

WARFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

7 County Lane, Warfield, RG42 3JP

clerk@warfieldparishcouncil.org.uk



Clerk: Janis Harding
Tel/fax: **01344-457777**
Mon-Thurs 9.30 – 12.30
Date: 28 November 11

Head of Spatial Policy
Environment, Culture & Communities
Bracknell Forest Council
Time Square
Bracknell
RG12 1JD

Dear Sirs

DETAILED CONCEPT PLAN WARFIELD SPD

As you are aware Warfield Parish Council has chosen to cooperate in the planning process to achieve the best possible outcomes for Warfield. However, we continue to maintain that the area of land is insufficient to accommodate the proposed scale of development and it will destroy the semi-rural character and identity of Warfield. In order to achieve the target figure of 2200 dwellings development will conflict with PPS1 and Saved Local Plan Policies regarding the protection of Cabbage Hill.

We trust you will take note of the following amendments we would wish to see included in the final version of the Supplementary Planning Document.

Comments on specific points:

Land parcels a, b, c, d, e, f

We refer to our previous submission to the Warfield SPD Consultation Draft and the Parish Council's objective to preserve Cabbage Hill as an area of local landscape importance and that it should remain undeveloped. Cabbage Hill should be protected as Bracknell Forest Council envisaged in Saved Local Plan Policy EN10 (Para 2.72 ii *Planning permission will not be granted for development which would harm the open, rural or undeveloped character, the special landscape qualities or the function of Cabbage Hill*). The protection of Cabbage Hill is further supported by Bracknell Forest Members resolution PPS1 regarding the protection of Cabbage Hill against development. Development would also be contrary to policy 5.9 of the adopted Warfield Parish Plan (Para 5.9 *Warfield Parish Council will argue against all development which threatens the integrity of green gaps, particularly in the south of the village*).

Furthermore, in her examination of the Core Strategy, the Planning Inspector noted in relation to the Local Gap 1: *“In future, it would also lie between Binfield and the proposed urban extension (CS5) to the east. In other words, between the Parishes of Binfield and Warfield.”* and *“The area to the east of Binfield and the north of Bracknell is largely dominated by the Blue Mountain Golf Course, which is a public golf course. I accept that it is important to retain the openness of the area particularly in the light of the CS5 urban extension. Furthermore, it would be desirable to retain the settlement pattern, such as it exists, to prevent further coalescence.”* In view of Bracknell Forest Council’s proposed redevelopment of Blue Mountain Golf Club, the function of Cabbage Hill will include providing the gap separating Binfield from Warfield and preventing the coalescence of the two villages.

There must be no development on parcels **a**, **b** and **c** as this would damage the important landscape irreversibly and breach the local gap. We would not oppose development east of the current building line in West End Lane nor would we object to partial development of the eastern section of parcel **f** provided development was sensitive, low profile and low density.

We would recommend the relocation of primary school PS2 in parcel **d** to the proposed alternative location in parcel **g**. Vehicle access to parcel **d** is likely to be very restricted and will inevitably lead to school run use of West End Lane which is clearly designated as a no through road with restricted access and usage.

Land parcels g, h, j

We suggest that development of these parcels would be contrary to Saved Local Plan Policy EN14 *‘Planning permission will not be granted for development in a river corridor which would have an adverse effect on nature conservation interests, fisheries or the open character of the landscape’*. However should development take place as proposed we would suggest that vehicular access should not be allowed to the periphery of the river corridor and houses in parcels **g** and **j** should front onto the river corridor to discourage its use for fly tipping. This principle should also relate to development in parcels **d** and **e**.

The route of the proposed link road will have an adverse impact on Avery Lane, an old established parish byway and would be detrimental to the semi-rural nature of the lane. This can be mitigated effectively by providing adequate separation and planting of hedges and shrubs, as has been achieved on Quelm Lane between Harvest Ride and Darby Vale, parallel to Newport Drive.

Land parcels k, m, n, p, ff

We consider that the proposal to place a neighbourhood centre either side of Newell Green would adversely affect the safety and flow of traffic and our preferred location would be parcel **n**. This location would be better suited for the centre being nearer to primary school PS1. If a larger area were needed we suggest parcel **n** could be enlarged and parcel **ff** be reduced accordingly.

We recommend that land parcel **p** is included within the proposed site of primary school PS1 to prevent potential residents of **p** becoming isolated and subject to inevitable traffic challenges arising from the proximity of the school. Parcel **ff** could be increased accordingly.

We suggest that the proposed density of parcel **m** is too high. This location adjacent to Larks Hill and an historic farmhouse is one of the most prominent in the area and thus has significant value. We suggest a lower density would be more in keeping with the semi-rural nature of the area.

Land parcels q, r, s, t, u

The proposed development of these parcels would be contrary to the Ecological Planning Research Survey undertaken in 2009 (Appendix 1) which found a breeding population of Great Crested Newts at the pond on Halo Farm in the Warfield Street South development. Sufficient terrestrial habitat and habitat corridors will need to be retained or provided close to the breeding pond within the proposed development. Map 4 in the document shows the proposed mitigation strategy. In view of this we would recommend that the areas of parcels **q, r, s, t** and **u** are reduced accordingly and the number of houses in this area is reduced.

Land parcels v, w, x, y

We consider parcel **w** would lend itself to medium density development rather than the low density proposed and density of parcels **x** and **y** could be increased to an excess of 40, in view of the close proximity to Tesco and to the local transport hub.

Land parcels z, aa, bb

Jigs Lane North with its existing development provides a natural boundary. We recommend that the density of parcel **z** be reduced and parcels **z** and **bb** become one area of lower density development to compliment the existing pattern of development and the river corridor.

A county registered nature reserve lies within parcel **aa**, which should be retained. Please refer to the Biodiversity Officer for further details.

Roads and accesses

We note the provision of roads and access to the new housing plots has not in the main been defined. However please note:

- The proposed use of Hedge Lane (Warfield bridleway 26) as a vehicle access road/ part bus route is a misuse of a public right of way/bridleway and will need to be reconsidered. We would suggest that there should be sufficient screening between it and any parallel access road to ensure the semi-rural nature of this parish lane is preserved.
- Sufficient screening of trees and shrubs between the new link road and Avery Lane (Warfield byway 8) to ensure the semi-rural nature of this old established parish lane is preserved.
- The case against development of parcel **c** has already been made. However, it is not clear how it could be accessed. Presumably no new road will be constructed across the open green space of Cabbage Hill and additional junctions on Forest Road are undesirable, aside from having poor sight lines without major modification.
- Proposed access for developments in parcels **q, s** and **v** – we recommend that all access is off Jigs Lane North, Harvest Ride or County Lane as additional junctions on Warfield Street are undesirable.
- Consideration should be given to making Maize Lane a N/S one way traffic route at the northern end to prevent traffic emerging onto Warfield Street.
- Warfield Street should not carry any more traffic by way of the new development.
- Consideration should be given to making Strawberry Hill one way traffic N/S due to its narrow profile, with junction improvements at the junction of Jigs Lane North, Warfield Street, Bracknell Road and Forest Road to improve flow of traffic.

- Our proposal that the neighbourhood centre is located on one side of Newell Green will ensure that traffic can flow to the best possible extent.

Open Spaces

- We recommend consideration be given to enlarging the proposed public open space parcels G9, G10, G12 & G14. These plots are considered to be too small for practical use and will be difficult to maintain.
- The provision of allotments within the parish is essential. The plan gives no indication that these have been accepted as an essential element of the infrastructure despite the fact that Principle 5, point 9 specifically requires their inclusion. As previously stated our preference would be for 3 smaller locations which we believe would be more sustainable and mitigate against vehicle movements.
- The provision of additional active open space is needed. We do not believe that any active open space enhancements can be provided within the existing facilities at Warfield Memorial Ground, Priory Field and Westmorland Park, thus making a further requirement within the new development.
- We consider the provision of on site SANG essential for a sustainable development. In order to preserve the semi-rural nature of the area we recommend that as much as possible of Cabbage Hill is retained as public open space. We recommend that parcel G1 be increased to provide SANG and OSPV land for the wider area thereby preserving the integrity of this prominent feature in the local landscape.

Schools

- We recognise an additional secondary school is an essential requirement of this development.
- We support the proposal for 2 x 2 form entry primary schools.

Summary

Taking into account our proposals, the density and schedule of accommodation should be revised as follows:

Use	Parcel	Area (Ha)	Density	No. Dwellings	Populatio ⁿ [?]	Comments
Open space	a	1.82	0	0	0	Merge into G1
Open space	b	3.42	0	0	0	Merge into G1
Open space	c	4.73	0	0	0	Merge into G1
Residentia ^l [?]	d	3.44	35	120	276	Enlarged by moving PS2
Residentia ^l [?]	e	2.13	35	75	172	
Residentia ^l [?]	f	1.54	35	53	121	Reduced to current building line
Open space	f	0.7	0	0	0	Remainder merge into G1
Residentia ^l [?]	g	0.82	35	28	64	Reduced by adding PS2
Residentia ^l [?]	h	0.71	35	25	57	
Residentia ^l [?]	j	1.49	35	52	120	

Residentia	k	8	35	280	647	
Residentia	m	2.78	35	97	223	Reduced density
Residentia	n	1.28	40	51	118	
Residentia	p	0	0	0	0	Removed by moving PS1
Residentia	q	3.36	35	117	269	Reduced by newt habitat
Residentia	r	1.11	40	44	101	Reduced by newt habitat
Residentia	s	1.57	35	54	124	Reduced by newt habitat
Residentia	t	2.48	35	86	197	Reduced by newt habitat
Residentia	u	2.6	40	104	239	Reduced by newt habitat
Residentia	v	2	35	70	162	
Residentia	w	2.47	40	98	225	Increased density
Residentia	x	2.27	45	102	234	Increased density
Residentia	y	1.13	45	50	115	Increased density
Residentia	z	0.61	35	21	48	Reduced density
Open space	aa	0	0	0	0	Existing Nature Reserve
Residentia	bb	1.38	35	48	112	
Residentia	cc	1.35	35	47	109	
Residentia	dd	0.8	35	28	65	
Residentia	ee	0.54	40	22	50	
Residentia	ff	1.61	35	56	128	Enlarged by moving PS1
Subtotal		58.14	36.875	1728	3976	

We trust you will take the above points into consideration and would be happy to provide further clarification if required.

Yours faithfully

Janis Harding
Clerk

Enclosures

Appendix A - Ecological Planning Research Survey 2009