed humps, play streets, avoiding asphalt and full height kerbs where possible.</li> <li>- Design of access roads which avoids deleterious impact on current Hayley Green residents eg no new access roads opposite existing dwellings, no increase in street lighting, avoiding new roundabouts/traffic lights.</li> <li>- noise reduction features.</li> </ul> <p>With reference to the above points I believe a much more detailed site design brief is needed. Many NDPs include this. It needs to be comprehensive such that it protects and preserves the character of the village. It should also be made clear in the NDP that any proposal from a developer that does not meet the site design brief will be reflected. If a planning document is silent on any issues, as this one is, it becomes a free for all and control is lost. Residents directly affected should be fully and meaningfully engaged in this process, with the designs responding to their concerns in the spirit of NPPF 66.</p> <p>3. In terms of the actual design for Hayley Green I also object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the policy refers to looser housing on northern boundary. The policy should indicate densest housing at the centre and looser housing on the southern boundary to avoid detrimental impact on existing village. Building high density housing in the southern area will certainly have a very negative for myself and my neighbours on forest road. In terms of the northern boundary, the only people impacted by that are drivers using the Bracknell road.</li> <li>- the policy should specify some multi dwelling buildings at the centre to maximise density on a contained area of the plot, thereby reducing density closest to existing village.</li> <li>- the policy should reference maintaining all substantial trees and hedgerows for purposes of biodiversity, character and screening. Including the hedgerows on forest road.</li> <li>- the plan should incorporate a 20m belt of trees on boundaries of the plot especially on forest road to maintain character, provide amenity space, screen existing properties and maintain their privacy. I feel very strongly that the proposed plan of building housing on the "horse field" will be detrimental in the extreme to the village, completely removing the rural character.</li> </ul> <p>I am also deeply against the latest sketch which appears to show a new road junction on to forest road. This will have a very negative impact in terms of noise, light pollution, traffic, privacy and character of the area. As is pointed out in the plan a large attraction of the Warfield area is ease of travel to maidenhead and m4 via the Bracknell road. It is inappropriate to direct traffic onto forest road, negatively impacting those that live there, only to have much of the traffic going down crickets lane. Any new junction should be on crickets lane.</p> <p>4. Overall I am particularly disappointed that the input from myself and my neighbours in Hayley Green appears not to have been taken into consideration to this point and I feel a solution is being entirely imposed upon us with any "consultation" being purely to complete a process rather than actually seeking to give residents a real opportunity to input. There does not appear to have been a genuine commitment to working residents collaboratively. I would also like to see the alternative plan put forward by Hayley Green residents reference at point 4.17. Given this has been assessed as reasonable, why is not represented in the NDP?</p>	<p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>Please also see Policy 3: Promoting Good Design in the Parish. This, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.</p>
Neutral	None to make	
Neutral		
Object		
Object		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	The plans put development on the fields which are essential to the rural feel of the village of Hayley Green. Dense housing will extend Hayley Green into an extension of Bracknell.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object		
Support	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	
Support		
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Policy 2 " Hayley Green (Objection)</p> <p>As stated in relation to Policy 1, the proposed allocation of land at Hayley Green for 235 dwellings appears to be a mechanism to ensure that the NP complies with the requirements of the WMS, which states that appeals can be more successfully frustrated when a NP allocates sites for housing. If the NP did not allocate any sites, it could not be argued that the WMS requirements were applicable and development should not be allowed on "unplanned" sites. Therefore, it appears that the Hayley Green site has been proposed, even though it is a flawed site, which has many issues, some of which may never be successfully resolved, simply to thwart development in other locations.</p> <p>The policy requires that a comprehensive outline planning application must be submitted for the whole site, even though it is in numerous, fragmented ownerships. Many sites in fragmented ownership never come to fruition, or they take many, many years to eventually come forward, because different owners have different interests, they work to different timetables and have different objectives. It is highly likely that the owners of such a fragmented site will never be able to submit a comprehensive outline application, which will significantly delay the delivery of much needed new homes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the development will significantly erode and harm the "gap" between Warfield Street and SA9 Area 3 to Hayley Green. The gap will be reduced to just 250 metres from the western edge of the Hayley Green proposal to the eastern edge of the allocated SA9 Area 3 development. This is a very narrow gap and there will be considerable inter-visibility between both developments. In effect, the gap will be a gap in name only. The 2 settlements will be effectively conjoined, especially, because the land use in the "gap" is an equestrian/riding centre containing several buildings, some of which are quite large and obtrusive. Under current planning policies. It is highly likely that further development and intensification of the use of the site will occur in the future, which will further erode the functionality of the "gap".</p> <p>The proposed development includes a "community hub". Hayley Green is an area well served by community buildings and facilities. A list of such facilities is contained in the NP at paragraphs 2.15 to 2.17. Further community facilities are planned within the policy SA9 development. Again, it seems to have been included in the proposal simply to make the development appear more suitable as an allocation, than other sites in the SHLAA, such as land north of Newhurst Gardens, which we are promoting on behalf of the owners, the Whitaker family. As part of such a small scheme, it is unlikely to be commercially viable to provide a "community hub" along with all the other costly NP requirements, including: affordable housing, public open space, sustainable drainage systems (SUDS), children's play area, roads, cycleways, footpaths and junction improvements. The plethora of requirements could well render the scheme unviable. It is unlikely that the proposed scheme will be able to provide the long list of requested benefits at a cost low enough to enable the owners to achieve an acceptable land value, which they can all agree to accept.</p> <p>It should be noted that all of the criteria listed in the policy as key to the delivery of the Hayley Green site, can be met by the Newhurst Gardens site, which is owned by my clients, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Illustrative masterplan " provided.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure delivery plan " can be secured by condition.</li> <li>3. Housing mix favouring smaller units " provided.</li> <li>4. Landscape impact " will be mitigated.</li> <li>5. Heritage impact " will be mitigated.</li> <li>6. Ecology, green infrastructure and boundary treatment strategy " provided.</li> <li>7. Flood risk and drainage strategy " provided.</li> <li>8. Drainage connection " provided.</li> <li>9. Transport strategy, including encouragement of walking and cycling " provided.</li> <li>10. Archaeological assessment and evaluation " provided.</li> <li>11. Planning obligation to secure community benefits " to be provided.</li> </ol> <p>Paragraph 5.18 states that the Borough Council is "opposed to piecemeal development, because insufficient consideration is given to strategic infrastructure, such as the provision of open space and other facilities". This is one of the main reasons why Bracknell Borough does not have and has not had for many years a 5-year housing land supply. The LPA relies too much on large housing developments, which can deliver infrastructure, but only after considerable periods of time. Large sites rarely deliver as many houses in as short a time as Council's predict. Bracknell Borough suffers a great deal from this phenomenon, which has created a 5-year housing land supply shortfall, which will never be addressed while the council continues to block and prevent smaller urban extensions, such as Land north of Newhurst Gardens, which could help to deliver a 5-year housing land supply in the short-term.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.19 states that the numerous owners of the Hayley Green site will be "expected to work together" to deliver the required infrastructure. This is an extremely hopeful statement. It is normally the case that the more landowners there are, the more difficult it is for them to reach agreement and work together to deliver development within a reasonable timescale. If the council makes excessive demands on them, such as requiring considerable amounts of infrastructure provision, the chances of the owners all agreeing with each other at the same time, diminish even further.</p>	<p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p>
Support		
Neutral	<p>Whilst the allocation of land at Hayley Green Historic England strongly support the requirements of the policy for proposals to be brought together within an overarching masterplan ensuring that a joined up approach is adopted and that proposals for individual parcels respond to the surrounding landscape character, including the provision of sensitive rural edges to development. We consider the provision of a green core to this area as an attractive element that should seek to retain some of its historic character. Nevertheless this does appear to be a very large allocation extending a small settlement and we are concerned that the development of an essentially new community will have considerable need for infrastructure.</p>	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	No communication with residents on size of development and number of houses, or choice of site	The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix A, Hayley Green was the most suitable.
Object	Retain the country / rural aspect of the village - No new houses	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object		
Object	(Thursday 24 August 2017) I have just completed a 3 hour walk to observe the site and feel a great deal of disappointment as at the moment there is a balance of green space, without these spaces there would be no beauty for the eye, rows of brick built homes these days are not beautiful. Having just recently moved here this plan is spoiling my enthusiasm for being here and I wish I had moved further out. Now I will help to protect it.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	Please don't use up our Green Belt land	Hayley Green is not in 'Green Belt'. No development on Green Belt land is proposed in the Warfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>I think the fields at Hayley Green are completely unsuitable for starter, intermediate and affordable housing. We already have Carnation Hall, Brownlow Hall plus a nursery/hall at Westmoreland Park, so why build another. Extra traffic - hundreds more cars. will hinder walking and cycling in the area. So the Council's idea of promoting walking etc is flawed. Leave our fields alone so we can enjoy the tranquility of same.</p>	<p>Within the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan, local residents were consulted with regards to 'Community Buildings'. The majority of residents voted against a building of any such kind (be it village hall; retail; business etc).</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements."</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>
Object		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>The allocation of land in Hayley Green was made without meaningful input from the residents. Two fetes and a few meetings do not constitute an effective contribution from the residents. Development would be excessive - tripling the size of the village. It would mean more cars, more traffic on country roads and more pollution. There would be no benefit to residents. Cycle paths are pipe dreams as the existing roads are too narrow. Stand alone and brown sites would be preferable.</p>	<p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles. All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix X, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Its good to have a plan but the allocation of 235 dwellings is not in keeping with the rural nature of the area. The current dwelling stock of about 60 would increase nearly 5 fold. The road network is not able to support this increase in traffic. The options to make junction improvements would be at the loss of trees + hedgerows. The street scene would be dramatically changed which is in conflict with policy No. 3.</p>	<p>In the “Transport Statement”, included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives.” and “more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.”.</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and required mitigation.</p>

Policy 3: Promoting Good Design in the Parish		
<p>Development proposals will be supported, provided their design respects the rural and historic character and setting of the parish and responds positively to the individual settlement studies including important features of the street scene and proposals utilise materials which are in keeping and are not obviously incongruous with individual settlement character.</p> <p>In the defined settlements in the parish the following detailed policies will apply.</p> <p>(i) Newell Green</p> <p>Proposals in Newell Green should have special regard to the following:</p> <p>XI. The significance of the Warfield Memorial Ground and Priory Fields as a central focus for the settlement and the retention of their open character</p> <p>XII. The significance of larger buildings set in large plots in establishing the settlement character whereby proposals for plot subdivision will not normally be appropriate,</p> <p>XIII. Development along Newell Green, Forest Road and Osbourne Lane should be in the form of semi-detached or small terraces and 2 storeys in height to reflect the existing streetscene,</p> <p>XIV. Building materials should principally be of red brick under slate roofs to reflect local character</p> <p>XV. New development should reinforce deciduous tree and hedgerow planting and front boundaries should be formed by hedgerows or low brick walls; close boarded fencing will be discouraged, and</p> <p>XVI. One field width separation should be maintained between the settlement boundary and open countryside to maintain the rural setting and views and physical links into open countryside. (ii) Warfield Street and Hayley Green</p> <p>Proposals in Warfield Street and Hayley Green should have special regard to the following:</p> <p>xiii. The significance in heritage terms of Newell Hall and The Priory,</p> <p>xiv. Development fronting Warfield Street and Forest Road should be in the form of 2 storey semi-detached or small terraced housing on small to medium size plots</p> <p>xv. On the settlement fringes a lower density less formal pattern of development will be acceptable</p> <p>xvi. Building materials may vary from red brick to render but existing building line should be maintained and boundary treatments reinforced,</p> <p>xvii. Proposals should reinforce tree and hedgerow planting to maintain the local landscape character and particularly at the gateway of each settlement to maintain a sense of separation.</p> <p>xviii. One field width separation should be maintained beyond the settlement boundary and open countryside to maintain the rural setting and views and physical links into open countryside. In all cases Infill development should minimise its impact on the streetscene and avoid harming the amenities of adjoining residential properties by way of forming a new access route or of overlooking neighbouring properties, and in all other respects accord with relevant policies of the neighbourhood plan and development plan. When seeking planning permission, developers of sites with multiple developer or land owner interest will be expected to produce evidence of collaborative working and contribute towards the overall infrastructure needs and masterplan of the site. Development shall include measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of residential development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) in agreement with the Council and Natural England. This will include the provision of a bespoke SANG, a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring and any other measures that are required to satisfy Habitats Regulations, the Councils Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and relevant guidance.</p>		
<p>Support: 42,      Neutral: 15,      Object: 29</p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Again a firm stance against infill development should be conducted by the Parish as it is fulfilling the SALP requirements.	One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.
Object	I object based on the whole plan. it is common sense however that any development in nature needs to be of good design and sympathetic be it one house or the proposed 19 at North Lodge Farm which I consider to be acceptable in number.	This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	The design in Warfield is ugly - very ugly.	This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.
Support	Please clarify "one field width between settlement boundary and open countryside." I hope that you mean that new developments must be a distance of one field's width from existing housing. Warfield Street residents do not want new housing directly adjoining their own properties. How wide is a field? Please define. Please explain "existing building line maintained and boundary treatment reinforced. Access must comply with Highway Standards concerning roads and footpaths. Construction and use must not occur on residents land, decreasing their amenity and quiet enjoyment. Access must be from main roads; residents do not accept access down quiet residential side streets, especially to cul de sac developments outside of defined settlement	
Neutral	No comment.	
Support		
Neutral	Its one thing to design sympathetically - I think I would like to see more innovation and modernity around Warfield - this does not have to threaten the environment but can enhance  e.g putting in tag posts for kids to map their walks/cycles/scooter rides -  cycle lanes stop or lead nowhere	
Support		
Support		
Support		
Neutral	This policy should specify the criteria to be met to meet these aspirations.	
Support	I support good design although it is never implemented, developments are thrown up without a thought for local residents and the impact it will have on there quality of life	
Object	How can it improve the design of Hayley Green by looking at extra buildings roads and Traffic, I DON'T think so.	This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Just leave this part of the town as it is. BFC is getting more than enough additional revenue from all the new housing in the area as it is.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Support		
Object	Adding 235 HIGH density dwellings in an accepted LOW density area is contradictory to the aims of the NP as its changes the character of the village. The road network surrounding the development is already over used and congested, with regular high speed use in limited speed areas; areas where the exercising or horses and cycling are regular facets of the culture. These number of dwellings are likely to add a further 500 car users to the existing traffic nuisance. There is also the impact on the actual building work within the village and surrounding areas. The road network can't support extended use by fully laden 30 ton trucks which damage the road surface and also damage the underlying ground structure compressing the natural rain water soak-aways thereby causing increased flooding of roads and properties.	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>In the "Transport Statement", included in the Pre-Submission supporting information, a Transport Model was run for the Hayley Green Masterplan, which concluded that there are some local links that show a small increase in traffic following the development (e.g. Bracknell Road to the north-east of Cricketers Lane), however the Council will always seek to mitigate any such impacts, either through highway improvements, or through green travel initiatives." and "more detailed modelling will be required at the application stage to ensure the impact is properly assessed with options for highways capacity and safety improvements.".</p> <p>All proposed developments will undertake this full planning process to evaluate the traffic impact and</p>
Support	I particularly like the proposals for the nature of the developments in Newell Green and Hayley Green but it is vital to avoid the unsympathetic style of building that we have already seen - see my comments on Proposal 1.	
Support	Red brick and tile are more common than red brick and slate on existing buildings  as stated in plan, so this should altered in plan	
Support	The details of transitions from more built-up to rural are good.	
Support		
Support	Good design in the Parish must consider how development effects the parish and should not change the essence of the area.	
Neutral		
Support		
Support		
Support	However New housing estates do not represent good design in my opinion. Do we really need this vast amount of new housing?	
Support		
Support	Essential	

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral		
Support		
Support	Adding more houses & over-crowding the local roads will not be Good DDesign	
Support		
Object	Building along the street frontage of Hayley Green would destroy the rural aspect and eradicate our village - becoming a through street instead.	Hayley Green, specifically on Forest Road, is a 'ribbon development' of houses fronting both sides of the street. Therefore, extending that strip of housing to mirror the opposite site of the road is the most appropriate development in planning terms.
Support	Couldn't agree more about street parking	
Neutral		
Object		
Support	Yes, effectiveness of roads, leading out to main roads. On some estates, it takes a long time just to get out of the estate, due to poorly planned layout, please avoid this! Also allow for larger gardens, shared public areas in between houses and apartment buildings.	
Support	Very important not to deviate form current style	
Object	Good design translates as " We tell you nice things and hope you are stupid enough to say 'Ok, then, thanks for being nice' ". Ther is nothing wrong with the current design!	This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.
Support	Good policy which i strongly support	
Support		
Object		
Object	It would appear from the NP that in addition to the 235 dwellings you would support in Hayley Green, you are also in support of further development/infill in Newell Green, Osbourne Lane, Forest Road and Warfield St. You appear to have no plan to push back on further development in any part of Warfield, instead just offer an opinion on planning guidelines. The net result is that you are supporting further erosion of this once characterful village setting.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.  One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>This conflicts with what is stated earlier 'that development should match existing properties' at the fronting on Forest rd.</p> <p>Collaborative working excludes any meaningful input or evidence from the Residents affected by the Neighbourhood Plan. Developers and landowners only appear to contribute.</p>	<p>Hayley Green, specifically on Forest Road, is a 'ribbon development' of houses fronting both sides of the street. Therefore, extending that strip of housing to mirror the opposite site of the road is the most appropriate development in planning terms.</p> <p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p>
Object	<p>I understand and fully support the policy aims to preserve the identify of Warfield but no not support further development beyond 2200 homes. I support any policy that respects the rural and historic character and setting of the parish. More building does not do this.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p>
Support	<p>building in keeping with existing and historic housing is essential. looser fit sounds good. estate style no .</p>	
Object	<p>Good design shows ability of designer but cannot override consent of residents.</p>	<p>This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.</p>
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object	<p>Houses fronting Forest Road and Bracknell Road will ruin the areas countryside character.</p>	<p>Hayley Green, specifically on Forest Road, is a 'ribbon development' of houses fronting both sides of the street. Therefore, extending that strip of housing to mirror the opposite site of the road is the most appropriate development in planning terms.</p>
Object		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		
Object	Filling in green areas would alter our village in a negative way.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	Filling in green spaces would alter the village's character and neither promotes good design or environmental progress.	The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	<p>Boxy little houses with tiny windows - once again shows how the planners, landowners etc are using this as another money making project</p> <p>The designs will not enhance the lives of those that live there nor those that live around the new estate</p> <p>Squashing as many houses onto a plot as possible is not good design</p> <p>Surrounding areas, areas between the houses - none of this has been thought through</p> <p>You are not concerned with how the new residents or the old residents will move/live/react to this new 'neighbourhood'.</p>	This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.
Support		
Support	Tree and hedge planting - would like to see encouragement for the planting of 'native' species	
Support		
Neutral	None to make	
Support		
Object		
Object		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Support	<p>Support in principle for the Parish but there should be NO further development along Warfield Street for the following reasons:</p> <p>The existing over-development to the south of Warfield Street;</p> <p>Recognition and protection of the unusually high number of heritage and character buildings along Warfield Street;</p> <p>Any further development will significantly increase the existing unacceptable high volume of traffic along Warfield Street and further endanger all road users, especially the older residents and the many horse riders from stables on lanes off Warfield Street who have nowhere else to go;</p> <p>Impact on the local character and culture of this rural community;</p> <p>Impact on the on-road parking requirement and safety of residents and road users (due to older properties with no off-road parking).</p> <p>Please define in the Plan what 'one field width' means.</p>	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Policy 3 “ Promoting Good Design in the Parish (Objection)</p> <p>This policy states that development proposals in Warfield Street and Hayley Green should have special regard to several criteria. We consider that it is important to point out that the proposal on land north of Newhurst Gardens, Warfield Street, meets all the suggested criteria and has special regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“ The significance of heritage assets “ the proposal will not have an adverse impact on listed buildings or conservation areas, as explained in the Heritage Statement submitted with the planning application.</li> <li>“ Two-storey semi-detached or small terraced housing preferred “ the proposal includes both house types, as well as larger family housing to meet local housing need.</li> <li>“ On settlement fringes, lower density development encouraged “ the proposal will be at a relatively low-density so that it will successfully transition from an urban to a rural environment.</li> <li>“ Building materials should match local types and boundaries should be reinforced “ the council will be able to dictate building materials to be used and a landscaping scheme will be implemented to strengthen boundary treatments.</li> <li>“ Proposals should reinforce tree and hedgerow planting to maintain local character and separation between settlements “ the proposal will maintain rural character through planting and it will erode any gaps, whereas the Hayley Green proposal will significantly erode one of the key local gaps.</li> <li>“ One field separation should be maintained between the settlement boundary and open countryside to maintain a rural setting “ it is not clear why this is needed or what it is intended to achieve. It does not appear to be good planning, as it will lead to wasted land and blight on the edges of settlements. This criterion should be deleted, as it does not serve a sound planning purpose.</li> </ul> <p>The policy goes on to state that “developers of sites with multiple developer or land owner interest will be expected to produce evidence of collaborative working”. As stated in relation to policy 2 above, it is the case that sites in multiple-ownership are much more difficult to deliver, because of the problems that inevitably arise when people with disparate interests and agendas are forced to work together. The fact that the NP contains this requirement confirms our point. The Hayley Green site will be difficult to deliver in a timely manner for this reason, among others; whereas the site at Newhurst Gardens will be easy to deliver, because it is wholly in the ownership of one family who all agree that the land</p>	<p>Planning Applications already in progress are not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Support		
Support		
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Support	<p>Support in principle for the Parish but there should be NO further development along Warfield Street for the following reasons:</p> <p>The existing over-development to the south of Warfield Street;</p> <p>Recognition and protection of the unusually high number of heritage and character buildings along Warfield Street;</p> <p>Any further development will significantly increase the existing unacceptable high volume of traffic along Warfield Street and further endanger all road users, especially the older residents and the many horse riders from stables on lanes off Warfield Street who have nowhere else to go;</p> <p>Impact on the local character and culture of this rural community;</p> <p>Impact on the on-road parking requirement and safety of residents and road users (due to older properties with no off-road parking).</p> <p>Please define in the Plan what 'one field width' means.</p>	
Support		
Object	<p>Have no stance on good design in houses for the parish, as not informed of development in the first pla. Because there was no communication with residents.</p>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p> <p>This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings.</p>
Object	<p>No more housebuilding</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p> <p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p>
Object		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>There should not be rows of houses, they should not be grouped together these huge fields keep residents balanced mentally and physically, mental problems are increasing due to the invasion of privacy land. (small houses) put rats together they will kill each other so huge fields balance and give peace too. If need be less houses but beautiful</p>	<p>Hayley Green, specifically on Forest Road, is a 'ribbon development' of houses fronting both sides of the street. Therefore, extending that strip of housing to mirror the opposite site of the road is the most appropriate development in planning terms.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>
Neutral	<p>No more houses would be a better option for the area</p>	
Object	<p>We had no input or influence on site selection - Knew nothing about the plan for Hayley Green until 4th October 2016. Why? The majority of houses in Hayley Green are detached properties. Also, there are a large proportion of bungalows, so semi-detached - terraced housing will not be in keeping.</p>	<p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p> <p>All private landowners on sites suitable for development were contacted, and based on the reviews, analysis and surveys found in Appendix A, Hayley Green was the most suitable.</p> <p>It is the landowners decision whether to put their land up for development or not, not residents or the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>This Policy, together with the Character Area Studies that are included in the Neighbourhood Plan, will help to ensure that new builds are sympathetic to the existing surroundings</p>
Object		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>The plan does not promote good design in the Parish. Filling green fields with houses does not respect the rural character of the village. Higher density two storey semi-detached or small terraced housing on Forest Road is not in keeping with the existing detached bungalows and chalet bungalows already sited on Forest Road., Low density, less formal development proposed is more acceptable anywhere, not only on the fringes of the village. The high density housing in the Plan points to yet another faceless housing estate.</p>	<p>Hayley Green, specifically on Forest Road, is a 'ribbon development' of houses fronting both sides of the street. Therefore, extending that strip of housing to mirror the opposite side of the road is the most appropriate development in planning terms.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>
Support	<p>Lots of good words here but not compatible with a development of this size. Proposals to reinforce tree and hedgerow would be welcome but often these are planted up and left to die. Responsibility to look after should be contained in the plan. Again the provision of cycle ways and pavements would just eat up the existing green space available. The provision of traffic lights at junctions does not support the rural character of the area but continues the process towards urbanisation</p>	

<b>Policy 4: Local Gaps</b>		
<p>The neighbourhood plan designates the following Local Gaps as shown on the policies map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Newell Green to Warfield Street</li> <li>- Warfield Street and SA9 Area 3 to Hayley Green; and,</li> <li>- Hayley Green to the parish boundary with Winkfield Row/Chavey Down</li> </ul> <p>Development proposals within the Local Gaps will be supported provided that they will not lead to physical or visual coalescence, damage the integrity and distinctive identity of the adjoining settlements (Newell Green, Warfield Street and Hayley Green) or compromise the integrity of the gap.</p>		
<p>Support: 37,      Neutral: 12,      Object: 37</p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Seriously, Look at the Borough Plan objectively. Only the subjective Warfield area is being addressed with no consideration to other Parishes. The whole area is now a Bracknell New Town extension. The identity of the semi rural locations is being destroyed.	The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan applies only to the Warfield Parish, other areas are out of scope. A number of adjoining Parishes/areas are developing their own Neighbourhood plan to address their residents concerns.
Object	Local gaps should benefit the current residents why enhance a strip of private land that is already Green yet take away the beautiful Green that is visible to all around Cricketers lane.	Local Gaps are intended to maintain separation between adjacent settlements thus allowing a clear visual and physical break in the built environment. This enables settlements to retain their separate identity and local distinctiveness.
Object		
Support	It is essential to retain gaps to prevent a sprawling suburban conurbation.	
Neutral	No comment.	
Support	The maintenance of gaps and green space between settlements is essential if Warfield is to retain its character.	
Neutral	I am not clear what the proposal is around local gaps	See policy 4: It ensures that the physical and visual separation is kept and settlements retain separate identities. Protection of the countryside as Bracknell continues to grow towards the Northern parishes.
Support	The gaps are not easy to find on the Policies Map as stated in the text.	
	Continued confusion between village and settlement.	
Support		
Support		
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral		
Object		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Object	Not enough building on brownfield sites, as usual BFC follows the developers who make more money from greenfield sites than brownfield sites.	Bracknell Forest have published their Brownfield Sites register, listing one site in Warfield Parish - Land @ Battle Bridge House & Garage, Forest Road, Warfield. It is expected that this will be developed in time.
Support	Although the gap to SA9 contains development and the gap to Winkfield is very narrow; support the principle but they are being eroded to make them meaningless.	Policy 1 and 4 there to ensure that gaps are preserved.
Object	SA9 doesn't include Hayley Green. The planned 235 dwelling development can't be seen in any light as adding to the character of the area or maintaining the Local gap policy. The development would impact all the criteria for making Hayley Green a Local gap therefore the rules pertaining to Hayley Green are broken by this development, 235 dwellings can't be hidden from view so visual impact; the 500 plus additional cars brought on the northern parish roads can't be hidden; there is no opportunity to improve the road network infrastructure as all the B-class roads are bounded by actively farmed rural land.	The field is a natural progression of the current street scene . The alternative to the proposed 'masterplan' is continued infill development around the parish in the sites identified in the BFBC Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. Policy 6 in place to enhance green infrastructure, defining a network of green infrastructure asset. Policy 2: Hayley Green, see xi.
Support	Agree. These areas are vitally important.	
Neutral	Need visual gaps i.e any new developments to be kept back from roads and planted with trees and shrubs to give rural feel	Policy 1 and 4 in place to ensure that these are preserved.
Support	The area is made up of different settlements. It would be a shame if the whole parish became a suburb of Bracknell.	noted and in policies 1 and 4
Support	If there is building between Cricketers Lane, Forest Road, Bracknell Road and Malt Hill, where is the local gap ?	The infilling of gaps in the countryside will not normally be permitted. Exceptionally, there may be situations where there is development of a small gap.
Object	We need to leave gaps between settlements otherwise we will no longer have any feeling of belonging to a community.	Understood, this policy is to implement Local Gaps to separate settlements.

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Gaps between local built up areas are important to distinguish between one place and another and add to the character and community of a small area. However, I object to any further development of Hayley Green.	noted in policy 4 for preserving local gaps. Noted
Support		
Support		
Support	With more of them	
Object		
Support	we need as many green fields as possible in this rural area	
Neutral		
Object	Local gaps should not be reduced	noted in policy 4
Object	Filling in local gaps is ugly & destroys the historic design & causes huge disruption during development	policy 4 in place to preserve the gaps
Support	Essential to preserve/protect individual villages/settlements becoming overwhelmed by future development and losing their separate identities	noted
Object	There has been no communication regarding building in Hayley Green, on the fields. The eradication of the fields would destroy the natural gap that they represent. The fields are an important part of the village - once gone they are gone forever!! A Warfield residents questionnaire in 2015 showed just 6% supporting building on green fields, with 72% against. This has been ignored.	The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter. The field is a natural progression of the current street scene . The alternative to a 'masterplan' is continued infill development around the parish, so no clear benefit to Hayley Green existing residents.
Object	The gaps should be bigger	noted
Object	You have not allowed enough "local gaps" pls do not build on all the local fields. Totally disgusted.	large part of the land has been identified as green open space, see Hayley Green Masterplan.
Object		
Support	Keep the greenbelt as much as possible, we need nature.	Greenbelt has already protection. Greenbelt boundaries as set in the local plan and which sets the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy.
Support	Need to keep these at the forefront of the awful urban sprawl	noted
Object	LEAVE THINGS ALONE!!	The alternative to a 'masterplan' is continued infill development around the parish, so no clear benefit to Warfield residents.

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral	I can certainly confirm that I support local gaps. However your policy statement talks of a local gap between Newell Green and Warfield St and goes on to say the idea is to prevent coalescence between these hamlets yet you then say development will be supported providing they will not lead to physical or vial coalescence, in my view a very clear contradiction. Isnt it the case already that there is no visible gap between Newell Green and Warfield St and yet you are in support of further development. The issue I have with this whole document is that it is full of contradiction.	The infilling of gaps in the countryside will not normally be permitted. Exceptionally, there may be situations where there is development of a small gap.
Object	The existing local gaps more than meet this need. Erecting 235 more houses effectively closes the gap.  The green space shown divides and creates two distinct settlement communities.	noted
Object	I strongly object to any development in local gaps for reasons outlined in 5.31- 5.33.	noted
Support		
Object	This policy has been created by Parish Council to support Hayley Green Development.  To the West of Gap is site for 28 houses. This proposal is to refuse any development on the gap but Policy 2 is to build over 235 houses next to Green Belt. Totally unacceptable.	The policies identified in the Neighbourhood Plan were all considered in developing the Hayley Green proposal and the gaps proposed are to maintain the separate identity and stop merging with other settlements to the West or East.
Object	On the grounds of effectively destroying the entity of Winkfield Row.	This would protect the entity of Winkfield Row by maintaining a gap between it and Hayley Green.
Support		
Object	Please see covering letter	
Support	Local gaps should be maintained, they are rightly designed to counter urban sprawl.	noted
Neutral		
Object	Whilst keen for local gaps, the plan puts the gaps in the wrong places. The most important green space in Hayley Green village is the very one on which the new development is proposed.	The policy is to identify and retain gaps between nearby adjacent settlements to halt coalescence and not to solely retain green space.
Support		
Object	Green gaps are necessary.	The policy is to identify and retain gaps between nearby adjacent settlements to halt coalescence.

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Green spaces are essential for successful community living and individual wellbeing. If this goes ahead there will not be any recognisable green space between Hayley Green and Winkfield Row. This is not acceptable.	Land has been allocated for Open green space in Warfield.
Object	<p>At the moment there are green spaces between all the current residential groupings, including the myriad of new developments.</p> <p>People need green spaces to live and survive - for well-being and health.</p> <p>The current building of hundreds and hundreds of houses in the area is already affecting the make-up of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Housing estate after housing estate with no green spaces will create an inner-city field, leaving nothing of the area's previous character.</p>	<p>635 new homes are required in Bracknell Forest each year. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not include suitable sites for development, the Council and private landowners will have a 'carte blanche' for infill and piecemeal development that will not offer infrastructure improvements or community assets that a larger 'masterplan' will do.</p> <p>Hayley Green masterplan identifies open green space and has identified land for this.</p>
Support		
Support		
Support		

Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Presubmission consultation 21 Jun to 8 Sep 2017 - Comments and Responses

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Policy 4 "Local Gaps"</p> <p>One of our clients currently has an interest in the northeastern corner of Area 3 of the SA9 Warfield urban extension "the broadly triangular area between Bracknell Road and Forest Road. This land appears to immediately abut the "Warfield Street and SA9 Area 3 to Hayley Green" Gap. However, Plan F "Preliminary Gap Study, Hayley Green" is another Plan that is regrettably hard to interpret definitively.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the Gap starts at the boundary with our clients site, and this boundary is defined by the Bull Brook. If this is the case, Plan F needs to show this clearly, and the supporting text should also offer clarity over precisely where each Gap starts and ends.</p> <p>We would welcome confirmation that the land which our clients have an interest in is not affected by this Policy.</p> <p>More generally, we would also question the purpose of this policy, particularly given this wording:</p> <p>"Development proposals within the Local Gaps will be supported provided that they will not lead to physical or visual coalescence, damage the integrity and distinctive identity of the adjoining settlements...or compromise the integrity of the Gap".</p> <p>At the most basic level, it could be argued that any development within a Local Gap will lead to some level of physical or visual coalescence, which would appear to be fundamentally at odds with the permissive stance of the policy.</p> <p>We would suggest that the policy should be expanded to confirm what types of development are considered appropriate within the Gaps. Are there particular uses that would or would not be considered acceptable? Or is the policy motivated by landscape and character considerations, rather than uses? This should be clearer.</p> <p>Furthermore, the "Warfield Street and SA9 Area 3 to Hayley Green" Gap includes the area between our clients land and Hayley Green. This area is dominated by Brookfield Farm Equestrian Centre, which a well established use with a number of large buildings in the site.</p> <p>Generally, we would expect Local Gap policies to focus on largely undeveloped areas of land so we could question the purpose of including this site in the Gap.</p> <p>Similarly, the Local Gap policy includes a large area of already developed, residential land to the northeastern corner of Bracknell, "Warfield Park". Again, how this policy could be practically applied in such a built up area is questionable.</p> <p>We would recommend that the Local Gap policy is amended to focus on areas of land within the Plan Area that are largely undeveloped.</p> <p>Potential Conflict "Policy 4 "Local Gaps and SA9 Warfield Extension allocation"</p> <p>Again, due to the quality of the images, in particular the "Warfield Neighbourhood Plan "Policies Map" it is hard to be definitive on the interaction between the SA9 Area 3 and the proposed Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, it does appear that the Local Gap designation encroaches into SA9 Area 3 by including the area known as "The Bull Brook River Park". Is it the intention that the Local Gap includes this Park? If so, we would question the veracity of this approach.</p> <p>Firstly, there is an undesirable element of overlapping policies between the Bracknell Site Allocations Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, it appears that the Neighbourhood Plan assumes that the River Park will be delivered but no detailed planning permission exists for it and the Site Allocations Plan only offers an indicative masterplan for most of the SA9 area.</p> <p>Whilst we accept and support that masterplan, and expect that this area will eventually be offered as public open space, we consider that this is a matter for Bracknell Forest Council to consider through the submission of detailed planning applications. Thus, we recommend that the Local Gaps policy is amended so that it does not include any of the</p>	Comments noted, policy revised.
Support		
Object		
Object		
Object	Gaps are not in the right places, they should be fronting Forest Road and Cricketers Lane.	The proposed gap does front onto Forest Road and Cricketers Lane.
Support		
Neutral	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	
Support		
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Policy 4 "Local Gaps (Objection)</p> <p>This policy seeks to maintain the local gaps of open land between settlements. It is a contradiction in the NP, that one of the key objectives is to maintain local gaps between the settlements in order to maintain the rural character of the area, while another is to allocate a site for 235 dwellings at Hayley Green, which will fundamentally harm and erode one of the key local gaps between Warfield Street/SA9 Area 3 and Hayley Green. The 250m gap, which will be left between the 2 settlements is far too small and will not fulfill its intended function. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development of 235 homes will "lead to physical (and) visual coalescence, damage the integrity and distinctive identity of the adjoining settlements (and) compromise the integrity of the gap". The NP's own proposal will contravene policy 4. Therefore, if the council wants to maintain this policy in the NP, it will need to be completely re-written to reflect the allocation at Hayley Green or the Hayley Green proposal must be removed. It is unsound planning to have a policy in the plan, which is so completely contradicted and rendered pointless by another policy in the plan (policy 2).</p> <p>In contrast, the proposed development on land north of Newhurst Gardens will not harm or erode any of the local gaps. It will be situated to the north of Warfield Street and it will not invade any of the designated local gaps. The incorporation of considerable areas of open space and landscaping, will ensure, as agreed by the planning officer in her report to committee in March 2017, that the character and setting of the location will not be materially harmed by the development. The same cannot be said for the Hayley Green development, which will erode a local gap and be extremely prominent and visible, such that its erosion of the open countryside will be extremely obvious when viewed from public vantage points. Furthermore, the Hayley Green development will erode the "countryside gap" to within 50 metres of the Green Belt, whereas the corresponding gap between the Newhurst Gardens development and the Green Belt will be around 700 metres.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the proposed allocation of land at Hayley Green completely undermines the efficacy of policy 4. The policy either needs to be deleted or completely rewritten to take account of this anomaly.</p>	<p>The policies identified in the Neighbourhood Plan were all considered in developing the Hayley Green proposal and the gaps proposed around Hayley Green are to maintain the separate identity and stop merging with other settlements to the West or East.</p>
Support		
Object	<p>Hayley Green fields represents a gap between developments in Winkfield and Warfield and should be left as they are.</p>	<p>noted</p>
Object		
Object		
Object	<p>If more houses, more cars more children more schools more doctors more drains more wall more floods more footprints more problems. Woods are ebeucial (sic.) fields are essential to keep us in touch with nature and balanced mentally. We only have a little amount of wild land Keep it!</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils. The Plan is to guide how the development in the Parish should be implemented.</p>
Neutral	<p>Do not build the houses in the first place - No "Local Gaps" will be available for you to fill.</p>	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	If building takes place on the horse field I do not feel there will be any gap between Hayley Green - Winkfield Row.	noted see policy 2 and 4
Object		
Object	The existing gap comprising the proposed sites is more acceptable than the much reduced gap proposed between Hayley Green and Winkfield Row.	noted
Support	We will have to wait and see if there are any left. Just be a suburb of Bracknell.	policy 4 in place to preserve the gaps

<b>Policy 5: Supporting Rural Exception Affordable Housing</b>		
<p>Proposals for rural exception affordable housing schemes, on sites that would not normally be acceptable for general housing development will be supported, subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The exception site is adjacent to an existing settlement boundary, or is well related to existing residential development and amenities located in, or adjacent to, a clearly identifiable settlement;</li> <li>- the scheme responds to a clear and demonstrable need by people with a local connection to Warfield for affordable homes, some of which will be social-rented houses and it comprises a mix of house sizes to reflect this need; and,</li> <li>- The proposed development would be appropriate to the settlement and land in which it is proposed to be located, in terms of scale, form and character and would not have a significant impact on the landscape setting or historic significance of the surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p>Where permission is granted this will be subject to planning obligations and will include safeguards that the scheme provides for the identified local affordable housing need.</p> <p>The delivery of suitable forms of rural exception housing development such as through Community Land Trusts or through Community Right to Build Orders will be encouraged.</p>		
<p>Support: 26,          Neutral: 25,          Object: 35</p>		
<p><b>In parallel with the consultation as well as from the comments below, it became apparent that there was not a need, nor support, for Rural Exception Affordable Housing in the Parish. This policy has been removed from the Plan.</b></p> <p><b>For completeness and transparency, the stances and comments are shown below.</b></p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	I was brought up in Social Housing and have worked hard to leave that life behind. Locations tend not to be looked after and crime rate and Anti social behaviour increases. How on earth can you means test the validity of a persons claim to a social house from where they were brought up. It will not be long until the council have a law suit in discrimination brought against them.	
Support	I support new developments that are small in nature that would be offered to the local community at a discounted rate rather like the Channel Islands policy you must qualify to own or rent one.	
Object		
Support	We oppose cul-de-sac developments. There should be a one field width to separate from existing buildings. The small scale of	
Neutral	No comment.	
Support		
Object	Why build affordable homes on land that would not normally be used to build homes on? Do you mean you want to extend Warfield Caravan park??	
Support	The text refers to Affordable housing	
Object		
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Affordable housing is to be built "as an exception to policy". That is not acceptable. All development shall be in accordance with the policies.	
Neutral		
Object	WE DO NOT NEED RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING	
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Object	Absolutely no need for this in this area, West Berkshire and Oxfordshire maybe.	
Support		
Object	The existing village is low density single story houses; the proposal is high density multi-story dwellings therefore contradicts the first rule of the exception housing	
Neutral	I am not entirely sure that I understand the purpose behind this proposal but if my understanding is correct I would comment as follows: Where construction is to be allowed, houses will be packed in tightly (as can be clearly seen in existing developments in Whitegrove, Quelm Park, etc) so that developers make maximum profit. Why allow additional building between these developments? Surely this will encroach into the green areas that have been designated within the proposals. Rules have a habit of being stretched where big money is involved and how long will it be before the green areas are slowly eroded away? Surely existing brownfield sites should be used for such development.	
Support	local people connections priority for cheaper housing	
Support	The area should not become only affordable for well-off people - as it looks to be heading now.	
Support		
Object	I think new large developments must not be in areas traditionally designated rural.	
Object	If the rural sites identified in the plan are not suitable for general housing then the rationale for building affordable housing is a contradiction. Building on semi-rural land in the area will negate one of the most important attractions of living in Warfield, and the surrounding areas, which is the availability and aesthetics of natural green space.	
Support		
Object		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support	Common sense approach - better to support reasonable propositions than have a worse result on appeal	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object	Why should affordable housing plans be treated to normal commercial housing applications. DEvelop Brown Field areas	
Neutral		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	This is not a small scale scheme - it will triple the size of Hayley Green village and change its rural nature forever.	
Support		
Neutral		
Object		
Neutral		
Object	Don't think the location is right	
Object	NEVER!	
Support		
Support		
Object		
Object	Please see my overarching comments for policy 1 which are applicable here also	
Object	Individual developments would provide a more acceptable alternative to creating two separated housing estates. The process of site selection appears to have been made with only token input by residents. Two fetes, a few meetings and a two year old questionnaire is not neighbourhood involvement.  The Plan was presented as a fait accompli to the residents.	
Support		
Support	I think this is needed and note it says small scale ie up to 10 dwellings.	
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral	This should not be seen as a way of getting around clause 5.12 above.	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object		
Support	I feel that section 5.12 could be strengthened to make more of the fact that the Warfield Parish Council opposes the 'over-development through cul-de-sac plots on the edge of settlements'. Warfield Street and the surrounding cul-de-sacs are already under significant pressure having been mentioned in the SHELAA document and could effectively be enveloped in development..	
Object	Affordable housing requires location in vicinity of transport hubs and community amenities ie: in the town centre.	
Object	Affordable housing requires location in the vicinity of transport, pubs and community amenities. I.e in the town centre and not in a village/hamlet.	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	<p>Are the houses really going to be affordable? Are you going to ensure local first time buyers are able to purchase these properties OR will you sell the houses to investors etc and landlords who will purchase the houses and then rent them out at inflated prices??? Will local first time buyers even be able to afford these houses. What stipulations have you put in place?</p> <p>Is this just another money making scheme for the council with no regard to those that already live in the area nor considering those local people who cannot afford to buy in the area??</p>	
Object	<p>Whilst it sounds a socially acceptable policy, I think the point is the same that I made in Policies 1 and 2. The local community has had enough of developments on greenfield sites, whether affordable or unaffordable. I also do not understand how it would be possible to give priority to people 'with a local connection and with a housing need in the affordable housing allocation process' and even if this were possible, surely this only happens for the initial occupants.</p>	
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral	None to make	
Support		
Object		
Object		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support		
Support		
Object	I feel there are plenty of affordable housing in Warfield already	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object	This is a large scale development which will totally change the character of the village.	
Object	I understand some affordable housing that should have been built in Ascot has instead been added to the Warfield development by BFBC. Do not build affordable housing right next to private developments - (Housing values)!!	
Object		
Object	Schools are bursting. Doctor surgeries full. We have enough houses here now.	
Object	No more houses needed in this area	

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	What is meant by affordable housing? How many local residents have expressed an interest? Will they be for rent or purchase? Worrying that people who do not care about the countryside may be considered for these properties. The council should concentrate on brown sites - infill	
Object		
Object	Affordable housing equates to housing for rent or purchase. If for purchase, they could be rented on and would no longer be affordable. The number of "affordable" houses per site are not stated. How many people with a connection to Warfield have expressed a desire or need for this type of housing? The plan makes no mention of identifying other available "exception" development sites in Warfield Street and Newell Green. Small exception sites are far more acceptable than two separate housing estates.	
Support	Yes some small developments should be allowed but also include other housing schemes	

<b>Policy 6: Enhancing Green Infrastructure</b>		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan proposes the establishment of the Warfield Green Infrastructure Network within the Parish, as shown on the Policies Map. The Network comprises a variety of green infrastructure assets, including informal open spaces, Local Green Spaces, woodlands, playing fields, assets of biodiversity value, play areas, footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycleways.</p> <p>Development proposals on land that lies within proximity to the Network will be required to demonstrate how they enhance the visual characteristics and biodiversity of the network and to ensure their landscape schemes, layouts, access and public open space provision and other amenity requirements contribute to the maintenance and improvement of the Network including the ecological value of the 'Cut' and 'Bullbrook'.</p> <p>Proposals that will lead to the unnecessary loss of land or features that form part of the network, that reduce its environmental quality or that will prejudice the completion of the comprehensive network will be resisted.</p>		
Support: 44,      Neutral: 16,      Object: 26		
Stance	Comment	Response
Object	Why bother, just build on it.	Resident feedback supports the retention and enhancement of Green Infrastructure
Object	Should we not look to improve and encourage our natural wildlife rather than write off the Cut and Bullbrook as little potential if the same had applied to the Thames it would have resulted in disaster. More off highway paths and Bridleways need to be built but also need to be enforced with fines for those who fail to use them if the roads are to be so much busier.	policy 6: a network seeks to create a new bridleway circuit with joined up bridleway in Binfield.
Object		
Support	Local residents do not want parks, play areas, playing fields etc adjacent to their existing housing. They must only be located within new developments. Warfield now urgently requires further bridleways for safety reasons.	Bridleway extensions/connections are in policy 6.
Neutral	No comment.	
Support		
Neutral	What are you planning to do to enhance green infrastructure. The loss of Larks Hill and the sunflowers is very sad - how will you enhance the green spaces we have left?  In order to create a behaviour change in warfield residents - support them to make maximum use of the environment - better signposts in Westmoreland wards outlining varying levels of walking trail, a coloured stripe on the pavement that people can follow for a circular 3 mile walk etc	These are good ideas and will be raised with the Warfield Parish Council for consideration.
Support		
Support	We welcome any additional green space areas for walking, cycling, sitting on a bench to enjoy the view.	
Support		
Neutral	Please ensure that local green spaces look natural by minimising street furniture and signage.	noted
Support	Enhancing green infrastructure boosts local morale and community spirit	noted
Object	Cannot see how this will work	
Neutral		
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral		
Object	I am objecting as there is no need for this policy if everything is left alone in the rest of North Bracknell which is what I want.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and the changes that brings.
Support		
Object	How can building on open farmland and woodland enhance the green infrastructure; or adding 500 plus vehicles to the congested northern roads help improve air quality or reduce traffic noise. Most of the roads in the area don't have pavements so increasing traffic will increase the risk of injury to pedestrians - especially as most roads are unlit	policy 6 seeks to address these issues
Support	In terms of Bull Brook: There is a serious requirement for Tesco to be more proactive and take serious responsibility for their trolleys. On our daily walks, it is not uncommon to see anything from 3 to 6 trolleys thrown into the river from the bridges along the stretch of Edmunds Lane from Bullbrook to the Forest Road bridge. As well as being unsightly and unacceptable, this blocks the flow of water and causes other environmental issues. Tesco's claim that the trolleys lock at the exits from the site but there are many places where they can be taken away without crossing the locking areas or indeed lifted out so that they do not lock. Also, many of the trolleys are not fitted with the locking mechanism. I understand from the warden at Bracknell Forest Council that Tesco uses a company to collect trolleys but that it will not collect them from the river!	This will be raised with the Parish Council for discussion with Tesco.
Support	Safe pedestrian and cycle provision essential	noted
Support	Horse riding has become more and more dangerous and I fully support plans to improve safety of riders.	noted
Support		
Object	Yes keep our green areas, That is what our area is - beautiful green countryside	noted
Neutral	Access to natural green space is important for the area and it provides many with the opportunity to explore and enjoy open spaces. However, planned open spaces have a man-made look and feel to them which urbanises the environment and forms part of an enclosure.	Green open space in countryside is looked at carefully in terms of planning, in order to be sympathetic to the character of the area.
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support	same comments as for policy 4	
Neutral		
Support		
Support	We have to maintain & preserve our Green Belt not destroy it. Bracknell Forest has already had massive housing expansion (Quelm Park, Temple Park, Wokingham, etc), enough is enough	Green Belt has a strong protective policy in place. Much of the sizable development is taking place in "countryside" which does not have the same level of protection.

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		
Object	This development proposal will not enhance the visual characteristics of the village - it will detract from it for ever. it will undermine its integrity and devalues the recreational value of the fields.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and the changes that brings.
Support	There is a need for more space for outdoor sporting facilities. Compared to Winkfield Parish we have so few	
Neutral	You still have not allowed enough green spaces.	noted
Object		
Support	We must support and enhance Green Infrastructure building for a sustainable future.	noted
Support	Desperately need more open green space	noted
Support	Fine	
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Support		
Object	Filling green fields with houses is at total odds with the concept of the 'green infrastructure.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and the changes that brings.
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object	There appears to be little improvement in this area.	noted
Object	The very location of the proposed development is the most damaging possible option for green infrastructure, and against the wishes of residents.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and the changes that brings.
Support		
Object	There is no way that 'green infrastructure' can be enhanced by adding houses to the area.	noted
Object	The proposed plan does not show a recognisable or enhanced green space - the proposed space would not be visible from the Forest road.	The proposed green space would provide amenities for existing and new residents

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	The area already has a lot of green space for recreational use, any green areas you propose to build between this over-packed housing estate will not benefit any current residents of the area. They are not visible from any boundary road, nor will they enhance the area. These small areas of grass within the estate will not be adequate for those in the new neighbourhood either.	For Hayley Green, the proposal creates of an accessible village green and open green space accessible to all new and existing residents, rather than private land with limited permitted access.
Support		
Support		
Support		
Neutral	None to make	noted
Support		
Object		
Object		
Object	Great idea but this does not take into consideration the views of the residents, thus failing to enhance the green infrastructure.	noted
Support		
Neutral		
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Support	New footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways must be developed in consultation with local residents. They should not just be imposed.	noted
Support		
Object	According to the proposed development there will be no green infrastructure left!	open green space has been identified in the HG masterplan
Object		
Object		
Object	If anything we need more green. GREEN PLEASE	noted
Object	Leave it all green as it is	noted

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	I do not think we need to enhance the green infrastructure as we already have lovely open green spaces viz fields!	noted
Object		
Object	There are plenty of informal open spaces already in existence. The proposed "Designated open green space" is centred on a proposed housing estate and is out of general view to most of the current residents. The proposed area should be reduced in size and the green field bordering Forest Road and Cricketers Lane could provide a more visible green space for the benefit to current residents and passers by. The suggested cycle paths shown between the estates and the Forest Road are impractical. People using them would have to cope with crossing an ever busier and more hazardous Forst Road and Bracknell Road.	For Hayley Green, the proposal creates of an accessible village green and open green space accessible to all new and existing residents, rather than private land with limited permitted access. As part of the delivery planning the highways authority would be consulted and the need for controlled cossings assessed.
Support		

<b>Policy 7: Local Green Space Designations</b>		
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan designates Local Green Spaces in the following locations, as shown on the Policies Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chuff Corner</li> <li>- Warfield Memorial Ground</li> <li>- Frost Folly and associated Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)</li> <li>- Hayley Green</li> <li>- Hayley Green Wood</li> </ul> <p>Proposals for development on the designated land that will undermine its essential, permanent open character will be resisted unless they are ancillary to the use of the land for a public recreational purpose or are required for a statutory utility infrastructure purpose</p>		
<p>Support: 41,          Neutral: 16,          Object: 29</p>		
Stance	Comment	Response
Neutral	<p>Would support the section 4.17 proposal as the Hayley Green Open space.</p> <p>As for Doctors this is compulsory with the amount of new homes in the area surely.</p>	<p>Support of Hayley Green Open space noted.</p> <p>The comment about Doctors seems to be related to Policy 8. The provision of a Doctors Surgery would need to be deemed sustainable by their providers. There are further responses in Policy 8 related to Doctors Surgery and similar community assets.</p>
Object	<p>The Green space is not meant to be hidden in the middle of a new development but be for all to enjoy. This feedback was give to the steering team and ignored.</p>	<p>The green space proposed will be accessible to new and existing residents.</p>
Object	<p>You are building over all the green space.</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and there are insufficient brownfield sites to satisfy the requirement in Warfield.</p>

Stance	Comment	Response
Support	Define the exceptional circumstances that would allow development.	Local Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Exceptions could be where the development would be compatible with the reasons for designation or where planning permission is no longer capable of being implemented.  Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 37-008-20140306  Revision date: 06 03 2014
Neutral	No comment.	
Support		
Support	Again from the Local Plan I am unclear what you propose - is it not to build upon designated green space? How can recreational spaces be enhanced? e.g putting in cafes for parents. How will security be addressed so these green spaces do not become spaces for drug deals or violent crime to take place ... when we get 10,000 more residents this will becoming an increasing risk	Areas designated as local green space in the policy are to be protected.
Support	Existing green spaces are not mentioned. It is important that they are listed in the Plan and are retained.	Existing green spaces are mentioned in Appendix A of the Warfield Neighbourhood Plan
Support		
Support		
Support		
Support	Local green space is key to insuring overdevelopment	noted
Object		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Object	I am objecting as their is no need for this policy if everything is left alone in the rest of North Bracknell which is what I want.	noted. However, as the owners have come forward to the Borough to sell the land for development, identifying land as local green space ensure its protection for the future.
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	The policy stops any development that will change to the Green Space designation - of which Hayley Green is one. Therefore the proposal is in conflict with this policy	noted. This type of comments is mentioned elsewhere.
Support		
Neutral	Small infill with minimum visual and traffic impact preferable to large sites to meet government targets	infill has very little benefit to residents and brings very little in terms of infrastructure. Small piecemeal development of less than 15 dwellings will not benefit from CL.
Support		
Support		
Support	Keep local green spaces	noted
Object	This will erode what little green space there is in the area.	noted. However, as the owners have come forward to the Borough to sell the land for development, identifying land for open green space ensure its protection.
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support	sensible	noted
Neutral		
Support		
Support	Green Space needs to remain exactly that - Green Space	noted
Support	The preservation of green spaces is essential to maintain a good quality of life for all	noted
Object	The Neighbourhood plan describes Hayley Green, along with other places, as a local green space designation - this will disappear if the development proposal goes ahead and the permanent open character of the village will be lost forever.	noted. However, as the owners have come forward to the Borough to sell the land for development, identifying land for open green space ensure its protection.
Support		
Object	You still have not allowed enough green spaces.	noted
Object		
Support	Keep, enhance and encourage more green spaces such as allotment sites, communal orchards, wildflower meadows etc	noted and the parish now has a new allotment site and it is expected that further sites will be allocated in the future
Neutral	Need more	noted
Object	Trick question which is of course linked to further building	concern noted
Support		

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		
Neutral		
Support		
Object	The designated space is out of proportion to the areas the plan designates for estate housing, as well as dividing the housing areas.	The purpose of the policy is to retain green spaces and provide publicly accessible recreation areas that have similar planning protection to Green Belt.
Object	Any development on the designated land WILL undermine its essential, permanent open character, it is unavoidable.	noted
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Support		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object	There appears to be little improvement in this area.	noted
Object	-The designation of local green space in Hayley Green is against the wishes of approx 70% of Hayley Green Households (HGRG petition being presented to Bracknell Forest Council, Sept 2017)  - Warfield Residents indicated a strong aversion to building on green fields in the Jan/Feb 2015 Residents Questionnaire: 72% Against	The designation of Local Green Space has the policy effect of the equivalence of the Green Belt when determining planning applications located within a designated Green Space. The petition quotes a 2015 survey of residents where 72% were against building on green fields. Unfortunately, the landowners have to agree to the Local Green Space designation and they have already expressed the interest to sell the land for development in line with the Hayley Green masterplan. Without a Local Green Space designation proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan, all of the land could be developed.
Support		
Object	Car parks and associated infrastructure for green space designations would clearly be placed upon actual natural green areas and therefore damage local nature.	The identified sites are all either near settlements (accessible without need for further parking) or have car parking facilities.

Stance	Comment	Response
Object	It does not seem that any consideration to green space (as found in other ares of the local) have been considered thoughtfully. Hayley Green has green spaces which will be lost if this policy goes ahead.	The purpose of the policy is to retain green spaces and provide publicly accessible recreation areas that have similar planning protection to Green Belt. The owners of the land need to support the Local Green Space designation. This was considered when defining the Hayley Green master plan.
Object	<p>There are designated green spaces throughout the Warfield area and these spaces are loved and used by all locals. Building on the Hayley Green area you will be removing designated green space from the community.</p> <p>The council are currently building hundreds and hundreds of houses in this area with no consideration for the wider community in an ecological or psychological context.</p> <p>Creating silos of houses of estates surrounded by tiny green spaces is not going to create a happy and conducive environment.</p>	noted. However, as the land owners have come forward to the Borough to sell the land for development, identifying land for open green space ensure its protection.
Support		
Support		
Support		
Neutral	None to make	
Support		
Object		
Object		
Object	Please see resident petition presented to Bracknell Forest Council in September 2017 by Hayley Green residents.	The designation of Local Green Space has the policy effect of the equivalence of the Green Belt when determining planning applications located within a designated Green Space. The petition quotes a 2015 survey of residents where 72% were against building on green fields. Unfortunately, the landowners have to agree to the Local Green Space designation and they have already expressed the interest to sell the land for development in line with the Hayley Green masterplan. Without a Local Green Space designation proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan, all of the land could be developed.

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		
Object	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	noted
Support		
Support		
Neutral		
Support	The maps showing Warfield Chase do not cover the whole area of the site. By default the unmapped areas fall outside the policies withing the WNP and become "available" for development.	Looking at the maps again, the only part that was "missing" is land that is owned by Bracknell Forest and managed by their Parks and Countryside Services team which is designated as Open Space of Public Value and covered by Core Strategy DPD Policy CS8.
Support		
Object	The neighbourhood plan describes Hayley Green as a designated Green Space	To clarify, the green space that is in the centre of the Hayley Green masterplan is the designated green space as shown in Inset Map - WNP2 Hayley Green Concept Masterplan on page 51.
Object		
Object		
Object	Green wild woods and fields please	Noted and Hayley Green Wood has been designated as a local nature reserve and Warfield has a large number of designated Open Green spaces
Object	Leave it all green as it is	Noted. However, land owners have already gone forward to the borough to sell their land.
Object	I do not think that the local green space designated are sufficient for the number of houses proposed	current proposed development is low density
Object		
Object	The green space shown on the Plan for Hayley Green is excessive. The field on the corner of Forest Road and Cricketers Lane would provide a visible and effective green corridor between Hayley Green and Winkfield Row. Similar corner sites in Winkfield Row and at the Plough and Harrow make a significant statement about the rural character of the neighbourhood.	noted

Stance	Comment	Response
Support		

<b>Policy 8: Supporting Community Assets</b>		
<p>Proposals that will lead to the unnecessary loss of the following community facilities and assets will be resisted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Warfield Memorial Ground, Cricket Pavilion, cricket pitch and children’s playground</li> <li>- Brownlow Hall, Newell Green</li> <li>- Whitegrove Community Centre</li> <li>- The Cricketers Public House, Plough &amp; Harrow public house, Spice Lounge restaurant</li> <li>- Retail properties at Whitegrove</li> <li>- Children’s Playground at Westmorland Park</li> <li>- Tennis Courts at Westmorland Park</li> <li>- Jeallott’s Hill Community Landshare</li> <li>- Village Orchard at Larks Hill</li> <li>- Football fields at Priory Fields</li> <li>- Harvest Hill play area</li> <li>- The Chestnuts</li> <li>- All Saints Rise Play area</li> <li>- Goddard Way Play area, amenity land &amp; meadow</li> </ul> <p>Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the buildings and ancillary land by way of its extension or partial redevelopment will be supported, subject to other planning considerations.</p> <p>Proposals to establish a new doctor’s surgery or a new dentist facility will be supported, provided they are located outside the Green Belt and have sufficient off-street car parking spaces.</p>		
<p>Support: 44,      Neutral: 19,      Object: 23</p>		
Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral	trick question again	
Object	Community assets will be under huge strain with the proposed as nothing is actually being put forward to address the increasing populous in the document	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the Government driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.
Object	The Clinical Commissioning Groups around the country state the likelihood of new GP surgeries being built and being sustainable is slim and the 5 year forward view looks at how exisiting surgeries can be supported to take greater patient lists - do you have the buy in from Bracknell CCG about another surgery being built - this can raise peoples expectations and make them angry when it doesn't happen as in the case of the Jennets Park development being promised a shop and still nothing has materialised	The policy is looking to retain the listed assets . The policy would also support the establishment of a new doctors surgry or dental practice, should they be deemed sustainable by their providers. It is recognised that assets need to have a sustainable usage and are aware of the economic situation.

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	<p>Is this whole development a box ticking exercise? Did you just stick in a pin a map on a green patch of land? Have you carried out any real analysis of the what the implications of building 200+ houses in a small community will do to the surrounding area? Do you care? Have you considered any of the thousands of square miles of brownfill sites? No, because they're too expensive and it's far too easy to just change policy and build on green belt land. What do you care?</p>	<p>One of the benefits of providing a concept masterplan for a larger development is that the infrastructure is better considered and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is paid by the developers towards sustaining the local area. Unlike piecemeal/infill development where a CIL charge is not applicable.</p> <p>The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.</p>
Object	<p>This area has enough now</p>	<p>Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the Government driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.</p>
Object	<p>The existing community assets as listed are already protected. There is no need to provide an additional community hall in Hayley Green. Sufficient facilities already exist locally, e.g. Carnation Hall, Charlotte Pratt, Brownlow Hall and the community centre at Whitegrove. The community asset shown on the Plan was removed on the original 2016 Plan following a meeting in January 2017. It has now reappeared without consultation with the residents.</p>	<p>The plan has been updated to remove the community building in Hayley Green. It was included in error as the majority of Hayley Green residents voted against a building of any such kind.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	<p>Only financial considerations or lack of support would cause any of the places mentioned to close.</p> <p>Building medical facilities does not mean that they would be taken up.</p> <p>The plan has reinstated the community facilities that were removed from the plan have reappeared.</p> <p>The most important community feature are the houses and field that live on the corner of Cricketers lane. The corner green spaces at the Plough and Harrow and at the Winkfield cross roads are similar important landscape features.</p>	<p>The policy is looking to retain the listed assets for their current and future community use. The policy would also support the establishment of a new doctors surgery or dental practice, should they be deemed sustainable by their providers. It is recognised that assets need to have a sustainable usage and are aware of the economic situation.</p> <p>The plan has been updated to remove the community building in Hayley Green.</p> <p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green "buffer" is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p>
Object	<p>Whilst praiseworthy, the lack of consultation with local businesses concerns me as their needs and opinions are not being adequately considered.</p> <p>For example, as a regular at the Cricketers pub I was horrified that the management of the pub were not consulted prior to the presentation of the plan on 4th Oct 2016.</p>	<p>The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident and business input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.</p>
Support	<p>Any well used and community buildings should be maintained regardless of development. The Cricketers charm comes from it's rural location and it should be allowed to become swallowed up as an estate pub.</p>	
Support	<p>Define "unnecessary loss". BFBC states that failure to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply means that all policies are out of date and hence development is necessary.</p>	

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	<p>It is noted that the Jealott's Hill Community Landshare, located to the east of the main Syngenta facility, has been listed within Policy 8 as a community asset.</p> <p>Draft Policy 8 of the Warfield Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) seeks to resist proposals which would lead to the unnecessary loss of such community assets, but would support proposals that would improve the viability of the community asset by way of its extension or partial redevelopment.</p> <p>As a major employer in the Parish, Syngenta are committed to supporting community assets, such as the Jealott's Hill Community Landshare, and as such do not object to the inclusion of this policy.</p>	
Support	building any more house will not support our community assets - they will be destroyed	
Support	The Hayley Green local community just cannot support a development of this size which will destroy the assets not enhance them	
Support	surely essential with huge rise in population.	
Support	Why include only some of the public houses in Warfield? The Yorkshire Rose surely needs as much protection as the other two public houses in Newell Green. The Shepherds House and New Leathern Bottle are also missing from the list (but perhaps being more rural need less protection?)	Comment noted and policy amended.
Support	I agree with the proposals - should the worst happen - which will lead to the unnecessary loss of community facilities - Assets already within our parish	
Support	Building of an outdoor&indoor pool at Hayley Green in the new community center which is on the table. Perhaps building a 'health hub' in conjunction to this where mobile NHS units can park. A community café would be desirable where local groups and/ or churches can alternate their services. Please no more Tesco, no Tesco extra. Please give a smaller business, hopefully someone local a chance to set up a shop selling healthy food, locally produced and supporting the few farmers still left in the area. Also, create a space where local artists can get together, teach, market their skills etc. Please create something for adults, something that has value.	
Object	Primary local business in Hayley Green is the Cricketers' pub, not consulted to my knowledge!!	The Warfield Neighbourhood Plan has been seeking resident and business input since 2014, with various resident open sessions, door-to-door questionnaires and updates posted in 'The Wren' newsletter.
Object	I am objecting as there is no need for this policy if everything is left alone in the rest of North Bracknell which is what I want.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the Government driven housing requirements of Borough Councils.

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	In Warfield a POST OFFICE is needed. As far as medical GP practices are concerned Warfield cannot cope with existing numbers of patients. How are they going to manage a bigger influx of patients these estates will bring!!	
Support	With 2200 ( and possibly more if Hayley Green goes ahead) homes, and local doctor surgeries at Warfield Green medical centre often leading to more than a week to see a doctor, it is essential that more surgeries are established. Dental surgery too.	
Object	The fields in Hayley Green are a community asset and as such should be protected. The loss of the fields in Hayley Green can be avoided - there are other development possibilities in both Hayley Green and in Warfield.	<p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green "buffer" is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	The fields in Hayley Green are a community asset and should be kept as there are other sites in Warfield available.	<p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green "buffer" is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>
Object	The report contains no increase in facilities to make capacity for the additional community. The exception being a proposed new GP surgery, but as this must be built outside the green belt, this will be another building development in the same area.	<p>The policy is looking to retain the listed assets. The policy would also support the establishment of a new doctors surgery or dental practice, should they be deemed sustainable by their providers. Such facilities would need to be readily accessible by all users.</p> <p>At present it is not possible to propose new development in the Green Belt.</p>
Support	Why is the location of new DR & Dentist surgeries not to be permitted within the greenbelt. Such community facilities are the least of the Green belt threats.	
Neutral		



<b>Policy 9: Supporting Rural Diversification</b>		
<p>The re-use of an existing building in the countryside will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is necessary for the purposes of agriculture or small scale social enterprise that meets community needs;</li> <li>- It would not adversely affect the character, function or appearance of the land, buildings of historical interest or nature conservation interests nor adversely affect residential amenity or road safety;</li> <li>- It will enable social enterprise, farm diversification or recreation that benefits the rural economy without harming open character of the land; and</li> <li>- where there is a loss of an existing use it would not give rise to a future need for another building to fulfil the function of the building being re- used; Proposals for housing development in the countryside to serve the essential uses of agriculture or some other special need will only be granted in exceptional circumstances and be in accordance with all other planning policies applicable to that location, including but not limited to policies applying within the Green Belt. Housing proposals will be required</li> </ul>		
Support: 37,      Neutral: 24,      Object: 25		
Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral	No comment.	
Neutral	This policy needs to be specific about what a prosperous rural economy is. With massive developments, maintaining a rural economy is a juxtaposition of intent.	
Object	If a covenant states on the title farming land, this is what the title should remain as.	Unfortunately this is not a Neighbourhood Planning matter. Restrictive covenants can only be released with the agreement of the beneficiaries of the covenant or by an appeal to the Upper Tribunal, pursuant to section 84 of the Law of Property Act 1925 ("LoP Act").
Object	Have seen no evidence of this.	There is a small and growing number of existing buildings in the countryside that are no longer required as the agricultural practices evolve, this policy is to address these buildings now and in the future.
Object	What rural buildings do we have in warfield that are not being used?	There are a number of disused barns in Warfield that have been and are being converted into other uses: Business and (mainly) Residential.

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	Definition of rural says it all	The definition of rural is "In, relating to, or characteristic of the countryside rather than the town.". The goal of this policy is to maintain the character whilst evolving/broadening the usage of the buildings where needed, in line with the policy.
Object	it's diverse already!	The goal of this policy is to maintain the character whilst evolving/broadening the usage of the buildings where needed, in line with the policy.
Support	re-use of existing builds is to be encouraged.	
Support	Ref para 5.55. The phrase 'support a prosperous rural economy' is unrealistic. Warfield is NOT a rural economy. It is a semi urban commuter economy with high leisure activity potential.	
Support	Very important to ensure that existing buildings can be re-used rather than become derelict and unsightly.	
Support	I feel relaxed when I get home from work and am able to drive past fields and open space. It is why I moved to the area!	
Object	The few industrial sheds on Hayley Green lane are the only existing buildings and would not be affected by this policy	There are other existing buildings that this policy applies to in the Warfield Neighbourhood Plan area in addition to Hayley Green.
Support	How do you support this by building on all available green space. This does not stack up.	
Object	If this council/Government is so besotted with building new estates on Green Belt land in the South East. Why: 1) Are there no new estates in the Surrey/Kent area adjacent to the M25 2) Are there no new estates adjacent to the banks of the Thames - Marlow - Goring - Sonning - Cookham... etc.	Unfortunately these areas are outside the Warfield Neighbourhood Plan scope. However, it should be noted that no new buildings on Green Belt land is being proposed in this Plan.

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	The building of a housing development does not contribute to a prosperous rural economy. Other options should be discussed with the residents of Warfield.	The Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.
Object	Proposals for housing development in the countryside to serve the essential uses of agriculture does not make sense.	This policy is about the re-use of existing buildings and not new buildings. For the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan, the Neighbourhood Plan Site Selection process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that when selecting sites, personal preferences were not considered. The suitability was based on a) land availability and b) environmental and planning principles.
Support	The reason I moved here is because it is one of the few areas where one can see a field with horses cows etc, children need to see nature as it is part of understanding life	
Object	There should be no attempt to curtail existing businesses in Hayley Green or encourage other ventures. Although The Cricketers and the small industrial in Hayley Green (Lane) have a positive impact on the rural nature of the village, any attempt to attract other businesses would contradict green field policies.	This policy is about the re-use of existing rural buildings and not developing new buildings. There is no intention to curtail any existing lawful business in any rural area.

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	<p>Again the proposed development conflicts with all aspects of this policy. High density dwellings in a low density area which is already a defined Gap .</p>	<p>This policy is about the re-use of existing rural buildings and not developing new buildings.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p> <p>The Hayley Green policy in this proposed Plan seeks to strengthen the gaps - ensuring the green 'buffer' is withheld between Hayley Green and Winkfield, and to Strawberry Hill in the South.</p>
Object	<p>have your plans included the livelihoods and welfare of those already living in, and earning a living in Hayley Green? You can't just demolish one community and replace it with another and just pat yourself on the back.</p>	<p>This policy is about the re-use of existing rural buildings and not developing new buildings.</p> <p>The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	Where it destroys Green Belt & puts inappropriate strain on already over used infrastructure then definitely not supported	This policy is about the re-use of existing rural buildings and not developing new buidings. There is no proposal or support in the plan for new development within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
Object	A housing estate does not contribute to rural economy	<p>This policy is about the re-use of existing rural buildings and not developing new buildings.</p> <p>Your comment looks to refer to the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan. This Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p> <p>All the landowners of land within the Hayley Green Concept Masterplan have put their land forward for development and the site was identified as part of the Site Selection process. This process, reports and all sites included can be viewed in the "Warfield Neighbourhood Plan Housing Site Assessment Report APRIL 2017" document in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Neutral		
Neutral	Not really sure what this means	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral		



<b>Policy 10: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage and Biodiversity</b>		
<p>Development proposals must seek to avoid having any significant adverse effects on designated environmental, landscape and heritage assets, including Chawnrige Bourne SSSI, the Warfield Conservation Area and the network of Local Nature Reserves in the south of the parish.</p> <p>Developments must deliver no net loss to biodiversity or heritage value and wherever possible a net gain. Where effects are unavoidable and their impact may be less significant to the surrounding locality, then the proposals must show how these effects will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Parish Council and local planning authority.</p> <p>In addition, any development proposals must contribute to and enhance the natural environment by ensuring the protection of local assets such as mature trees, hedgerows</p>		
<p>Support: 50,          Neutral: 17,          Object: 19</p>		
Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral	Please see Statement submitted via email to <a href="mailto:info@warfield-np.org.uk">info@warfield-np.org.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk">info@warfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk</a> on 8 September 2017	
Object	It is impossible to mitigate the effects of housing/development on the countryside! Pollution, noise, light, rubbish. Too many people, concrete, etc etc. Once the fields are built on they are gone forever.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future.
Support	would like to know the how....	
Support	Please maintain original names for roads and areas, rather than someone just invent a new set. Example, Sopworth Way should have been retained the name of Quelm Lane.	
Support	Important to retain existing hedgerows in places such as Maize Lane and Old Priory Lane. Please do not allow developers to remove these and replace with newly planted boundaries. It takes hundreds of years to create the biodiversity found in one of these old hedges and it cannot be simply reproduced in a new boundary.	
Support	We must protect our heritage - that will not be enhanced with new houses after new houses	
Support	Protecting and enhancing does not necessarily mean retaining every existing tree or bush especially where they cause a nuisance eg excessive shading of properties by tall trees close to properties or intrusion into open/amenity spaces. Non-native and invasive species should be replaced with native species.	

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	There is no heritage improvement here or biodiversity addition as the plan removes natural habitat from the area and places it under concrete	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Support	If this policy is followed the plan cannot go ahead in my opinion as you will be destroying a large swathe of the natural environment.	
Support	How do you support this by building on all available green space. This does not stack up.	
Support	A development of the size proposed will destroy the local heritage	
Object	Have seen no evidence of this.	The requirement for this came through resident input from open sessions and questionnaire responses that were held since 2014. Until the policy is adopted following the Neighbourhood Plan referendum, it will not take effect to guide planning applications/behaviour.
Object	This development proposal would have a significant, detrimental effect on the environmental, landscape and heritage assets. Trees and hedgerows would surely be affected / destroyed. The fields could never be replaced once gone they are gone forever.	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Neutral	I am doubtful about how the proposals for Hayley Green align with enhancing heritage!	

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	Putting 235 houses on green fields is diametrically opposite to heritage and biodiversity	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	Hayley Green's heritage has been up until now undeveloped and this must be protected. Biodiversity can not be enhanced by building development.	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	Hayley Green has a heritage rich in biodiversity and once this land is built on - it cannot be changed or regenerated. Building development will not enhance Flora and fauna.	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	<p>Really, what are you doing to protect local heritage and biodiversity? Building on any land will destroy the biodiversity and ecological make up of the area.</p> <p>Are you planning on building 200+ ecologically friendly houses? How can a development of this size do anything but ruin the biodiversity of the area? Have you checked for newts or bats? What sort of environmental studies have you carried out? Once you build you have destroyed forever the flora and fauna local to this area.</p>	<p>It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>
Object	<p>The environmental landscape and heritage that makes up Hayley Gren would disappear forever with the building of a housing estate on green fields.</p>	<p>It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>
Support	<p>I remain very concerned about impact on biodiversity of Hayley Green proposal.</p>	
Object	<p>The proposed development of most of the green space in Hjayley Green will have a detrimental effect and would conflict with the aim of protecting the natural environment of Hayley Green. Our most valuable asset - the green in Hayley Green - would disappear for ever.</p>	<p>It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	The intention of this policy is good, but the Neighbourhood Plan undermines this very purpose.	It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.
Object	Warfield Parish and BFC are destroying the countryside.	<p>It is assumed that you are referring to the Hayley Green Policy in your comments. The Hayley Green Concept Masterplan includes the creation of a large area of 'public open green space' to retain habitat which is currently private land - this is achieved by encouraging the landowners and developers to work together to create a united plan rather than sell their individual plots and build infill/piecemeal developments without mitigating the loss of green spaces.</p> <p>Unfortunately given the Green Belt to the north and the already developed (and approved plans for development) land to the south, there is no option but to look to infill development, the countryside and the small pockets of brownfield sites to deliver the Government driven housing requirements.</p>
Neutral	No comment.	
Neutral		

Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral		
Neutral	None to make	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object		
Support	has to be the right action	
Support		
Support		
Support		
Support	Yes, important.	
Support	Needs protecting at all costs	
Support	as long as you dont then build on the basis of my answer!	
Support		

Stance	Comments	Response
Support		
Support	Protecting and enhancing Biodiversity should be a key consideration on any proposal, leaving green spaces is key.	
Support		
Support	We consider the policy provides an approach that fulfils the requirements of the NPPF, although using some more individual language.	
Support	Yes protect what is here we love it. It is fragile. It is important. Don't disturb the water table any more look after the dithes they need attention. I walked the whole area Thurs 24 August 2017 the stream is stagnant by the bridge needs cleaning + stop pollution from chemicals + matter	
Support		
Support	Fully support this policy	

<b>Policy 11: Promoting Dark Skies</b>		
All development should be designed in a way that does not require external lighting or the use of street lighting. Proposals for any necessary street and external lighting should be energy efficient, reduce light scatter and comply with the current guidelines established for rural areas by the Institute of Lighting Engineers (IoLE). Proposals for development will be expected to demonstrate the measures to be taken in response to the IoLE guidelines.		
Support: 44,      Neutral: 23,      Object: 19		
Stance	Comments	Response
Support	How can this be done when developing mainly rural Hayley Green ?	
Support	With some concern: I studied astronomy at university and I really would appreciate a darker sky - sadly not currently the case here in Whitegrove. However, the new LED lighting is very dim and I am concerned about a potential increase in crime as a result. I have seen other areas of the country where it has been introduced and the light at street level, where existing streetlamps have been converted, leaves many inadequately lit areas.	
Object	If you weren't building here you wouldn't have to consider destroying the dark sky environment. There is no way you can avoid extreme amounts of light pollution. 200+ houses and all the 400+ cars are going to make Warfield look like a permanently lit up retail park.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Object	More houses equals more light pollution.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Object	With a development of 230 houses and street lighting, would impact on the light pollution in the area.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Support	Building 234+ houses in the area will not promote dark skies - that is an impossibility - just wishful thinking. Do not build - that will promote darker skies.	

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	Light pollution from 235 additional dwellings as well as the additional traffic can only drive away from this policy	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Object	The addition of 200 + new homes could only add to the light pollution in the area. Whilst Hayley Green is, at present, dark the not too distant glow from Bracknell is a dire warning!	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Neutral	a small development would have far less impact than a 235 home area not all lights will come form the streets in such an area some will be from the homes.	
Neutral	As long as paths and roads are adequately lit for safety.	
Neutral	The words are too "wishy washy" although the principle is sound.	
Neutral	Policy lacks sufficient detail.	
Object	I don't feel that my area ever really gets dark.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter existing development, however, it can promote certain values to be used in new developments and renovations to existing developemnts.
Object	load of nonsense really	
Object	This policy is weak. It should be much more prescriptive and specific to the area. So for Hayley Green there should be no street lighting except as it is essential for safety and where light is required it should be bollard type rather than standard street lamps to maintain dark skies of a semi rural community.	
Object	I am ambivalent about this policy. Dark skies are part of the charm of the village. I disagree with this policy if it involves any form of street lighting	Some lighting may be necessary/required by residents or the Highways Authority - this lighting should comply with the IoLE guidelines to minimise impact on the night sky.
Support	At night I will not be able to see all of the developments.	
Support	Light pollution is a big problem in overdeveloped towns	

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	Keep us Green and Dark without development	
Support	More housing less dark skies go to the Brecon Beacons to see what I mean.	
Object	I don't understand how development should be designed in a way that does not require external lighting or the use of street lighting but proposals for any necessary street and external lighting should be energy efficient etc could exist, These 2 sentences contradict each other	Some lighting may be necessary/required by residents or the Highways Authority - this lighting should comply with the IoLE guidelines to minimise impact on the night sky.
Support	The lighting on the Quelm Park estate is unnecessarily bright. Again a minimum of signage and street furniture will reduce light.	
Object	Elderly and children welcome street lighting for there own security and safety.	Some lighting may be necessary/required by residents or the Highways Authority - this lighting should comply with the IoLE guidelines to minimise impact on the night sky.
Object	The intention of this policy is good, but the Neighbourhood Plan undermines this very purpose.	Unfortunately a Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the government-driven housing requirements of Borough Councils and so needs to consider how these should be delivered. It is in this reality that this policy looks to minimise the impact of any development on Dark Skies.
Neutral	No comment.	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral	dont really know what this means	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral	Light pollution is insidious and needs to minimised	
Neutral		

Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral	None to make	
Neutral		
Object		
Support	Very strongly advocate a dark skies policy and this is favoured by all in Warfield St.	
Support		
Support	environmentally necessary	
Support		
Support		
Support	Light pollution is an ever expanding blight on our skies. Focus development onto Brown Field sites	
Support		
Support	Yes noise and light pollution is becoming a huge problem.	
Support	support and feel no additional lighting should be introduced to areas where there are currently no street lighting.	
Support		
Support		

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	I want to be very clear here! Living in Warfield St which is very much a dark skies area, I very much support the continuation of that policy. However, once again there is contradiction in your document whereby it states "All development should be designed in a way that does not require eternal lighting" but in the very next breathe states "proposals for any necessary street and external lighting should be energy efficient". So you are not standing firm at all on the dark skies policy, what exactly is your policy here. We clearly cannot rely on this committee or the WPC to fully support residents with this.	
Support		
Support		
Support	Dark skies are important and should be maintained	
Support		
Support	Keep us green + leafy we are here because we love it. Lots of people were born in the village + are still here. They are devastated at your plan	
Support	Fully support this policy	

Policy 12: Drainage Infrastructure		
New and improved drainage infrastructure will be encouraged and supported to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the development		
Support: 42, Neutral: 24, Object: 20		
Stance	Comments	Response
Support	The road infrastructure does not cope with the existing traffic load	Comments noted, not relevant to drainage
Neutral	Does not cover issues such as paving of front gardens and maintenance of existing drainage systems such as ditches.	Noted
Object	trick question again. Support drains for more houses!	Concern noted
Support	The roads are fragile + no more traffic please. Traffic means noise pollution danger for wild animals + children THIS AREA BELONGS TO THE WILD ANIMALS, they have been here since year dot.	
Support	but noticed that the development can go had anyway ??? this drainage assessment and work has to be condition of the houses being built .	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of
Object	Drains in Warfield are already inadequate and raw sewage is leaked onto Bracknell Road every winter during heavy rainfall times, also, the proposed development area is partly in a basin that experiences flooding.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of the development.
Object	Drainage in Warfield is already inadequate and raw sewage is leaked onto Bracknell road in heavy rainfall in recent years.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address.
Object	Really??!! This area is already prone to flooding EVERY SINGLE WINTER. Will you be informing the new residents they are living near/in an area susceptible to flooding? Have you had analysed the land and assess what would happen if you concrete over the whole of Hayley Green? What implications will the building of this estate have on the current residents and those in the surrounding areas? Are you going to foot all the bills when everyone has to claim for unexplained floods in their houses?	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address.
Object	This is highly inadequate even now, with frequent flooding onto Forest Rd from the houses opposite cricketers lane due to the clay soil and building on flood plains.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	Water drainage and flooding in the area is already a problem, and will only be increased with the building of 235 houses.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of
Object	Parts of the Plan are subject to flooding, for example the field at the corner of Cricketers Lane and Bracknell Road. Current drainage problems also need to be resolved. Blocked drains and ditches are not uncommon along the Forest Road. Until these issues are addressed, it is pointless to promise any new drainage infrastructure.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of
Support	There is a drainage problem in certain areas of the proposed building site	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage and mains drains, which is what this policy is looking to address. Developers building in areas subject to flood risk need to take measures to address the risk as part of
Object	The drainage of water is a known problem in this area. Whenever there is substantial rainfall the roads become overwhelmed with water - i have several photographs to support this which I will attach to this feedback form if I am able. The addition of 200 + homes can only exacerbate the problem.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage, which is what this policy is looking to address.
Object	Drainage in the Hayley Green area is very poor, the policy does not adequately address the impact of the village going from 106 houses to a proposed total of 341 houses.	Noted the concerns about surface water drainage, which is what this policy is looking
Object	If you do not build more housing then you do not need to rip up the roads causing short term havoc to those already living in the area. Been bad enough over the last 2 years in north Bracknell.	Noted, though roads may need to have been dug-up to address maintenance issues for
Object	Drainage in the northern parish is mainly by soakaways and small stream; removing existing natural soakaways of areas that can absorb rainfall will increase flooding on the roads in the area.	Noted, though this policy is not about the removal of soakaways - it is about the provision of adequate drainage infrastructure, however that is achieved: soakaways, drains,
Object	It is not a strong enough statement. Like all of the borough development of the infrastructure is coming second constantly to the developers	Noted. This is a problem owned by the relevant infrastructure provider, not really a planning matter... but something that the Warfield NP SG want to have addressed.
Object	The existing drainage system needs to be improved before any new drains etc are considered. Extensive flooding at the end of Cricketers lane is testament to the government flood assessment rating	Noted. The routine maintenance of ditches by landowners is important to their
Support	The regular flooding of in Bracknell Road & Cricketers Lane shows that existing ditches & drains (always blocked) cannot cope. Removing farmland will only worsen the position	Noted. The routine maintenance of ditches by landowners is important to their
Neutral	Don't understand it - but you are building a lot of houses on fields.	
Neutral	No comment.	

Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral		
Neutral	The water table is already incredibly high in Nuptown and roads in Nuptown flood. This must NOT make it worse	
Neutral	I have considerable concerns about what will be required and the timescales needed to put what will be required in place - not to mention the amount of disruption to traffic flow and the local environment.	
Neutral		
Neutral	None to make	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Object		
Support	This needs doing anyway the current water and sewage are insufficient already to support the needs of the current residents.	
Support		



<b>Policy 13: Parking, Garaging and Ancillary Buildings</b>		
<p>for new development in the countryside should be appropriately located or screened to minimise landscape impact.                      Where planning permission is required, parking, garaging and ancillary buildings should be well integrated into the plot and its landscaping. They should be visually subservient and should not obscure or dominate the house frontage or approach, and should be softened with adjacent planting to reduce their impact on the wider streetscape.                      Parking requirements should fully comply with the Bracknell Forest Parking Standards applicable at the time of application.</p>		
Support: 41,      Neutral: 25,      Object: 20		
Stance	Comments	Response
Neutral	Yes I agree to this policy if development goes ahead but I object to further development.	
Object	we don't need anymore!	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Object	The provision of parking, garaging and ancillary buildings would impact the area in a negative way, this is the countryside.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Support	Parking must be offroad and screened. BFBC is minded to support applications where significant visitor parking spills onto the road outside existing houses.	
Support	anything which stops on road parking has to be the right way forward	
Support	There is an urgent need to ensure adequate parking is provided. Pavement parking on the Carnation Drive estate is nor ridiculous with Local Police & Authorities unwilling to address it. Further traffic & residents carts will only make things worse as there will always be a drive to build additional saleable units over provision of adequate parking	
Support	The provision for offroad parking would appear to be insufficient as there is never enough car parking spaces provided. You only need to look at the new developments where cars are parked up on the pavement. No one uses their garage so don't include this as a space. Need to get this right as it only causes conflict in the future.	

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	It is all very well developers building garages, but they have to be fit for purpose. Family homes often have at least one large family car. Garages must be built large enough that people can open the car door inside a garage and get out of the vehicle comfortably.	
Object	This policy is probably in place. I cannot see the BFC Planners not complying with this policy.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Object	The majority of families now have 2 or more vehicles per household. Will these small, affordable houses be built with double garages or multiple parking bays to avoid on-street parking?	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Object	Developers will squeeze every nook and cranny out of a plot to maximise profit. Unfortunately the house holds that have more Cars than the allocated spaces just spill out cluttering the street scene. When visitors come it is even worse. Please see the Woodside development already.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Neutral	More focus on alternative modes, reducing car based trips would be better.	

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	235 houses equates to 300 to 400 more cars, destroying the environment and further polluting the air we breathe.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Support	<p>But ensure that there are enough spaces for visitors. Learn lessons from Jennett's park. People will use private transport for many years to come.</p> <p>Where are the policies on road infrastructure and public transport?</p>	
Object	The problems with garages are twofold: 1) The average garage built for the average is too small for a car 2) Residents do NOT use their garages for cars anyway. Parking: Most houses now have at least 2 cars. Driveways not long enough.	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Object	<p>The proposed development of 235 homes would mean the probability of 470 cars needing both parking and garaging - this would need to be accounted for in any planning.</p> <p>The local infrastructure cannot cope at the moment - roads are heaving with traffic. Any local road enhancements would divert traffic onto already busy lanes.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.</p> <p>Additional traffic loads would be assessed and addressed by the Highways Agency as a consultee on development plans.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Support	It is vital to get a realistic figure for the number of cars per property. Even 1 bedroom starter homes and flats are likely to have two cars since most are occupied by couples. The figure also needs to take account of the numbers of visitors that are likely to converge on any area during weekends and evenings. Clearly, the figure was considerably underestimated when this part of Whitegrove was planned in the 1990s.	
Object	With the development of 235 houses means a possible 470 cars to be parked and garaged, without the concerns of traffic build up as it is already a very busy road	The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.
Object	Parking provisions for over 235 houses smacks of housing estate and this clearly is the council proposal in real terms. The excessive traffic caused by the increased vehicles will also mean substantial rises in pollution and to wear and tear to already inadequate roads.	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.</p> <p>Additional traffic loads would be assessed and addressed by the Highways Agency as a consultee on development plans.</p>

Stance	Comments	Response
Object	<p>As I have previously mentioned, there are already HUNDREDS of houses being built in the area yet there has been no provision for extra roads and public transport. Adding an extra lane at the Coppid Beech roundabout is NOT going to stop the ridiculous build up of traffic. Image living at the new Amen Corner estate - residents won't be able breathe for carbon monoxide. I would like to see some real analysis and data collection of traffic in the area.</p> <p>Have you really allowed enough provision for over 400 cars on this new estate?</p> <p>As planners, architects, councillors don't you want to create an environment that people want to live in? One that improves the lives of the residents and those around? 200 + boxy ill-designed over-priced little houses squeezed into an already over populated neighbourhood Really, is that your solution to the housing crisis in this country? Planning any new estates near your house?</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's policies look to mitigate the effects of delivering the Government driven housing requirements, allocated through Bracknell Forest Borough Council, in Warfield Parish. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the fact that BFBC and Warfield will receive further allocations in future and the associated parking need.</p> <p>Additional traffic loads would be assessed and addressed by the Highways Agency as a consultee on development plans.</p>
Neutral	No comment.	
Neutral		
Neutral	None to make	
Neutral		
Neutral		
Neutral		

Stance	Comments	Response
Object		
Support	I support smart design for all new builds and to factor in any future cars being added to the household a family of two adults and two teenagers will have four cars	
Support		
Support	There needs to be enough parking, the developers need to build homes with space for minimum 2 carspaces for a three bedroomed property.	
Support		

Stance	Comments	Response
Support		
Support	difficult now. Why more cars? Delivery vans? Most families have food delivered now, forest road will be unpleasant. People don't use garages as they are meither on the move. School run work etc.	
Support	If we aren't swamped with houses off road parking should be simple	
Support	Although commercial vehicles will spoil the ambience of the area	