



## WRRA Local Plan – Additional Information part 2 Excerpts from the Draft Sustainability Appraisal

---

### WRRA introduction to Additional Information Part 2

The Draft Sustainability Appraisal is an **evidence document** that has been produced by the council to appraise and **evaluate** the various elements of Draft Local Plan in terms of their contribution to the principle of achieving **sustainable development**.

For the purposes of this additional information document there shown below, eight extracts that relate to the proposed sites in Winkfield Row, namely Cluster 5 and Mushroom Castle.

These may of **help** in assessing and **commenting on matters relating to sustainability**.

The link to view the full document is <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/4880468>

### **Excerpt 1**

3.127 The strategic gap between Bracknell and North Ascot covers many of the **Winkfield** sites that are located in the countryside (outside of settlement boundaries and outside of the Green Belt).

- CLU5 – the strategic gap covers the majority of the site. The areas to the north of Forest Road are more open and are proposed for use for some limited development, a primary school and SANG. The area to the south of Forest Road is proposed to be almost entirely developed. It is difficult to see how development of the site can be comprehensively brought forward without eroding the strategic gap to some extent. However, the presence of existing built development along the Western side of this part of the site on Chavey Down Road and on its Eastern side on the opposite side of Locks Ride significantly reduces the contribution this land makes to the gap.

### **Excerpt 2**

#### Sites Proposed for Allocation

3.181 Given the relatively limited number of sites submitted for consideration through the SHELAA and level of constraints evident across the Borough it has been necessary to consider the suitability of all sites for housing as well as whether mitigation can be utilised to increase suitability. This has required consideration of the cumulative impact of constraints on individual sites so that suitability can be assessed on a holistic basis. On balance, the sites listed below and specified in policies within the Draft BFLP offer the most sustainable opportunities for development. Constraints which have the potential to affect the capacity of sites have been considered during capacity assessments; these are outlined in Table 16 below and covered in further detail in site profiles in the Draft BFLP Background Paper as well as evidence studies<sup>19</sup>. **The Background Paper includes plans showing the proposed developable areas of sites, reference to these is key to understanding the extent of development and how issues are being addressed.**

Cluster5 (Wink8- 14 & 35)	Land at Winkfield Row	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt to the north of the site</li> <li>- High heritage value (Conservation Area, historic landscape value, Listed buildings, Historic Park and Garden)</li> <li>- Fluvial, surface water and groundwater flood risk</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presence of trees (including protected)</li> <li>- Strategic gap</li> </ul>
Wink15	Whitegates, Mushroom Castle, Chavey Down Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presence of trees</li> <li>- Adjacent Local Wildlife Site/Ancient Woodland</li> <li>- Surface water flood risk</li> </ul>

**WRRRA note** : Link to the background paper – **Cluster 5 information is found on pages 169 to 176** :

<http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/file/4880812>

### **Excerpt 3**

#### Services

3.150 In line with sustainably locating sites, consideration was given to access to services. Consideration was given to the potential for the provision of additional facilities as part of larger developments and for small and medium scale residential developments to provide financial contribution towards off-site community facilities. Sites at CLU5 and CLU7 are poorly served at present, however the proposed number of dwellings on each site (once constraints are taken into account) falls below the scale of development where an on-site community hub is required (650 net dwellings); financial contribution towards off-site community facility provision will be required. Policies LP6 and LP7 relating to these sites require a comprehensive package of on and off-site transport measures to mitigate the development's impact on roads and encourage sustainable modes of transport. Both require provision of a primary school which could potentially have dual use, mitigating to some extent the lack of services in close proximity to the sites.

Continued on next page

## **Excerpt 4**

### Options considered in response to site-specific issues

3.155 The suitability of the majority of sites for housing development has been considered based on the alternatives above. However, a number of further options have been considered with respect to certain sites. This is particularly the case for sites where a number of constraints are evident but there is potential to contribute significantly towards housing supply within the Borough.

3.156 Further consideration of these sites has been necessary due to the limited number of large sites promoted and desire to allocate a mix of different sized sites, as set out in Spatial Strategy. If these sites were not considered for allocation, due to the existence of constraints which limit the potential of some areas, the Council would be unable to meet the housing requirement and support growth in the Borough. Instead, the Council would become reliant on other land coming forward during the plan period and, as a result, would not be able to select the most appropriate sites and plan comprehensively including in terms of providing infrastructure. Such an approach would be less sustainable than the approach which has been pursued since it would not be possible to identify, and focus development in, the most sustainable locations.

## **Excerpt 5**

### CLUSTER 5

3.168 Cluster 5 is one of the larger sites submitted. The site is split by the Forest Road; the character to the north (towards the Green Belt) has a different character (more rural), than the area to the south. Overall, the site is not as well located as alternative sites; transport is dominated by the personal car and services are relatively limited in the area. The area to the south relates better to the existing settlement.

3.169 Several constraints are evident on the site, for example the north-west of the site is located in close proximity to a Conservation Area and has high historic landscape sensitivity; Listed Buildings are present to the north of Forest Road. The northern boundary of the site experiences fluvial flooding, with further surface water flood risk affecting the site. Land south of Forest Road scores better than land to the north against the SA objectives.

3.170 Consideration has been given to only allocating land to the south of Forest Road. However this would be unlikely to provide SANG without compromising development capacity; a reduction in capacity would not facilitate the necessary infrastructure improvements needed to improve the sustainability of the location.

3.171 Consideration has been given to only allocating land to the north of Forest Road, this would reduce SANG requirements as the 5km SPA buffer passes through the site. However the northern area is not as well connected to the settlement; and is more constrained than the south.

3.172 The proposed allocation focuses development to the south of Forest Road, with further development to the northern edge of Forest Road, with a Primary School and SANG beyond. The north western area of the site has been avoided.

**Excerpt 6** The Sustainability Assessment of Sites included in the Draft Local Plan – Including Cluster 5 and Mushroom Castle (WINK15) is summarised in table 12 (see following pages)

**WRRRA Note :** SA9 Economy and Employment the individual elements are rated as Neutral however the combined site has been rated as Positive. Aside from the actual construction jobs that would be temporarily provided and employment opportunities in a new school , what is the evidence to justify the positive rating?

**SA12 – Health –** Aside from the SANG provision where is the evidence to justify this rating? You may also wish to refer to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – section relating to Cluster 5 when assessing and reviewing the Sustainability Assessment for Cluster 5

3.107 The key for Tables 11, 12,13 and 15 is as follows:

**Key for Tables 11, 12, 13 and 15**

Scoring	Explanation
✓✓	Very positive effect on the SA objective
✓	Positive effect on the SA objective
0	Neutral
Imp	Depends on implementation
✓x	Positive and negative effects on the SA objective
x	Negative effect on the SA objective
xx	Very negative effect on the SA objective
?	Effect unknown

Continued on next page

**Table 12: Sustainability Appraisal Results for Sites Proposed for Allocation<sup>1</sup>**

SA Objective	Constraint type influence <sup>2</sup>								Locational type influence <sup>3</sup>								Green Belt?	LP3 and LP8 allocation
	SA2 Climate adaptation	SA3 Biodiversity	SA4a Landscape	SA4b Historic	SA6a Pollution (air, soil, noise)	SA6b Pollution (wastewater)	SA7a Resource use (other)	SA7b Resource use (water)	SA1 Mitigate climate change	SA12 Health	SA15 Community	SA16 Services	SA17 Travel	SA18 Land use	SA9 Economy & employment	SA11 Housing need		
BIN1	0	Imp	*	**	Imp	*	*	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	45
BIN5	Imp	*	✓*	✓*	Imp	*	*	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	40
BIN6	Imp	*	*	✓*	Imp	*	*	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	34
BIN7	0	Imp	✓*	✓*	Imp	*	*	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	0	✓	N	5
BIN10	0	*	*	**	0	*	*	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	*	✓	N	13
BIN11	*	Imp	✓*	*	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓*	0	✓	N	22
BIN12	*	0	✓*	✓*	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓*	*	✓	✓	✓*	0	✓	N	8
CLU3 comprising	**	*	**	✓*	Imp	*	0	✓	0	0	✓*	✓	✓*	✓*	✓*	✓✓	N	570 <sup>+</sup>
BRA3	**	*	*	✓*	Imp	*	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓*	*	✓*	✓✓	N	CLU3 <sup>+</sup>
BRA4	*	*	**	✓*	Imp	*	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU3 <sup>+</sup>
BRA6	0	Imp	Imp	0	*	*	0	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓*	✓✓	N	67
BRA7	Imp	0	0	0	✓*	*	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	Imp	✓✓	N	200* (11,600m <sup>2</sup> )
BRA11	Imp	0	0	0	*	*	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	Imp	✓✓	N	212* (3,050m <sup>2</sup> )
BRA12	Imp	0	0	0	*	*	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	N	92* (2,350m <sup>2</sup> )
BRA13	0	*	✓*	✓*	*	*	0	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	Imp	✓✓	N	69* (2,000m <sup>2</sup> )
BRA14	*	Imp	✓*	✓*	✓*	*	0	✓	✓✓	✓*	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	N	144* (5,700m <sup>2</sup> )
BRA15	*	Imp	✓*	0	✓*	*	0	✓	✓✓	✓*	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	N	267* (9,400m <sup>2</sup> )
SAND5	0	0	*	✓*	✓*	✓	0	✓	*	✓*	0	✓*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	217
WAR9	0	*	✓*	✓*	✓*	*	*	✓	0	0	0	✓*	✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	33



SA Objective	Constraint type influence <sup>2</sup>									Locational type influence <sup>3</sup>								
	SA2 Climate adaptation	SA3 Biodiversity	SA4a Landscape	SA4b Historic	SA6a Pollution (air, soil, noise)	SA6b Pollution (wastewater)	SA7a Resource use (other)	SA7b Resource use (water)	SA1 Mitigate climate change	SA12 Health	SA15 Community	SA16 Services	SA17 Travel	SA18 Land use	SA9 Economy & employment	SA11 Housing need	Green Belt?	LP3 and LP8 allocation
WAR10	0	Imp	✓*	✓*	*	*	*	✓	0	0	0	✓*	✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	96
CLU7 comprising:	Imp	Imp	✖✖	✓*	*	*	*	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	235
WAR13	Imp	Imp	*	✓*	*	*	*	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	*	0	✓✓	N	CLU7
WAR14	0	Imp	*	✓*	0	*	0	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	*	0	✓	N	CLU7
WAR15	*	*	✖✖	✓*	0	*	*	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	*	0	✓✓	N	CLU7
WAR16	*	Imp	✖✖	✓*	0	*	*	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	*	0	✓✓	N	CLU7
WAR22	*	Imp	✖✖	✓*	0	*	*	✓	*	✓	0	✖✖	*	✓*	0	✓	N	CLU7
CLU5 comprising:	Imp	*	✖✖	✖✖	✖✖	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	✓*	*	*	✓*	✓	✓✓	N	500
WINK8	0	*	*	*	✖✖	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK9	Imp	0	✖✖	*	0	*	*	*	*	✓	0	*	*	*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK10	0	*	*	*	✖✖	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK11	0	Imp	*	✓*	*	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK12	0	Imp	✓*	✓*	0	*	*	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓	N	CLU5
WINK13	0	0	0	✓*	0	*	0	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓	N	CLU5
WINK14 N	*	Imp	✖✖	✖✖	*	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	✓*	*	*	*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK14 S	Imp	Imp	✓*	✖✖	✖✖	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	✓*	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK35	Imp	0	✓*	✖✖	*	*	✖✖	*	*	✓	0	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	CLU5
WINK15	0	*	✓*	✓*	*	*	*	*	*	✓	✓*	*	*	✓*	0	✓✓	N	48
WINK20	0	*	✓*	0	✖✖	*	0	*	✓✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓	*	0	✓✓	N	278
WINK22	✖✖	*	✖✖	*	*	✖✖	0	*	✓✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓	✓*	0	✓✓	N	450 <sup>+</sup>
WINK34	0	Imp	✓*	✓*	*	*	0	*	✓✓	0	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	N	6

<sup>1</sup> Appraisal findings are dependent on the evidence base, some of which is still being finalised. As such the findings are subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> These SA Objectives principally indicate the level of constraint on sites.

<sup>3</sup> These SA Objectives principally indicate if sites are sustainably located.

\* Mixed used scheme.

<sup>+</sup> Total final number to be subject to further work on the implications of flood and ecological mitigation.

**Excerpt 7** - Note that the full table can be viewed pages 112 – 116 of the Sustainability Appraisal report

## Likely Effects of the BFLP and Alternatives

**Table 18: Cumulative effects**

SA16 Services	✓*	✓*	✓*	<p>The Spatial Strategy supports the development of sustainably located sites where services are available. The proposed site allocations meet with the Spatial Strategy, as far as the land availability and constraints within the Borough permit. However <b>CLU5</b> and <b>CLU7</b> are poorly served; whilst a primary school is to be provided on each site (which could potentially have dual-use), along with sustainable transport measures and financial contribution towards off-site community facilities, the impact at these sites may be negative.</p> <p>Policy LP9 requires the provision of new or enhanced infrastructure.</p>
SA17 Travel choice	*	*	**	<p>The Spatial Strategy supports the development of sustainably located sites where sustainable modes of transport are available, and the need to travel is reduced. The proposed site allocations meet with the Spatial Strategy, as far as the land availability and constraints within the Borough permit. However the allocations in Warfield and <b>Winkfield</b> typically have a poor choice of transport beyond the private car - <b>CLU5</b> and <b>CLU7</b> mitigate this to some extent due to the scale of development. Sites in Bracknell offer the greatest sustainable travel choices.</p> <p>Increased development is likely to generate additional vehicle movements, impacting congestion, travel time, air quality and noise. Policies LP9, LP45, LP46, LP47, LP48 apply. Road traffic levels, and rail passenger movements are slightly increasing; this trend is likely to continue. It may be mitigated to some extent as work patterns change (e.g. more flexible working may reduce the need to travel and peak travel flows) and infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Air quality may have secondary effects on the SAC and SPA (refer to SA3 above). This is uncertain until further work is completed</p>

### **Excerpt 8**

3.189 There is potential for proposed allocations at **CLU5** and **CLU7** to be poorly served by facilities. **CLU5** also presents potentially significant negative impact to heritage assets, further work is required. Remediation of the landfill at **WINK20** offers the potential for significant environmental improvement in the longer term (post remediation).