

Land at Jealott's Hill, Warfield NUMBER OF COMMENTS MADE BY TYPE OF RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED
STATUTORY CONSULTEE / DUTY TO COOPERATE BODY	
General / Principle / Misc.	
020 Bray PC	Accepts existing building footprint on the site is previously developed land.
020 Bray PC	Site should not be allocated as it goes above the Borough's housing need.
044 Sandhurst Town Council	Fully support the proposal.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	RBWM object to the proposals for Jealott's Hill. Proposals will significantly impact RBWM, given its proximity to RBWM.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Cannot support or object to proposals due to limited detail.
Green Belt	
020 Bray PC	Funding to maintain Syngenta on the site is not an exceptional circumstance.
020 Bray PC	Site is isolated in Green Belt; removing from the Green Belt would be unacceptable and would allow for other isolated Green Belts sites to come forward.
370 Wokingham Borough Council	The site is located wholly within the Metropolitan Green Belt and therefore exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated to release land for development.
517 Binfield Parish Council	BPC does not support the housing development in the green belt. The science park could be developed without the need for housing on site.
517 Binfield Parish Council	As an area of open green belt, currently unspoilt and undeveloped, this is currently a benefit to the environment. The proposed development of 4,000 homes would be a very visible detriment to the green belt.
532 Warfield Parish Council	Contributes to all five purposes of the Green Belt, the most significant being 'safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	The site is isolated in Green Belt and is largely fields and woodland, and thus makes a substantial contribution to the openness of the Green Belt.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Proposals would have a significant detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this part of RBWM, given the adjacent location and the large amount of built form proposed.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated, and the future operation of the existing facility by development of a new settlement does not outweigh the resultant considerable harm to the Green Belt. Proposal would also constitute over-development of Green Belt.
882 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Highways technical note	Argument for removing site from Green Belt appears weak, and there is little evidence that alternatives to enabling development have been considered and discounted in order to secure the future research facility.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Response to Winkfield NDP show that Winkfield Parish residents thought it was important to keep the Green Belt.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	There is already sufficient brownfield land at Jealott's Hill to create a science park without building on Green Belt land.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Whilst the site is not entirely accessible to the local population, it is not clear why it was not changed from Green Belt during the recent Green Belt review.
Transport	
020 Bray PC	Impact on traffic due to additional movement (specific details given – A330).
020 Bray PC	No evidence given on how traffic impacts will be mitigated.
020 Bray PC	Potential to impact AQMA (specific details given - A330).
292 White Waltham Parish Council	Extremely concerned about proposal to develop 4000 homes at Jealott's Hill. Proposed development is adjacent to parish boundary and extra traffic movement of up to 10,000 vehicles per day, will pass along A330 to Maidenhead and along Drift Rd to reach M4 junctions 8/9. Will have a devastating impact on parish roads already gridlocked at 8am and 4pm each weekday. Church Hill, White Waltham already has serious problems regarding out of date sewage and drainage works due to the mass of vehicle movements during peak times.

517 Binfield Parish Council	The location is not sustainable and would likely be mostly car dependent, leading to a significant increase in traffic movements throughout the area. It is especially important for affordable housing to be in sustainable locations with easy access to public transport.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Proposals will significantly impact RBWM, given key routes to Maidenhead (including Elizabeth Line station) and M4 J8/9 traversing significant parts of RBWM.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	The site is isolated and in an unsustainable location, with inadequate public transport encouraging car use for access to employment and facilities. Proposal is thus irresponsible in relation to sustainability and climate change.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Detrimental impact on roads in surrounding areas (Hawthorn Hill, Holyport, Bray, Ascot), some of which are already congested during rush hours (including A3095 and A330 towards Drift Road roundabout and M4, M40 and A404(M)).
882 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Highways technical note	<p>RBWM Highways technical note states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBWM's Highways Authority objects to the proposals. Location is not sustainable and will significantly impact highway and transport networks within RBWM, particularly along A330/A308 corridor. • Proposal is not consistent with NPPF, as it does not focus development within most sustainable locations and is unlikely that the location could be made more sustainable, fully mitigating traffic impacts. • A comprehensive transport assessment will be required, supported by extensive modelling on likely impacts on wider area (extending along A330/A308 corridor as far as A4 as well M4 J8/), if proposal is pursued.

898 Winkfield Parish Council	<p>Considering LP12 Infrastructure, it would be impossible to build 4,000 homes without major new infrastructure and the proposal thus likely requires serious amendment. WPC would struggle to support the proposal without sight of an IDP that addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local road network. Current proposed improvements would be inadequate for the increase in vehicle movements (gives calculations). Request sight of the traffic model. • Surrounding road network. Roads in Warfield and Winkfield are already seriously congested with traffic travelling between strategic roads (M3, M4, M25, M40) bringing high levels of pollution. Major investment in new roads and major improvements to existing roads and junctions is required to avoid increased congestion. • Site is not served by public transport and is not within walking distance of any. As a minimum, comprehensive, regular and frequent bus service should be provided, linking site to neighbouring facilities and services, as soon as any housing on-site is inhabited to avoid forced car use. May need to run at a loss for some years, so funding would be required. • Dedicated cycle route should be provided between site and Bracknell cycle network to ensure cycling is safe and viable.
------------------------------	--

Historic Environment	
-----------------------------	--

455 Historic England	<p>We agree with the assessment made by LUC and with the guidance in respect of appropriate understanding of the nature and significance of the historic environment. While some references to the historic environment have been taken through to policy LP7 and associated profile, the detail is less than the recommendation in the LUC report. If site profiles are to be used that guidance could usefully be contained within the site profile.</p> <p>We also agree that a masterplanning approach is needed for these sites, particularly given their size. It is of high importance that the work to fully understand the historic environment is done ahead of the masterplanning work, so that the masterplanning work can respond to this evidence. If these sites are allocated, the masterplanning process should consider how the NPPF requirement of a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of, and clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment. The historic environment can be an important part of the design of new places, helping to provide distinctiveness and character.</p>
----------------------	---

Landscape / Ecology / character	
--	--

532 Warfield Parish Council	Loss of Jealott's Hill Community Landshare orchard is contrary to Biodiversity Action Plan.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Internationally and nationally designated sites lie within RBWM and within 7km of the proposed development. An appropriate assessment therefore needs to be undertaken. This needs to include the cumulative effects with other developments in the area.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Priority habitats are adjacent to site in RBWM. Assessment into the impact (direct loss/fragmentation, air pollution, recreational pressure and impacts from cats/dogs) on these will be required. Avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation measures may be required. Compensation, in the form of on or offsite biodiversity offsetting will also need to be assessed and included if appropriate.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Carbon emissions from construction and future use will be very significant, worsening climate change and contrary to national targets to become carbon neutral. Proposal may result in requirements for new roads, road widening and junction improvements, resulting in loss of significant roadside vegetation including important hedgerows and boundary trees. Vehicles would create emissions, noise and visual intrusion and impact surrounding vegetation, ecology and RBWM residents.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	The site's elevation above surrounding land would cause development to be prominent across local and wider area, causing significant detrimental impacts on quality of landscape resources of RBWM. Light pollution would worsen within RBWM and would be viewable from tens of miles away.

879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Resources required for building the development are likely to have impacts off site, adversely affecting water, land, soil and biodiversity. Residues and emission are likely during construction and future use. Development may affect the hydrology of local area including RBWM, impacting vegetation/species outside of development footprint.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	LP45 Protection and enhancement of trees and hedgerows should be adhered to and enforced on development on this site.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	BFC should reconsider necessity for housing along edge of Maidenhead Road given landscape value of existing vista. Some vegetation may have to disappear, but retainment of the majority of it could camouflage housing development, retaining semi-rural character. Almost all residents support this.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	How will severe impact on biodiversity, due to destruction of habitats supporting many protected species, be mitigated?
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Warfield is not an extension of Bracknell town, it is a large and diverse semi-rural parish. Balance between economic growth and protection of countryside's land assets must be achieved, as public/local residents care about their environment and do not want permanent damage caused by excessive development.
Housing	
532 Warfield Parish Council	Housing not required to meet local housing need.
532 Warfield Parish Council	Developer recommends higher capacity (4,000 units) than the 2019 SHELAA (3,505 units).
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Proposal results in housing provision well above BFC target, making allocation at this stage questionable.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Not aware of any duty to co-operate discussions between BFC and other authorities, including Slough, to ascertain whether over-provision could meet other unmet needs. Bracknell Forest falls within the area of search identified in the Wider Area Growth Study - Part 1.
Economic Development	
532 Warfield Parish Council	Recognises importance of site for employment, economic activity, agrochemical development and that research has changed however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there that companies will move to Jealott's Hill? • What evidence is there that enabling development is required to help fund the investment needed? • Is there a commitment from the occupier to the site long term and what would happen if they withdrew?
553 Warfield Parish Council	Site should be designated as an employment area. The site contributes significantly to the employment land supply for class B uses (B1 research and development of products and processes) and meets the council's objective of supporting economic growth and resilience.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	No detail provided on class of employment proposed. Would like to see a large varied mix including provision for start-up professional businesses, office space, warehousing as well as retail and leisure if proposal goes ahead. These should provide jobs for some of the new residents, reducing the increase of the burden on local road infrastructure. This should, however, be balanced against the need to drive footfall into Bracknell town centre.
Infrastructure	
106 South East Water	South East Water will need to lay water mains to reinforce the existing infrastructure in order to support the planned 4,000 new dwellings at Jealott's Hill.
327 Surrey County Council	Welcome provision of three primary and one secondary school. This will obviate any displacement factor that could otherwise impact on school place provision in Surrey.
405 Department for Education	Welcomes the requirement for 3 primary schools and a secondary school

532 Warfield Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road network insufficient Little evidence of how transportation to and from the site would take place • Site bordering another local authority area and would have a significant impact beyond the boundaries of Council. • Significant investment on a regional/national basis would be required to deliver improvements. • Lack of accessible access to the public transport network • 'Self-containment of journeys within the site' is a worthy objective relatively few residents are likely to live and work on-site and with no provision for some basic facilities during the plan period i.e. secondary school) significant journeys off-site would be required. Expect proposals to be complaint with policy LP13 Transport principles.
532 Warfield Parish Council	Provision of 1 primary school during the plan period and no commitment during the plan period for delivery of community facilities including retail, healthcare and community hub is inconsistent with spatial provision in para 4.21
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Development will bring additional strain on already overburdened local infrastructure.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	More detail on flooding, drainage and sewage required. What does 'Sustainable Drainage Systems' mean?
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Pleased to see inclusion of a Primary Healthcare Facility and schools, but stringent conditions need to be used to ensure these are provided alongside the inhabitation of first dwellings, unlike Jennetts Park store.

Plan-making	
527 Warfield Parish Council	Inconsistency on the language used to describe the proposals for Jealott's Hill (garden village, garden settlement and garden village principles). Recommend a consistent approach or an explanation given as to why different terms are used.
532 Warfield Parish Council	Proposal is of national and international importance and should be subject to more detailed consultation and investigation than a Local Plan.
532 & 551 Warfield Parish Council	Evidence required to appraise proposal not available or incomplete e.g. transport and site features including missing the copse at Wellers Wood, Drown Boy pond, recycling centre, utility infrastructure and Jealott's Hill Community Landshare including orchard. Would expect to see as a site-specific requirement for the protection of Drown Boy Pond and Wellers Wood and the existing community Landshare project site and orchard.
532 Warfield Parish Council	Notes the significant issues raised by the Council in the supporting documents (including Housing Background Paper, heritage assessments, Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, accessibility statements, ecologic assessments and waste water treatment). Concerned that the Council considers that these issues could be addressed through development management making the site suitable for allocation. This approach is not supported.
879 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	The minimal engagement with RBWM causes considerable concern. BFC has thus not fulfilled the Duty to Co-operate requirements and should remedy this through the next stages of plan-making. Considerable further work needs to be undertaken by BFC in relation to justification and cross boundary working.
882 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Highways technical note	Proposal appears at odds with other policies and evidence set out within the Draft Revised Growth Strategy by over-providing housing and employment relative to agreed needs and targets.
898 Winkfield Parish Council	Policy LP7 should have more stringent wording preventing changes/amendments to the plan which would have detrimental impact on the local area, as has happened numerous times before.
RESIDENTS AND OTHER LOCAL ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS	
General / Principle / Misc.	
026 Buffett, 097 Hughes, 208 Earl, 401 Donaldson, 577 Mullier	Support the proposed development of the site (overall), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the live/work garden village providing integrated economic and social development. • Removes less suitable sites in south Winkfield from the Local Plan

002 & 003 & 322 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 046 Gale, 057 Maidens Green Society, 067 Fernandez, 068 Boyd, 070 Richards, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 079 Richards, 081 Keys, 091 Rimmer, 092 Pearson, 094 Barlow, 095 Young, 108 Fernandez, 109 Hayden Kellard, 112 Mitchell, 120 Sparkes, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 123 Collins, 130 Hawkes, 131 Hazell, 132 Beck, 136 Duncan, 137 Jones, 140 Tillet de Clermont-Tonnerre, 147 Bowen, 148 Graver, 149 Elmes, 325 Bainborough, 151 Kingston, 154 Willatts, 156 Hill, 157 Hill, 164 Midson, 167 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 170 Grace, 171 Sergeant, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 177 Gates, 178 Stok, 187 Collinson, 188 Ehinger, 190 Elmes, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 193 Sauven, 194 Etherington, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 210 Woodbridge, 212 Gates, 213 Makins, 228 Manoukian, 237 Dunn, 233 Newnham, 238 Beni, 244 Gates, 261 Scutt, 265 Mackenzie, 267 Smith, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 274 Hayes, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 287 White, 301 Greenwood, 310 Osada, 314 Chambers, 316 Devitt, 323 Lumley, 324 Hooker, 331 Lumley, 332 Dimpleby, 348 Sauven, 349 Hirst, 350 Moriarty, 364 Griffiths, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 375 Stock & Stock, 376 Holburn, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 391 MacKenzie, 422 Murphy, 442 Yates, 446 Brant, 462 Richmond, 466 Warfield Environmental Group 470 Warner, 471 Derbyshire, 562 Haan, 563 Bradley, 581 Taverner, 582 Bell, 586 Fazey-Gunn, 650 Sparkes, 684 Sparkes, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 767 Young, 768 Seaman, 769 Cole, 788 Blackburn, 794 Jones, 796 Bartlett, 798 Bridges, 799 Saadetian, 803 Squires, 807 Jones, 808 Manoukian, 809 Jones, 810 Plumb, 811 Bridge, 812 Bridge, 815 Barlow, 819 Olivian, 820 Browne, 821 Browne, 832 Manoukian, 836 Ehinger, 838 Belie, 839 Griffiths, 884 Manoukian, 925 Cope, 927 Fitzell, 928 Blakemore, 933 Glen, 936 Lloyd, 942 Barron

Strongly object/object to proposed development of the site (overall).

030 Holyport Residents Association, 036 Gibson, 062 Smith, 069 Gay, 072 Robinson, 073 Stroud, 084 Turner, 088 Jones, 172 Ramsdale, 256 Manning, 257 Rogers, 300 Redman, 315 King, 328 Manning, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 393 Kedward, 403 Browne, 404 Hurtado, 441 Lawrence, 543 Spendlove, 560 Turner, 563 Bradley, 585 Martin, 869 Doughty, 934 Kedwards, 964 Turner	Strongly object/object to proposed development of housing on the site.
191 CPRE, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 417 Murphy, 484 S Collings, 465 Warfield Environmental Group, 769 Cole, 928 Blakemoor	<p>Comments relating to the terms garden settlement/garden village, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term 'garden village' is inappropriate, given failure to engage with the local community. Community involvement at all stages is a key requirement of the garden settlement scheme (MHCLG 2018 Garden Communities, paragraph 12) and local community is not engaged. All terms including 'garden' label should be removed as premature. Needs to be assessed as a proposal for 4000 houses in Green Belt. • The term 'village' is misleading – development would be a small town. • Garden settlement, garden village? Be consistent in terms used and provide a definition. • The proposal has been represented as a new village with all of the required amenities – rather utopian and naïve – a nice idea but not necessarily practical. It is a new town.
484 S Collings	Para 6.50 is incorrect – 215 ha Green Belt will be lost.
466 Warfield Environmental Group, 484 S Collings, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Para 6.54:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the majority of the land to be lost is not greenfield, it is Green Belt. • Should say greenfield/Green Belt.
LOCATIONAL PRINCIPLES (relating to this site)	
140 Tillette de Clermont-Tonnerre, 257 Rodgers, 376 Holburn, 469 Bottwood, 561 McArthur, 788 Blackburn, 925 Cope	<p>Focus housing needs on all current possible brownfield sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should not be developed. • Sub-standard or empty buildings should be developed.
025 Fernandes, 067 Fernandez, 130 Hawkes, 194 Etherington, 198 Fall, 349 Hirst, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Alternative spatial approaches recommended in regard to housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edge of settlement sites are better located and far more acceptable - allow new housing developments to grow organically around the perimeter of the town, rather than establishing an isolated new settlement. • Small scale housing/infills strongly preferred over one or two large scale sites as they are easier to integrate, less likely to damage character and less likely to add pressure to existing road infrastructure. • The policy should be to reinforce Town centre and existing villages where necessary (Binfield, Hayley Green, Chavey Down, Warfield) where sustainability can be improved. • Currently there is a lack of empathy from the Council towards Warfield and Binfield; development should be more evenly spread across the borough. • 'Vertical' development of Bracknell town centre is a more appropriate way of generating new housing with minimal transport requirement (carbon footprint) and minimal encroachment on the Green Belt.
146 Bell	Query why land to the south of London Road which is well connected has been dropped in favour of an isolated Green Belt site.

<p>025 Fernandes, 064 Sparkes, 067 Fernandez, 068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 083 Money, 085 Cope, 091 Rimmer, 101 Bowler, 113 Monks, 124 Kingston, 139 Fitzwilliams, 140 Tillette de ClermontTonnerre, 146 Bell, 149 Elmes, 151 Kingston, 162 Midson, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 190 Elmes, 192 Parkinson, 193 Sauven, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 198 Mead, 201 Deplodge, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 257 Rodgers, 265 Mackenzie, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 307 Brunander, 322 Bonfante, 323 Lumley, 325 Bainborough, 331 Lumley, 348 Sauven, 349 Hirst, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 380 Barlow, 388 Taylor, 391 MacKenzie, 393 Kedward, 684 Sprakes, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 815 Barlow, 836 Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 933 Glen, 934 Kedwards, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Potential to redevelop existing brownfield land at Jealott's Hill, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having worked at Syngenta for 12 years, can categorically stipulate that there is sufficient brownfield built-on land within the existing Syngenta Jealott's Hill site to build the proposed science and innovation park to protect their existing jobs and create 1200 more without loss of Green Belt. • Having worked at Syngenta for 11 years, there is sufficient brownfield built-on land within the existing Syngenta Jealott's Hill site to build the proposed science and innovation park, to protect existing jobs and create more. The reduction in facilities and staff over the last 10 years will have left a void that can be filled without excessive development. • There is more than adequate brownfield land on the current Syngenta footprint to accommodate all their proposed requirements. • Syngenta intends to reduce the square metres it uses after development has taken place – therefore if the private company is able to reduce square metres required while increasing the number of jobs on the site then no additional development is required on the site and the Green Belt boundaries do not need to be removed. • Sufficient brownfield land within its curtilage to adapt and expand its business to meet changing needs (office/lab rather than large scale field testing). • Science and innovation park may have some standalone merit, but this does not necessitate a garden village over the whole site/there is not special need for housing. • Redevelopment of existing brownfield in principle seems reasonable; however, would still be large and require significant justification. • A smaller development, such as a larger office block, would be understandable but a new settlement is not. • Residential development on brownfield areas would be reasonable, though even a development of less than 400 homes would require significant justification. • Policy GB5 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan supports limited infilling and would provide sufficient space to improve/rebuild existing research facility/fit the proposed science park. • Nationally important centre for scientific research can be met without sacrificing irreplaceable Green Belt.
<p>025 Fernandes, 082 Jenkins, 085 Cope, 096 Hartley, 101 Bowler, 109 Hayden Kellard, 124 Kingston, 147 Bowen, 151 Kingston, 149 Elmes, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 188 Ehinger 193 Sauven, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 265 Mackenzie, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 307 Brunander, 323 Lumley, 331 Lumley, 349 Hirst, 633 Bridges, 391 Mackenzie, 767 Young, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 816 Gurney, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges, 925 Cope, 928 Blakemoor, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Potential to relocate existing business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since Syngenta no longer need the land for crop trials it would be reasonable to deduce that the work can be continued either at Jealott's Hill or elsewhere. Laboratories can be built in any location. Comments range from their needs could be met elsewhere in the borough/the region/the county/the world. • If Syngenta is now moving away from land-based testing to more laboratory testing then the company needs to invest in a new facility in a designated Science Park, or to an existing business area around Bracknell with better transport links. • There is a reducing demand for offices with agile/flexible working. There is already 1,000,000 sq ft of empty office space and unlet industrial space in the borough to provide for a Science Park. Some have been available to let for many years; demand likely to reduce further in the future. • Should be located in defined employment area close to motorway network and amenities. • Reading Science Park is a much more attractive location for industry – co-located with Reading University, good public transport links. • Syngenta may decide the Oxford/Cambridge corridor is better suited to their needs once monetised the Green Belt. • If Syngenta is seeking to create jobs, they should move somewhere in the UK more in need of jobs. • Syngenta could do their research anywhere in the world without harming Green Belt.

<p>070 Richards, 079 Richards, 082 Jenkins, 148 Graver, 251 Kennelly, 300 Redman, 322 Bonfante, 324 Hooker, 388 Taylor, 393 Kedward, 402 Glover, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 831 Phillips, 838 Belie, 840 Ratcliffe, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope,</p>	<p>Comments relating to the merging of settlements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of Green Belt/countryside between Holyport and Bracknell is beautiful and should be protected as a boundary between outskirts of Maidenhead and the start of Bracknell. This area has already been compromised by developments (gives various areas). • BFC would be handing responsibility for maintaining separation to RBWM as BFC would no longer control sufficient Green Belt to the North to guarantee a sufficient gap. • Development would encourage urban sprawl to join Syngenta to Bracknell. Scotland's Farm and Home have already tried – will be easier to allow these to meet future targets. • Would need a Green Wedge defined between the new 'village' and the defined settlement boundary further south. • A green wedge will be required in the area north of A3095 around Scotland's Farm up to Moss End and east behind Warfield Street. This would be a protective buffer to prevent further development north of Forest Road into the rural areas of Warfield. • Concerned whole area between London to Reading, Maidenhead and beyond will be covered in concrete eventually. • Proposal will create urban sprawl from Reading to Maidenhead and then to Slough/Windsor. • Binfield will merge with Bracknell and Wokingham/it has already merged. • The development will as good as merge Bracknell, Warfield, and Hawthorn Hill. • Bracknell, Binfield, Crowthorne and Wokingham have already effectively merged. • There isn't really a gap between Bracknell and Wokingham anymore. <p><i>[Refer also to landscape and character section, and Green Belt section. This is also one of the five purposes of the Green Belt]</i></p>
<p>HOUSING</p>	
<p>208 Earl, 525 Seville, 577 Mullier</p>	<p>Support the proposed housing/community development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's an opportunity to build a community based via economic and social development. • Co-location of housing would assist in attracting the talent needed to exploit the potential provided by an expanded science related site through providing high quality modern sustainable development into an area with limited availability and typically high cost housing. • Locality of modern sustainable housing would support a greener approach to lifestyle of those attracted to the site. • The proposed modern, affordable and more sustainable housing with improved carbon emissions credentials will benefit the Bracknell area.

<p>001 Moore, 021 Leach, 067 Fernandez, 073 Stroud, 081 Keys, 085 Cope, 091 Rimmer, 101 Bowler, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 121 Cox, 124 Kingston, 133 Clarkson, 139 Fitzwilliams, 149 Elmes, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 177 Gates, 178 Stok, 188 Ehinger, 189 Auster, 190 Elmes, 193 Sauven, 198 Fall, 201 Deplodge, 210 Woodbridge, 212 Gates, 215 Fall, 216 Proddrow, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 228 Manoukian, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 244 Gates, 251 Kennelly, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 265 Mackenzie, 267 Smith, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 287 White, 294 Thorin, 301 Greenwood, 307 Brunander, 322 Bonfante, 324 Hooker, 325 Bainborough, 328 Manning, 348 Sauven, 349 Hirst, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 375 Stock & Stock, 380 Barlow, 382 Carter, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 391 Mackenzie, 393 Kedward, 404 Hurtado, 441 Lawrence, 461 Knox-Johnston, 465 and 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 470 Warner, 484 S Collings, 582 Bell, 608 M Collings, 620 S Peacey, 637 Nixon, 650 Sparkes, 684 Sparkes, 767 Young, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 810 Plumb, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 831 Phillips, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 836 Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 840 Ratcliffe, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 874 Boorman, 902 Wallen, 923 de Roy, 925 Cope, 928 Blakemore, 934 Kedwards, 936 Lloyd, 937 Silverston, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Site should not be allocated as it goes above the Borough's housing need, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borough is comfortably within its 5-year supply target. • Housing need met within other sites proposed for allocation. • 4,000 dwellings is 230% over what is needed. • Unnecessary increase by c40% relative to government target. • Though it is estimated only 1,200 homes will be completed by 2036, there is little to stop the 4,000 being progressed whether needed or not. • The acceptance of another 4000 houses sounds like a front for some other, non-associated, benefit to BFC.
---	---

<p>021 Leach, 148 Graver, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 927 Fitzell</p>	<p>More strategic comments regarding housing need/excess of development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be better to encourage people to live in less densely populated areas of the UK. Many parts of the UK and even the SE are less urbanised. • Population growth may have decreased by 2036 due to realisation of impact of climate change impact. • The political force for new housing without reliance on recent reviews or continued detailed analysis of real and actual needs has led to a situation where thousands of newbuild homes remain unsold. • Why does Bracknell have to expand to this degree?
--	---

<p>002 & 322 Bonfante, 045 Holmes, 053 MacDondald, 062 Smith, 063 Silvester, 071 Nicholls, 081 Keys; 082 Jenkins; 087 Beardsmore-Gray, 119 Vassor, 131 Hazell, 148 Graver, 156 Hill, 164 Midson, 165 Gooder, 235 Bickley, 236 Bright, 257 Rodgers, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 267 Smith, 282 Gunn, 302 Dove, 305 Shrimpton, 387 Freeman, 400 Mulroy, 402 Glover, 462 Richmond, 463 Harris, 469 Bottwood, 581 Taverner, 586 Fazey-Gunn, 799 Saadetian, 808 Manoukian, 815 Barlow, 816 Gurney, 832 Manoukian, 839 Griffiths, 884 Manoukian, 934 Kedwards</p>	<p>Overdevelopment/generally too much housing development in area/surrounding areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive development in northern parishes over a short timescale (Whitegrove Estate, Quelm Park, Blue Mountain, Woodhurst Park). • Warfield takes unfair share of development within Bracknell Forest when compared to other northern parishes (refer to Woodhurst Park). • Adverse impact of current developments. • Saturation point where potential benefits of new development do not outweigh the impact and volume of change needs to stop or pause to allow impact of ongoing development to be assessed before further development. • Houses are not selling. <p><i>[Refer also to related comments regarding quality of life/rural feel/infrastructure points.]</i></p>
<p>002 Bonfante, 065 Sparkes, 148 Graver, 213 Makins, 216 Proddrow, 254 Mauler, 256 Manning, 261 Scutt</p>	<p>Oversupply of housing. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queries whether housing at Jennett’s Park and Woodhurst Park is sold/occupied. • Other housing in northern parishes is more than capable of meeting the expansion needs of Syngenta • What is the need for additional housing? • Should consider unoccupied homes, including new build homes and second homes. • Land would be a large building site for years (gives Land at Warfield as example of developments slowing due to over-supply) – would cause blight.
<p>387 Freeman</p>	<p>House prices will fall in Warfield as there will be no demand. Properties in Bracknell Forest with land may be much less desirable and rural house prices may fall given decline in numbers of horse owners.</p>
<p>244 Gates, 301 Greenwood, 314 Chambers, 325 Bainborough, 367 Sheikh, 385 CruzRimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston, 988 Bonfante</p>	<p>Alternative site options, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around 65% of the Borough is not Green Belt land - ample alternative sites which are better served by transport links. • SHELAA identifies many sites that would have much, much less impact on our green areas.
<p>021 Leach, 119 Vassor, 154 Willatts, 402 Glover, 581 Taverner, 649 Clark, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 767 Young, 831 Phillips, 840 Ratcliffe, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen, 927 Fitzell, 928 Blakemore,</p>	<p>Too much development on the site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why build over vast area. • 4,000 homes is unrealistic. • Nature and scale of proposals are overbearing. • 4,000 homes is a small townful. • Why are the council using the land owner’s figures and not applying the housing density recommended in the Housing Background Paper – would result in 3,505 homes rather than 4000. • Too many homes being crammed in - small gardens; unattractive; less light in homes; privacy compromised; car parking unworkable causing tensions. Woodhurst Park given as example. • Only around 25% of the site to remain as green space. • Effectively creating an extended city of Bracknell by stealth. • Site does not fit with paragraph 6.28 in terms of suitable housing densities. • Densities do not accord with the rural nature of the area.
<p>831 Phillips</p>	<p>Housing delivery of only 80-100 homes per year is a mere trickle. Long term impact on access roads. Insufficient to ensure infrastructure will be delivered alongside.</p>

130 Hawkes	Housing incompatible with Science Park. The conflation of proposals for a science park with a planning application for a large housing estate is incongruous. Estate agents rarely feature views over chemistry labs, boiler houses and waste disposal facilities.
831 Phillips	Approval of this site will inevitably lead to even more demand for housing as the population base increases.
841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	If it is to go ahead, some sheltered housing should be provided for those with special needs plus housing for older people so that occupants can use of the Landshare for health and wellbeing without the need to travel
021 Leach	Whilst they are space-saving, 3 storey family homes inappropriate – unattractive and not safe for families (too many stairs; can't watch young children).
253 Jerome	Housing should be for Bracknell people only.
441 Lawrence	I have an uncomfortable sense that Syngenta will retain some control over the management or maintenance of the housing on its land. If there is any such tenure, this will be an indication that BFC is abrogating its responsibility towards its citizens, who will be governed by Syngenta, not BFC.

322 Bonfante, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges	No need for housing for employees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that current employees live in the same Borough, and there is no evidence current employees would wish to live and work at the same place. Site is easily commutable from Bracknell and Maidenhead. Employees will likely continue to commute from countryside. Too remote for young scientists Syngenta hope to attract
794 Jones	Younger generations are developer's target market, yet can't think of anything worse than being in a crammed, congested, polluted, built-up housing estate. Would not be a good place to raise a family.
Affordable housing	
208 Earl, 401 Donaldson, 525 Seville, 788 Blackburn,	Support provision of affordable homes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes will benefit the Bracknell area. Many professionals struggling to get onto the property ladder; being able to do so in a stunning location with facilities and employment in walking distance is remarkable.
022 Hunter	Sceptical of the proposed affordable housing provision – unlikely to be achieved (example – Woodhurst).
113 Monks	The site is not in a sensible location for affordable housing provision given the lack of good public transport links and lack of a range of employment opportunities in the vicinity.
267 Smith	Even if a smaller scale development is allowed on site the emphasis should be on starter homes, not vaguer affordable homes, and these should be erected first to avoid back sliding by developers. This would help meet government pledges and there is a great call for this in this area; for young people opposed to large homes for people from outside the area.
053 MacDondald	Far too many 'help to buy' homes proposed.
402 Glover	What is the definition of 'affordable home'? Are the remaining 3000 'unaffordable'?
470 Warner, 794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 934 Kedwards,	Concerns over affordability of affordable homes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many new houses in Bracknell/Wokingham, none or very few are 'affordable' to the majority of our youngsters. Have not seen any of the newbuild properties that my child could afford to purchase on a young adult's wage – affordable housing is over promoted. With a x9 differential between average house price/average wage, the affordable homes will open up opportunities for housing associations and private buy to let. 1400 affordable homes probably mean very little for existing local residents wanting to buy at a discount, and is patronising to younger generations who still cannot afford it (Cabbage Hill an example). 35% affordable housing is being used to sweeten the deal – a great strap line. Shouldn't be advertised as 'affordable'.
942 Barron	Other identified sites would provide more affordable homes.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	

<p>047 Holland, 097 Hughes, 208 Earl, 290 Miller, 401 Donaldson, 525 Seville, 577 Mullier, 831 Phillips,</p>	<p>Support proposals for business expansion/Science Park, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals would support UK government’s industrial strategy and clean growth agenda. • Bracknell Forest cannot afford to lose Syngenta – see project example in Leeds. • Council needs to consider how to encourage other companies on board. • Syngenta’s work is nationally and internationally important for the production of food and agricultural innovation, the technical functions of the site are unique within Syngenta and UK; and are critical to the success of business. • Approaching its 100th year in existence, the facilities, buildings and infrastructure should be brought to a standard matching world-class expertise and abilities of the workforce. This will require significant investment; Syngenta will make such an investment if plans are successful. • The link between the diversity of personnel and high productivity in innovation is clear; in order to sustain this and bring in new talent investment is required to compete in an ever more competitive global market for talent. • Evidence exists that innovation happens more quickly and more dramatically at the interfaces between disciplines and between organisations. Creating a location in the area which deliberately generates such interfaces will result in an innovation ecosystem that will create substantial business value, new highly skilled and well paid jobs, and enhance the reputation of Bracknell as a centre for innovation and investment. • Unique opportunity offered by proposals for scientific advancements, increased professional connectivity and a world-class scientific centre. • Excited by the prospect of having a Science and Innovation Park with global connections locally. The potential to attract professionals with a wide range of scientific disciplines would be a huge benefit to the local area. • Increased connection to academia to support companies. • Educational opportunities for residents. • Further opportunity to train and recruit scientists at the site. • Working at Syngenta carries numerous benefits for current, and future employees. • Increase in jobs, high quality/skilled jobs (up to 2,000).
<p>798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 811 Bridges, 812 Bridges, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Contravenes Local Plan policies for Employment Areas, paras 4.16-4.18.</p>
<p>769 Cole</p>	<p>Other areas of Bracknell Forest can meet employment need (e.g. TRRL in Crowthorne & industrial areas of Bracknell Town); development is not necessary.</p>
<p>794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones,</p>	<p>BFC have actively encouraged conversion of commercial space to residential; yet is now changing its tune 180 degrees to support this development; at odds with its behaviour to date. Where is BFC’s long term strategy on commercial development?</p>

002 Bonfante & 322 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 057 Maidens Green Society, 062 Smith, 064 Sparkes, 067 Fernandez, 072 Robinson, 081 Keys, 085 Cope, 088 Jones, 095 Young, 120 Sparkes, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 127 Duncan, 128 Norton, 130 Hawkes, 139 Fitzwilliams, 140 Tillette de Clermont-Tonnerre, 146 Bell, 148 Graver, 162 Midson, 165 Gooder, 167 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 172 Ramsdale, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 177 Gates, 178 Stok, 189 Auster, 190 Elmes, 191 CPRE, 193 Sauven, 198 Fall, 201 Deplogde, 215 Fall, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 228 Manoukian, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 239 Hoare, 244 Gates, 250 Barnett, 254 Mauler, 257 Rodgers, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 261 Scutt, 265 Mackenzie, 267 Smith, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 287 White, 291/294 Thorin, 301 Greenwood, 303 May, 314 Chambers, 315 King, 323 Lumley, 324 Hooker, 331 Lumley, 349 Hirst, 367 Sheikh, 375 Stock & Stock, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 380 Barlow, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 393 Kedward, 400 Mulroy, 402 Glover, 408 Robertson, 436 Ketley, 440 Prendergast, 441 Lawrence, 465 Warfield Environmental Group, 485 and 486 S Collings, 508 Cager, 582 Bell, 585 Martin, 636 A & B Brant, 633 Bridges, 608 M Collings, 418 Murphy, 441 Lawrence, 446 Brant, 637 Nixon, 638 De Roy, 650 Sparkes, 652 Hosken, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 767 Young, 768 Seaman, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 799 Saadetian, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 807 Jones, 808 Manoukian, 809 Jones, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 816 Gurney, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 831 Phillips, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 839 Griffiths, 840 Ratcliffe, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 876 Blakemore, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 923 de Roy, 925 Cope, 927 Fitzell, 928 Blakemore, 934 Kedwards, 937 Silverston, 988 Bonfante

Lack of evidence to justify exceptional circumstances relating to economic matters, including:

- Comments relating to Syngenta's finances/ability to self-fund development:
 - Syngenta is a highly profitable global company - able to fund their own research and plans to adapt/expand without selling land/enabling development.
 - Syngenta is not a charitable foundation; NGO; nor is it a local Warfield enterprise that requires the effort and understanding of local residents for its survival. Far from it.
 - ChemChina (Chinese government owned Agri Tech group) acquired Syngenta in June 2017 for US\$43Bn therefore the survival of the research site cannot possibly depend on investments funded by this proposed development.
 - Syngenta made over \$1Bn within EMEA (2018 report) and £3.9Bn globally.
 - Review of Syngenta's most recent financial filings indicate an uncertain financial future and a declining operating income.
 - Development appears to be commercially driven to suit investment requirements of multi-national company.
 - Proposal is a money-making exercise for Syngenta/why does a company of such value need financial support? Syngenta want to fund their new science park and make vast profits in the process.
 - Syngenta are applying for an Initial Public Offering within the next two years which no doubt Jealott's Hill will form part of their assets which will increase dramatically in value, enhancing their share price if planning is granted.
 - If development of the site is so essential to sustain the site, what will happen in the next eight years before housing development starts?
- Comments relating to the economic significance of Syngenta to Bracknell Forest borough:
 - No specific reference from BFC that the 'national or international significance' of Syngenta's site is specifically financially important to Bracknell Forest output.
 - The c.800 jobs at Syngenta Jealott's Hill represent only c.1% of the total jobs in BFC. This is in no way significant enough to 'warrant exceptional circumstances'. BFC benefits from very low unemployment at 2.5%. This is c.1/3rd less than the national average. There is no general economic need to justify the proposal.
 - *[Reference should also be made to comments below regarding employment.]*
- Comments relating to the exceptional circumstances/the business case:
 - Insufficient information provided to validate that enabling development of 400 houses is required to expand its business; or that Syngenta needs a financial boost.
 - How much do Syngenta need to invest in the site to make it sustainable or what time period this will need to cover?
 - Where is the business plan and company accounts that clearly indicate the 'enabling development' is required?
 - Any requirement for built facilities to meet Syngenta's needs is not a valid justification for major private company generating funds through inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
 - Maximising financial return does not provide exceptional circumstances.
 - Research proposals are not exceptional.
- Comments relating to the potential for the business to leave the site:
 - Syngenta have no intention to provide the research centre.
 - Question the validity of the Council having the power to 'secure the future' of this business.
 - Business could leave at any time regardless of housing/expansion, taking the land sale profits with them.
 - Companies will operate where it is economically viable to trade for their business. They will not stay long term based on an argument developing land will support the economic viability of their business. These are entirely different decisions.
 - Questionable as to the time frame that ChemChina will retain ownership. The site has had three or more owners since acquired by ICI in 1927. If Chemchina were to sell it on as a result of planning permission being withheld it is likely that another organisation will acquire it and life will still continue.
- Comments regarding the profits from development:
 - None of the money raised through proposals will remain in England/it will go to China. How is the development therefore really beneficial to the local community or the UK as a whole?
 - Syngenta is a wholly owned subsidiary of Chemchina which is itself wholly owned and directed by the Peoples Republic of China. There are a number of Syngenta sites within the UK and all are currently under pressure to repatriate cash to China in order to pay off the original purchase price. The agricultural land which came with the Jealott's Hill site is peripheral to the modern scientific plant research and is therefore a prime asset to be offloaded at its maximum value.

- Comments regarding other potential funding sources:
 - Since this operation is so important, it should be funded by Central Government, if insufficient funding is available from agriculture/related industries.
 - If there is a public interest in assisting this company with its finances it is surely the responsibility of Central Government, who will need to have regard to the law relating to subsidies to companies.
- Broader comments relating to Syngenta and its operations:
 - The business' past decisions have purely been made based on profitability.
 - Contrary to claims, field trials have not taken place at the site during the past 16 years.
 - The original British owner of the site, ICI, successfully improved their experimental facilities without sacrificing Green Belt land and maintained a good relationship with their neighbours.
 - **This site is already Syngenta's largest globally**, and already houses a number of centres of scientific excellence.
 - Syngenta and the companies within its group have 100 sites worldwide – reducing the importance of this site.
 - Maybe Syngenta will move into property development following land value increase?
 - Where are the commitments for direct job creation by Syngenta or indeed job retention?
 - If Syngenta was of such renown wouldn't schools/businesses visit it/promote it to their students?
 - Syngenta already have outreach programs with schools.
 - Syngenta already actively work with the community through Landshare and charities.
- Comments relating to the planning process and Local Plan wording relevant to this topic:
 - Object/strongly object to prejudicial para 6.48 'The future operation of the site is dependent on significant investment being made which will require enabling development to help fund it.'
 - Not appropriate to use public benefit (Green Belt) or public subsidy to fund enabling development.
 - Commercial and financial benefits should not influence planning decisions.
 - Significant risk of corruption exists at all levels within the Borough through external interests.
- Proposal is based on short term grounds.

	<p>Many respondents referred specifically that the Green Belt should not be released for financial reasons. <i>[Refence should also be made to the associated comment relating to exceptional circumstances under Green Belt below.]</i></p>
<p>244 Gates, 301 Greenwood, 228 Manoukian, 367 Sheikh, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 388 Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 484 S Collings, 582 Bell, 633 Bridges, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Syngenta AG's CEO commented on the 22nd Oct 2019 to Bloomberg that the company is preparing for an IPO (Initial Public Offering) (stock market listing) and expects this to be within the next 2.5 years. Expected to raise many billions of \$ (source: Bloomsberg 15th August 2019).</p>
<p>022 Hunter, 068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 122 Cox, 148 Graver, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 192 Parkinson, 193 Sauven, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 198 Fall, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 288 Thorin, 323 Lumley, 331 Lumley, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 484 S Collings, 633 Bridges, 608 M Collings, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen, 942 Barron</p>	<p>What guarantees are there that Syngenta will maintain a presence on the site? Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to dispose of site to Taylor Wimpey and leave the area with massive profit. • Likely to move from site given planned merger between ChemChina and SinoChem which often result in stripping of assets. • Syngenta office in Switzerland has already been stripped out and sold. • Likely to sell site given need to reduce burden of purchase of Syngenta. <p>What will happen if Syngenta withdraw from the site? Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans from the Council if Syngenta withdraw from the site/no demonstration of alternatives. • Would housing be allowed on vacant employment areas if Syngenta leaves? Risk of becoming dormitory village. • Would other employers remain if Syngenta leaves? • Would housing be allowed on vacant employment areas? • May become a remote dormitory village with few local employment opportunities.
<p>021 Leach, 064 Sparkes, 085 Cope, 130 Hawkes, 323 Lumley, 331 Lumley, 484 S Collings, 767 Young, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope,</p>	<p>Expansion of existing business/development of Science Park, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence provided to suggest a Science Park is needed to encourage other companies to locate there; or for these companies, schools and universities to collaborate more effectively with Syngenta. • No evidence that other companies want to relocate to this site. Evidence needs to be provided that other companies have expressed an interest in moving to an expanded research site. • No evidence provided that a Science Park couldn't be achieved using existing office space in the borough. • With improved communications, there is less need for a close physical relationship to ensure collaborative working with companies involved in associated technologies. • Question why, if Syngenta's business is dependent on the development of a 'science park' to support a key part of their business - synergising their various technologies and expertise with start-ups, university spin offs etc - they haven't already invited such companies and universities to share their site in investment and in the application? They may have done, but surely this should be made apparent, if so, to make a better case for an organically growing global centre? • No indicators of what research Syngenta want to extend into. • What evidence supports the requirement for 1.32million sqm of additional commercial space so soon after the new £8million science block was opened? • May not prove to be an attractive and sustainable site for companies to operate from. • Syngenta will not be able to rely on 'specialist' local businesses, as given the site is in the Green Belt there are no businesses.

<p>124 Kingston, 127 Duncan, 148 Graver, 151 Kingston, 187 Collinson, 633 Bridges, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 265 Mackenzie, 276 Street & Street, 291 Thorin, , 315 King, 323 Lumley, 331 Lumley, 388 Taylor, 436 Ketley, 441 Lawrence, 585 Martin, 633 Bridges, 684 Sprakes, 748 British Horse Society, 767 Young, 794 Jones, 796 Bartlett, 806 Mcalister, 807 Jones, 808 Manoukian, 809 Jones, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 839 Griffiths, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 927 Fitzell, 928 Blakemore, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Employment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for the jobs claiming to be created: ○ The c.800 jobs at Syngenta Jealott's Hill is c.1% of total jobs in BFC – neither significant nor exceptional. Many employees will be from outside of BF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal is not required as unemployment in the Borough is c. 2.5%, well below national average. Many unfilled jobs locally. • Potential loss of employment should the development not go ahead: ○ Barely veiled threat to remove the employment should planning permission not be given. ○ What threat is envisaged to jobs at Syngenta if the Council does not agree to the proposed development at this site? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Realise that jobs may be put at risk if this does not go ahead, but the scale of this development far outweighs the benefits. • Benefit of employment to Bracknell Forest borough: ○ No assessment by the Council of the number/type of jobs created as a direct result; if they will be filled by people LIVING on the development; nor assessment of genuine wealth creation within the Borough (including comments to establish an offset benefit against damage to the Green Belt). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No guarantee that income from employment will remain in the borough or that employees will live on site. ○ Not clear how many jobs will actually benefit BFC residents. • Employment by Syngenta: ○ No commitment from Syngenta to create or retain jobs. ○ Not clear how many jobs will be retained by Syngenta given the area they occupy is to reduce. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job proposals are irrelevant as no company can guarantee future/current jobs. • Specialist nature of employment / location of employees: ○ Significant proportion of employees travel long distances to the site from outside the area - will increase with more jobs. ○ Specialist employees needed therefore likely to employ from outside the area and commute long distances to work. ○ Not clear if the skills needed by Syngenta exist in BF or need to be attracted to the borough by the housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Likely that a significant proportion of the circa 5,000 economically active residents will not be employed on site and will still commute out. Nothing to make them work on site. Others will commute in. ○ The remote location will not attract young scientists. • Other employment for residents of the development: ○ Proposal will create 900 jobs yet expand the population by 12,000. Will there really be work for all these people? Where are they coming from? ○ Where will people find work, i.e. doctors, nurses and dentists? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Employment will only be needed to satisfy the incoming population. • No guarantee that new jobs will be created immediately after the first phase of development complete. • New development will suffer brain drain and competitive pressure from larger employment market in Bracknell Town. • Failure to consider loss of employment opportunities provided by rural activities such as equestrian uses (tack shops, farriers, equine dentists/physiotherapists etc).
<p>767 Young</p>	<p>This proposed development does nothing to support the continued regeneration of Bracknell and may indeed be a threat to it in that it does little to address the vacant office space issue today and may act as a counter attraction and brain drain in the future.</p>
<p>128 Norton</p>	<p>Syngenta, now a Chinese state-owned company, no doubt has a high level of security/privacy. If the plan is agreed, will there be an opportunity to see what kind of work is being carried out there?</p>
<p>128 Norton, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 807 Jones, 809 Jones</p>	<p>Issues relating to increase in land value/windfall profit, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who owns the land? • Is the legal entity who owns the land and will see vast increase in land value based in UK? Will they pay appropriate tax on the profit? • Given the sacrifice of Green Belt will the Council ensure Syngenta do spend the considerable uplift in the value of the Jealott's Hill estate on improving the scientific facilities? • By changing the status of this land from Green Belt to industrial and housing development, BFC could be seen to contravene the EU subsidies policies by ensuring this company which owns all the proposed land is given a windfall profit of over £500,000,000.
<p>273 Waddington & Waddington</p>	<p>What was the £60million disposal in Syngenta UK Ltd's accounts?</p>

684 Sparkes, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Many horse livery yards and businesses will be dramatically affected. Riders choose to keep their horses here for off road routes. Calculated the number of horses stabled in the area surrounding Jealott's Hill, which use the network of bridleways and off road routes and it is nearly 300 horses (map provided). The British Horse Society (BHS) estimate the cost of keeping one horse was £4,300-£6,100 per annum on a DIY basis. However, a significant number of local horses are kept on part or full livery which costs £7,500-£9,000 pa. If we use the average cost of keeping the horse this is potentially a loss of revenue for the area of plus £1,905,000 per annum. There are also two tack shop/feed merchants, a large veterinary practice and numerous farriers and other associated businesses located here which rely on the horse population in the area.
INFRASTRUCTURE	
Services, facilities	
525 Seville	The proposed new schools, commercial buildings, accommodation, and sports and leisure facilities will be tangible benefits for the Bracknell area.
401 Donaldson	Great opportunity to emphasise STEM subjects to children and young adults in such a community.
841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Contravenes LP12 Infrastructure.
841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Contravenes LP14 Standards for open space of public value (refers to Table 4, point B4).
841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Viability assessment needs to be undertaken before any conclusion is reached regarding sustainability.
045 Holmes, 046 Gale, 055 Calcutt, 062 Smith, 063 Silvester, 087 Beardsmore-Gray, 108 Fernandez, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 119 Vassor, 147 Bowen, 158 Luck, 164 Midson, 166 Grace, 188 Ehinger, 216 Proddow, 221 Sinclair, 267 Smith, 322 Bonfante, 348 Sauven, 378 Prior & Craig, 388 Taylor, 400 Mulroy, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 484 S Collings, 469 Bottwood, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 650 Sparkes, 799 Saadetian, 836 Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 927 Fitzell, 934 Kedwards	<p>Already too much pressure on/will put more pressure on infrastructure and services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare (including hospitals, dentists and GPs – no plans for increasing provision – potential to endanger lives). • Schools. • Proposed secondary school unlikely to be used initially, causing further reliance on existing schools and further congestion. • Existing retail – not enough retail to support this type of development. • Water resources.
332 Dimpleby, 836 Ehinger, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Utilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding water supply, water pressure, drainage/sewage and electric supplies. • No assessment of wastewater. • Area is at serious water stress – therefore not a good idea to build 4000 dwellings above those that are genuinely needed. • Where will the water supply for a development of this scale come from? • Upgrading sewage, installing water etc may destroy ancient hedgerows.
120 Sparkes, .0177 Gates, 212 Gates, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Over supply of education facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear why the proposed retail/community hub and secondary school are required given the existing Tesco site and new secondary school (Kings Academy). • Provision of three primary schools and a secondary school is unjustified. • 1,200 homes will yield approx. 420 primary aged children. As the average size of a primary school is 282 pupils 2 primary schools will be needed this plan period. <p>Approximately 300 secondary aged children will live in the 1,200 homes. As the secondary school will not be built during this plan period, there will be many cars travelling to existing secondary schools (such as Kings Academy). SEN provision will also be needed (approx. 120 pupils). Has Kings capacity to accommodate them?</p>
498 S Collings, 615 M Collings, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Phasing of infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% of the homes proposed within the plan period (to 2036), with provision of one primary school suggests there will be no secondary school, local centre providing convenience retailing, healthcare facility, community hub or other community facilities within the plan period. Residents will need to travel elsewhere, on roads which are already congested. Not a sustainable development. • No information provided re timescales of infrastructure. • No community facilities are proposed during this plan period which is not sustainable and adds to car movements.

841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Proposed retail floorspace may have an adverse effect on the local centre at Moss End which must be left to continue to thrive.
441 Lawrence, 508 Cager, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges	The new facilities on site will serve the new residents of the 4000 houses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No benefit to existing community. Are being used as 'sweeteners', no added value as require for new residents.
142 Pilcher, 154 Willatts, 155 Vyret, 252 Britt, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	Support continuation or replacement of the Community Landshare, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing Landshare site does such excellent work for the community. Currently a showcase, highly successful, lauded. Relocation will disillusion volunteers. Various organisations use the site and must not be left without that support. Benefits people of many different ethnic backgrounds, varied knowledge and physical and mental abilities. A place of friendship, tranquillity, wide horizons. Mental and physical health benefit. Leave feeling positive and upbeat. Facilities include 6 acres, orchard, vineyard, polytunnel (good for bad weather use). If re-sited, will result in a loss of a substantial mature 450 tree orchard believed to be one of the biggest in Berkshire. The orchard supports 77 varieties of flora. Orchards are mentioned as a priority feature in the Council's Biodiversity Action Plan (Woodland Objective).
231 Jealott's Hill Community Landshare	c. 1000 visitors per year to the site. Invite to visit the site. List of site community Landshare facilities provided to identify requirements if the site is relocated (including growing areas, other land areas, buildings, land boundary and security, and utilities).
469 Bottwood,	No commitment of financial support to the community from the company/Council to support the local people.
748 British Horse Society	Concerned about the potential loss of youth charities such as the local Pony Club given the decline in horse owners.
Transport	

002 Bonfante & 322 Bonfante, 025 Fernandes, 057 Maidens Green Society, 067 Fernandez, 068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 124 Kingston, 146 Bell, 151 Kingston, 158 Luck, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 200 Singleton, 201 Deplodge, 214 Symes, 221 Sinclair, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 269 Westbury, 275 Painter, 296 Payne, 303 May, 315 King, 328 Manning, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 387 Freeman, 388 W Taylor, 417 Murphy, 441 Lawrence, 461 Knox-Johnston, 462 Richmond, 463 Harris, 484 S Collings, 561 McArthur, 608 M Collings, 620 S Peacey, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 816 Gurney, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 831 Phillips, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 840 Ratcliffe, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 876 Blakemore, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 928 Blakemore, 942 Barron	Unsustainable location for development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contravenes LP13 Transport principles. Site does not fit with paragraph 6.28 - site is remote from the main transport hubs. Proposed development would be unsustainable, isolated, remote from existing populated areas. Mid-way between Bracknell and Maidenhead, in the middle of open countryside. Site only accessible by car / infrequent buses/ heavily reliant on car-based transport. Long distance to railway stations/main transport hubs (nearest train stations are at Bracknell, 3 miles away; and Maidenhead, 6 miles away). Poor rail links into London will lead to new residents driving to get anywhere. Poorly located to many services and facilities. No walkable amenities. The site is served by the A3095 and A330, both of which are country roads without pavements and hostile to cyclists and pedestrians. Lack of public transport links. Syngenta and BFC need to recognise the enormous investments required to provide regular bus services and cycle paths to connect site to surrounding major settlements. Whilst encouraging eco-friendly modes of transport and travel is admirable, this is not the reality for commuting, school runs and general travel for the majority of people. BFC agrees that it may be impossible to provide sustainable alternatives to cars use for foreseeable future. How can this be considered a sustainable development to justify loss of Green Belt when there are no joined up infrastructure plans between BFC and adjoining boroughs?
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resultant impact to air quality, climate change and environmental impact.
132 Beck, 149 Elmes, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Impact to rail infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A portion of new residents will want to access the high-speed train line (road traffic impact). Parking provision at closest railways stations is poor e.g. Martin's Heron, Bracknell and Maidenhead (Stafferton Way – already full).
387 Freeman, 925 Fitzell	<p>Parking in Bracknell town centre will struggle to cope with additional demand.</p>
205 Singleton, 253 Jerome, 558 Sherrington, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Comments relating to transport by bus, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As well as improved bus services into Bracknell and Maidenhead, a bus service should be provided direct to Brants Bridge and Heatherwood medical facilities. None currently exists. Buses need to link the site to the town centre and supermarket. Services need to be more frequent. A Bracknell day ticket only extends as far north as the Plough and Harrow – will this be extended to Jealott's Hill? Improvements could be CIL funded.

001 Moore, 002 Bonfante & 322 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 022 Hunter, 024 Scott, 025 Fernandes, 030 Holyport Residents Association, 036 Gibson, 039 Ruddle, 045 Holmes, 046 Gale, 047 Holland, 053 MacDonald, 057 Maidens Green Society, 062 Smith, 063 Silvester, 065 Sparkes, 067 Fernandez, 069 Gay, 070 Richards, 071 Nicholls, 073 Stroud, 079 Richards, 081 Keys, 085 Cope, 087 Beardsmore-Gray, 088 Jones, 094 Barlow, 096 Hartley, 101 Bowler, 108 Fernandez, 109 Hayden Kellard, 112 Mitchell, 113 Monks, 119 Vassor, 120 Sparkes, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 123 Collins, 124 Kingston, 128 Norton, 131 Hazell, 133 Clarkson, 137 Jones, 139 Fitzwilliams, 146 Bell, 147 Bowen, 148 Graver, 149 Elmes, 127 Duncan, 151 Kingston, 154 Willatts, 165 Gooder, 166 Grace, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 170 Grace, 172 Ramsdale, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 177 Gates, 178 Stok, 187 Collinson, 188 Ehinger, 189 Auster, 190 Elmes, 191 CPRE, 193 Sauven, 196 Mead, 198 Fall, 210 Woodbridge, 212 Gates, 213 Makins, 214 Symes, 215 Fall, 216 Proddow, 225 Royall, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 235 Bickley, 236 Bright, 237 Dunn, 251 Kennelly, 253 Jerome, 254 Mauler, 257 Rodgers, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 260 Sharpe, 261 Scutt, 265 Mackenzie, 267 Smith, 269 Westbury, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 282 Gunn, 287 White, 290 Miller, 296 Payne, 300 Redman, 303 May, 305 Shrimpton, 307 Brunander, 310 Osada, 323 Lumley, 324 Hooker, 331 Lumley, 332 Dimpleby, 348 Sauven, 349 Hirst, 356 Stearn, 364 Griffiths, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 375 Stock & Stock, 378 Prior & Craig, 380 Barlow, 382 Carter, 387 Freeman, 388 Taylor, 391 MacKenzie, 393 Kedward, 400 Mulroy, 402 Glover, 403 Browne, 404 Hurtado, 441 Lawrence, 442 Yates, 446 Brant, 461 KnoxJohnston, 462 Richmond, 463 Harris, 465 and 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 469 Bottwood, 484 S Collings, 508 Cager, 558 Sherrington, 561 McArthur, 581 Taverner,

Impact upon road infrastructure within the borough, including:

- Roads are already heavily congested/gridlocked and unable to cope with additional movement:
 - Traffic infrastructure in north of Bracknell Forest borough is a major issue – very poorly served with no high quality, high capacity transport routes.
 - New roads for Warfield development are already struggling suggesting Jealott's Hill's situation will be no better.
 - Recent developments have increased congestion over last few years (including Cabbage Hill, Binfield, Legoland).
 - Cumulative impact of recent/unimplemented developments. No significant upgrades have occurred despite the level of development.
 - Level of traffic is generally dangerous.
- Changes to the road infrastructure:
 - Limited ability to upgrade existing roads, an 'upgrade' will not be enough.
 - Significant investment in infrastructure needed.
 - No plans from Syngenta to expand the road system/make substantial improvements.
 - If it goes ahead, surrounding roads and junctions are suitably improved prior to development commencing.
- Impact to residents and environment as a result of increased traffic and changes to road infrastructure:
 - quality of life
 - air quality/pollution
 - noise and vibration
 - social impact
 - urbanisation of rural roads/loss of countryside
 - required improvements to roads/junctions will have impact on rural character, on surrounding properties and settings (e.g. Grade II Cruchfield Manor).
- Issues specific to rural roads:
 - Country lanes/B roads are not arterial, some are unlit, windy, tree lined and lack footpaths.
 - Minor roads are being used as rat runs - will increase - notable damage to verges, road surface integrity and substrate compaction (e.g. Bottle Lane, Ryehurst Lane – as Three Legged Cross junction is already at capacity and Warfield development is not yet fully occupied; road around Warfield Church and Frost-Folly).
 - Rural lanes would need upgrading with at least wider roads and pavement – feasible?
 - Roads will lose their rural nature.
- Increase in traffic:
 - Traffic and vehicle movements will inevitably increase - insufficient evidence that existing workers at Syngenta will want to relocate from their existing houses to the proposed "garden settlement". Unlikely that research scientists will wish to live in "affordable housing".
 - It is unlikely that Syngenta would support employment for a further 4,000 homes so residents will need to travel to work. Reports indicate only 10% of the employment would be served by people residing in this village.
 - Report states by 2049 there will be 4,614 residents in employment. If 10% of those work at Syngenta that is only 461 employees locally sourced. Does not corroborate the claims (in externally commissioned reports) about internalizing the movements.
 - BFC estimate only 20% of site residents would work on site – so 80% will commute.
 - Inconceivable theory that the 10-12,000 people living here will mainly spend their lives on site. Neither the plan nor the Infrastructure Delivery Plan demonstrate that a large number of journeys will be self-contained. Commuting to/from the site is inevitable.
 - Increased traffic will negate any benefit from Crossrail.
 - Increased reliance on home deliveries will also increase traffic.
- Traffic impact assessment/survey needed – with input from residents.
- Support sustainable modes of travel however questions whether take up will be sufficient to make noticeable improvement
- Newell Road – the road and pavements needs widening, with traffic lights at each end.

Specific concerns regarding: A3095 Maidenhead Rd, A330 Ascot Road, Wellers Lane, Osborne Lane, Westhatch Lane, Bishops Lane, Malt Hill Road, Warfield Street, Kingscroft Lane, Cock Lane, Church Road, Binfield Road/Forest Road junction, Three Legged Cross junction, bridge in Binfield, North Street (Winkfield), A322, M4 J6 & 8/9, Forest Road, Ellison and Sopwith roads (narrow), Plough & Harrow lights, Spice Lounge Junction, Ellison Road, Sopwith Road, Newell Road.

586 Fazey-Gunn, 636 A & B Brant, 633
Bridges, 608 M Collings, 620 S Peacey, 637
Nixon, 638 De Roy, 651 Sabine, 684
Sparkes, 768 Seaman, 769 Cole, 788
Blackburn, 798 Bridges, 794 Jones, 796
Bartlett, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 807
Jones, 808 Manoukian, 809 Jones, 810
Plumb, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 816
Gurney, 820 Browne, 821 Browne, 828
Strange, 829 Mcalister, 831 Phillips, 832
Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 836 Ehinger, 838
Belle, 839 Griffiths, 841 Wallen, 869
Doughty, 870 Bridges, 871 Elford, 874
Boorman, 876 Blakemore, 884 Manoukian,
902 Wallen, 925 Cope, 927 Fitzell, 928
Blakemore, 933 Glen, 934 Kedwards, 936
Lloyd, 942 Barron, 962 Stunt, 964 Turner

<p>030 Holyport Residents Association, 036 Gibson, 045 Holmes, 090 Halfacre, 092 Pearson, 096 Hartley, 101 Bowler, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 113 Monks, 132 Beck, 147 Bowen, 166 Grace, 167 Kingston, 170 Grace, 174 Kingston, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 191 CPRE, 193 Sauven, 198 Fall, 236 Bright, 237 Dunn, 260 Sharpe, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 282 Gunn, 287 White, 290 Miller, 322 Bonfante, 324 Hooker, 346 Proddow, 367 Sheikh, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 404 Hurtado, 484 S Collings, 558 Sherrington, 560 Turner, 561 McArthur, 636 A & B Brant, 637 Nixon, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 815 Barlow, 841 Wallen, 871 Elford, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope, 934 Kedwards, 964 Turner</p>	<p>Impact upon road infrastructure outside of the borough which needs to be taken into account, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unacceptable impact (congestion, pollution, noise, inconvenience) on roads and unacceptable disruption to residents outside of Bracknell Forest. • Extra traffic will also be generated by Crossrail/Elizabeth Line and RBWM's own Local Plan. • Infrastructure is already overloaded. • No road improvements noted to the north of the site. • Associated pollution. • RBWM Local Plan does not address the issue of additional traffic from this site. • Improvements required outside of borough – BFC have no responsibility but intend to impact traffic. • If further development on the Maidenhead side of Bracknell occurs a separate vehicle movement plan is required to determine the impacts on the wider areas or a Holyport bypass is required. • Have any discussions relating to the management of additional traffic been made? • Impact of ongoing development at Woodhurst and other allocations in Bracknell Forest and allocations in neighbouring Boroughs and in particular the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM), and Wokingham Borough Council. <p>Specific issues raised which need to be taken into account include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A330 Ascot Road in Holyport is gridlocked in rush hour (Braywick roundabout to Holyport Green) – some suggest bypass should be built to resolve this. • Holyport is already an AQMA. • A330 Ascot Road extremely narrow road by BUPA Nursing Home side wall/Real Tennis Club (two large vehicles cannot pass). • A404/M4. • RBWM will need to make a commitment to getting the A330 at Holyport/Braywick roundabout substantially changed to allow easier access to M4/M40, Maidenhead (Cross Rail). • BFC should arrange an additional motorway junction (junction 9) with feeder roads. Route proposed via enclosed map with (response 030) (route is from Jealott's Hill site northwest to the M4, continuing to Waltham St Lawrence). Proposed development is unacceptable without this. • Not aware of plans for relief road to take traffic from this area to join M4 between J8/9 to ameliorate traffic congestion. If were cost would probably fall on local community reducing opportunities for better use of funds. • Increased traffic levels through the area following the "Smart" improvements to the M4. • Existing levels of congestion on the A3095 to the west.
<p>962 Stunt</p>	<p>Concerns over the traffic modelling/assessment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ATC has been placed only Bottle Land and Ryehurst Lane in last five years, yet traffic flow has almost tripled. • BFC's model is based on data dating back to 2007 – not fit for purpose. Some recent data was used and discussed within the recent Tilehurst Lane Inquiry but do not consider the model robust evidence in this instance. • Model is high level and centred on Bracknell Town Centre. Binfield is too remote for accurate forecast. Syngenta is even further from the centroid of the model so it is completely inadequate. • Does not comply with LP51 Assessing transport impacts and requirements (transport assessment must be done before adoption of the plan).

<p>021 Leach, 024 Scott, 039 Ruddle, 047 Holland, 068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 085 Cope, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 290 Miller, 375 Stock & Stock, 684 Sprakes, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 841 Waleen, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope, 942 Barron, 962 Stunt</p>	<p>There is inadequate detail of the proposed strategic improvement to the road network and junction improvements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only improvements to limited junctions indicated on plan. • The proposed junction changes are unworkable. • Further information needed. BFC need to explain measures to population concerned at an early stage rather than appearing non-committal. • Request for a plan showing the proposed highways infrastructure improvement works to be able to provide an informed response to the consultation. Policies refer to improvement works, but there is no plan of sufficient detail. • One small stretch of road upgrade on A3095 – totally inadequate. • BFC have admitted that it has no plans as to how to manage the additional traffic. • Do not understand how roads can be improved if landowners do not relinquish land for road widening. Also loss of ditches and hedges that support wildlife.
<p>290 Miller, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Propose the following upgrades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade the whole of the Maidenhead Road as far as Warfield Street. • Traffic calming and restricting measures on roads likely to receive increased traffic. • Upgrade the Ascot Road/Malt Hill junction. • Upgrade the Cock Lane/Winkfield Road/Bracknell Road/Maidens Green junction. • Consider upgrades to the current traffic light junctions on Warfield Street. <p>Alternative proposal: Council should consider closing some of the roads partially or in full to vehicles and making them quiet rural roads to support biodiversity, SANG and Green Belt. The lanes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bowyers Lane (access only for residents) • Wellers Lane (south of Frost Folly) • Osborne Lane (past The Cut river bridge) • Westhatch Lane (after Scotland's Farm entrance and up to junction with Wellers Lane)
<p>085 Cope, 096 Hartley, 112 Mitchell, 121 Cox, 124 Kingston, 149 Elmes, 166 Grace, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 187 Collinson, 188 Ehinger, 190 Elmes, 193 Sauven, 198 Fall, 260 Sharpe, 267 Smith, 287 White, 290 Miller, 356 Stearn, 462 Richmond, 633 Bridges, 637 Nixon, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 836 Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 925 Cope</p>	<p>Highway safety and accident concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous junctions and narrow lanes. • Proposals will increase the already high risk of accidents/fatalities for horse riders and cyclists. • Existing single track roads are in poor repair, which will worsen, become dangerous. • Many animals killed on the rural roads. <p>Locations noted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country lanes. • There has already been a very high numbers of accidents and fatalities in the locality (some specifically refer to fatalities on the A330 and nearby Drift Road). • Most fatalities are on the rural road network. • A3095 Maidenhead Rd (5 accidents in 5 years). • Accident blackspot at Maidens Green; A3095 and A330 junction at Hawthorn Hill. • Accident blackspot on A330, including double bends (including motorcyclist fatality; cars in ditches; cars frequently hit wing mirrors; many cars & lorries traverse the centre line of this road in both directions – often such incidents are not reported). • Accident black spot at junction of A330 and A3095. • Poor visibility at junctions (Ascot Road/Malt Hill; and Cock Lane/Winkfield Road/Bracknell Road/Maidens Green)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Malt Hill is an accident black spot.
096 Hartley, 132 Beck, 148 Graver, 928 Blakemore	<p>Construction traffic concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where will construction traffic be routed? How will it be enforced? Thousands of lorries driving through villages. 7.5 ton limit signs are already ignored. The impact to access roads (including Holyport) will be huge for many years to come. Will traffic be channelled to the Royal Berkshire Polo ground which is already making roads filthy/ruining the countryside.
119 Vassor	Surprised the Highways Agency can support another large development in the area.
Pedestrian infrastructure	
024 Scott, MacDonald 053, 119 Vassor, 124 Kingston, 149 Elmes, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 177 Gates, 190 Elmes, 193 Sauven, 212 Gates, 251 Kennelly, 400 Mulroy, 462 Richmond, 798 Bridges	<p>Concerns relating to road side pedestrians, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some routes already extremely dangerous for pedestrians before development due to lack of pavement/narrow roads, nature of road, lorries mounting pavements, speed limits, increase in traffic etc. – A3095, Osborne Lane, Westhatch Lane, Ascot Road. Increased traffic/changes to country lanes will reduce pedestrian safety. Some recommendations made for changes to highways given based on local experience (rep 053 Osborne Lane). Routes that are currently safe will become dangerous. Already unsafe to access footpaths from house as no pavement/houses right up to the road (Hawthorn Hill).
Cycling infrastructure	
025 Fernandes, 205 Singleton	<p>Provision of cycling infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sceptical of proposed provision of Bracknell – Jealott’s Hill dedicated cycle lanes. A safe cycling network would need to be implemented, connecting Jealott’s Hill with schools in the area (see city of Gronigen). This could be CIL-funded.
073 Stroud, 149 Elmes, 190 Elmes, 310 Osada, 356 Stearn, 748 British Horse Society	<p>Safety concerns relating to cyclists, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area is well used by cyclists. Increased road traffic would reduce safety for cyclists. Road surfaces in area are adequate/dangerous in places, especially for cyclists; increased traffic will worsen the situation. Cyclists currently enjoy quiet green belt lanes – they will cease to be appropriate to use.

205 Singleton	New pedestrian/cycle link should be extended to Bracknell town centre, Maiden's Green, Legoland and National Cycle Route 4 (map and description of route provided). Could be CILfunded.
Bridleways and footpaths	
401 Donaldson	Welcome provision of a country park.
<p>139 Fitzwilliams, 149 Elmes, 164 Midson, 189 Auster, 213 Makins, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 260 Sharpe, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 304 Greenwood, 310 Osada, 356 Stearn, 388 Taylor, 442 Yates, 558 Sherrington, 650 Sparkes, 808 Manoukian, 832 Manoukian, 838 Belie, 841 Wallen, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Concerns over loss of/change to footpaths/off-road routes, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is well used by walkers, runners for leisure (physical and mental wellbeing). Current good network of bridleways, byways and footpaths. • Loss of beautiful Green Belt enjoyed for walking and observing wildlife. • There are 10 Public Rights of Way which run through or along the boundary of the site. 6 are Byways, 3 are Bridleways and one Footpath. They total 8 kms within the site area and create the most significant network of leisure routes within the Borough. They provide a vital off road rural infrastructure for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and carriage drivers which would be unsustainable in its current 'shared' rural character in the light of the proposed development. • Bracknell would lose a key element of its Best Place to Live objective. • There is nothing in the consultation documents to indicate how the legal requirement to retain the PROW routes will be applied. • Mental and physical benefits of access to open space. • Site is interspersed with footpaths and lanes that are publicly accessible already. • Jealott's Hill is a great place to work as you can go for a walk or run at lunchtime. • One of few Green Belt areas with safe and free places to ride a horse or walk a dog. • Loss of amenity would impact people as far as London. • New provision needs to be coordinated with neighbouring authorities. • Good to join site with Binfield, Warfield, Holyport etc.
<p>017 Rimmer, 065 Sparkes, 073 Stroud, 083 Jenkins, 121 Cox, 125 Mentzel, 149 Elmes, 225 Royall, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 304 Greenwood, 310 Osada, 356 Stearn, 387 Freeman, 442 Yates, 462 Richmond, 684 Sparkes, 748 British Horse Society, 798 Bridges, 838 Belie, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Concerns over loss/change to bridleways and safety for horses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area well used by horse riders and carriage riders. • Horse fatalities have already occurred in the area. • Clarity on plans for the retention and maintenance of bridleways in and surrounding site required – horse riders, cyclists and walkers appear to not be mentioned within plans. • Plan will result in loss of bridleways (and increase in traffic). • Existing safe off road riding network is limited (made worse by signs banning riding within the Cabbage Hill estate). • Existing routes must not be lost, particularly circular routes. Particularly as increased traffic caused by new housing and careless drivers have caused the roads to no longer be safe. • Loss of countryside/rural nature will affect use of Bridleways as will be in a housing estate (e.g. boxed in by fencing) not the countryside. • Imperative bridleways remain as they are – resurfacing would restrict equestrian use. • Recent housing development has resulted in loss of bridleways (and grazing land) – becoming few and far between. • Loss of bridleways very short sighted; will force horse riders onto already congested roads to reach destinations, increasing risk of accidents/fatalities for both riders and drivers. Some question whether BFC will take responsibility for the increase of injuries/deaths resulting from increased traffic. • Too hazardous to ride a horse here now. • Increased road traffic would reduce safety for horse riders. How will they access the off-road routes? • Road crossings will need upgrading for horses to enable safe passage. • Riders choose to keep their horses here to enjoy the off road riding. The British Horse Society (BHS) undertook a comprehensive survey of equestrian businesses and riders - 100% of equestrian owners and businesses agreed that without safe off road riding it was likely that horse owners will choose to keep their horses out of the area (refer to liked economic point).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciates the work of the Rights of Way Officer.
748 British Horse Society	<p>The proposed single short cycleway indicated on the concept plan would be woefully inadequate. Further consideration must be given to include a fully inclusive off road network of bridleways for all non-motorised users to enjoy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If SANGs policy is to be met 'new good quality recreational opportunities' should be provided, including new bridleways to ensure there is a 'cohesive network' is present, connecting existing bridleways. If this is not done cyclists and horse riders will be forced to continue using roads with further traffic given the congestion. • Proportion of bridleways to other forms of public right of way in Bracknell is just over half the national average which itself is insufficient. Any new public right of way thus must have bridleway status in order to include use by cyclists. • In placing a development in the middle of one of its more rural parishes, the council and the developers need to take this opportunity to ensure that Bridleways are included in the open spaces and around the SANGs if they cannot be placed through them. • In order to meet Natural England's Greenspace Quality criteria SANGs must meet the expectations of the wider community and neighbourhood; I expect new bridleways to be included in the design of this development, and the concept plan does not meet my expectations. It also states SANG areas should be welcoming to all; they should thus be inclusive and accessible to not just walkers and cyclists but horse riders, disabled, elderly, parents with prams and buggies. • Bridleways will benefit the whole community (both new and existing residents) and should be seen as a necessity. • Bridleways enable all to combat obesity, so not including them goes against Natural England's policy to combat obesity and promote physical activity. Developers and Natural England are failing to support this policy by excluding any user (including cyclists and horse riders). • Horse riders seem to be low priority when looking at the Thames Basin policy; this is likely to be because visitor survey statistics are flawed and likely indicate a lower proportion of horse riders than there are. • Statistics show that when added together over 50% of the population either walks, cycles or rides a horse. It thus makes little sense to accommodate only 22% of the population (just walkers). • Natural England have no legal right to prevent bridleways going through or around the site, so site owners has the right to request rights of way are put through the land. Doing so would leave an amazing legacy for future generations of residents. • Bridleways are easier to maintain than footpaths as it is possible to drive a tractor with hedge cutting machinery through them, minimising manpower requirements. • Bridleways should employ a surface that makes them accessible for all, such as Flexi-pave, given the clay soil type. • Improvements to bridleway network are supported by other organisations such as Defra, National Trails, Byway and Bridleway Trust, CTC and International Mountain Bike Association.
COUNTRYSIDE AND GREEN BELT	
Character, landscape and openness	

002 Bonfante & 322 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 053 MacDondald, 057 Maidens Green Society, 067 Fernandez, 070 Richards, 073 Stroud, 064 Sparkes, 082 Jenkins, 082 Jenkins, 082 Jenkins, 085 Cope, 088 Jones, 101 Bowler, 108 Fernandez, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 119 Vassor, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 128 Norton, 130 Hawkes, 132 Beck, 139 Fitzwilliams, 140 Tillette de Clermont-Tonnerre, 146 Beck, 149 Elmes, 151 Kingston, 164 Midson, 165 Gooder, 167 Kingston, 172 Ramsdale, 174 Kingston, 176 Stok, 177 Gates, 178 Stok, 187 Collinson, 188 Ehinger, 189 Auster, 193 Sauven, 194 Etherington, 191 CPRE, 210 Woodbridge, 212 Gates, 213 Makins, 235 Bickley, 251 Kennelly, 254 Mauler, 256 Manning, 257 Rodger, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 260 Sharpe, 261 Scutt, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 305 Shrimpton, 310 Osada, 323 Lumley, 324 Hooker, 331 Lumley, 332 Dimbleby, 349 Hirst, 356 Stearn, 364 Griffiths, 375 Stock & Stock, 376 Holburn, 387 Freeman, 388 Taylor, 393 Kedward, 400 Mulroy, 402 Glover, 462 Richmond, 466 Warfield Environmental Group 470 Warner, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 620 S Peacey, 633 Bridges, 417 Murphy, 462 Richmond, 469 Bottwood, 562 Haan, 563 Bradley, 638 De Roy, 684 Sparkes, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 768 Seaman, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 796 Bartlett, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 816 Gurney, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 836 Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 874 Boorman, 876 Blakemore, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope, 934 Kedwards, 942 Barron, 962 Stunt

Impact upon the rural and open character of the area, including:

- Does not comply with LP35 Landscape character (outside of defined settlements) and separation of settlements.
- Loss of part of defined Landscape Character Area (clay farmland) (refers to policy LP 35 Landscape character).
- Character of the area, as described in the LCA, section 7 will be destroyed.
- One of the most picturesque areas in Berkshire.
- Unspoilt countryside (clay farmlands), pleasant views over farmland, quiet minor roads with few cars, bridleways and footpaths around Frost Folly is perhaps the most important amenity North Bracknell has to offer.
- Desire to remain living in a rural/semi-rural environment.
- Proposals are wrong in a rural area, will urbanise a rural area.
- Irretrievable/irreversible damage to the rural character/landscape/green space.
- Significant loss of countryside between Bracknell and Maidenhead.
- Material alteration to the countryside aspect of Warfield.
- Loss of amenity resulting from urbanisation and loss of natural resources.
- Loss of rural nature of local roads – reducing pleasantness of location.
- Visual amenity.
- Proposals are unacceptably large. High density, high rise development.
- Thousands of identical looking houses.
- Development should be low density and appropriate to the surrounding countryside.
- Proposal is completely out of character with surrounding open countryside and village setting.
- Whole village concept would be out of keeping and detrimental.
- Development would need to be sympathetic to integrate into the landscape.
- Impact on future generations/retain for future generations.
- Will be hard to explain to future generations who would have played in fields.
- Love and respect home and surroundings, hoped to pass it on to another couple.
- Access to countryside is a fundamental human need given people's pressured lives.
- Loss of mental and physical benefits of access to open space. Wellbeing.
- This area of Green Belt should be preserved for Bracknell's growing population who will be living in high density housing.
- Rural character of local historic villages should be protected.
- Only 60ha - approx. 25% - of the site will remain green space which is out of proportion with the extreme development.
- Comments relating to the loss of the 'Forest' in 'Bracknell Forest' rename 'Bracknell Housing Estate'.
- Whilst a significant part of the site will be turned into SANG this will nevertheless change the landscape character.
- The proportion of new houses proposed in the countryside (37%) to existing settlements (63%) is too high if the rural landscape around Hawthorn Hill and Jealott's Hill is to be retained.

The majority of respondents commented that the Green Belt should not be developed for these reasons. Contrary to national policy.

002 Bonfante, 053 MacDondald, 057 Maidens Green Society, 094 Barlow, 194 Etherington, 269 Westbury	<p>Preserve/keep the character of Bracknell Forest villages, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearby villages are losing their village identities.
068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 085 Cope, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 393 Kedward, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 620 S Peacey, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 769 Cole, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 808 Manoukian, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 831 Phillips, 832 Manoukian, 834 Oxenham, 841 Wallen, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 884 Manoukian, 902 Wallen, 924 Thompson, 925 Cope, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron	<p>High elevation/topography of the proposed site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interconnected visibility with the wider area and undeveloped nature of the surrounding areas will mean that development will have a dramatic and detrimental impact on the landscape. Development on the slopes and summit of ridge will be able to be viewed from miles around and affect many miles of Green Belt by compromising the open nature of the of the Green belt. Highly visible site on the top of a hill. This landscape appraisal rates the sensitivity of the site as Medium-High for development. Much of the landscape is open and on a hill so difficult to mitigate impact on rural area. BFC agrees that proposals would permanently damage rural landscape/views. Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal Addendum concludes the sensitivity as medium-high.
021 Leach, 022 Hunter, 025 Fernandes, 073 Stroud, 081 Keys, 191 CPRE, 275 Painter, 349 Hirst, 375 Stock & Stock	<p>Proposed development will dramatically change/harm scenic/important views, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thames Valley Across Warfield North and south Knowl Hill The Cut Bridleway Windsor Castle Hawthorn Lane Wider landscape Windsor and Slough
401 Donaldson	<p>Serious consideration seems to have been given to the effect on landscape.</p>
191 CPRE	<p>Some boundaries follow land ownership rather than natural features which reduces effectiveness of landscaping.</p>

<p>022 Hunter, 088 Jones, 119 Vassor, 121 Cox, 133 Clarkson, 164 Midson, 165 Gooder, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 187 Collinson, 190 Elmes, 193 Sauven, 194 Etherington, 198 Fall, 213 Makins, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 267 Smith, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 296 Payne, 324 Hooker, 328 Manning, 349 Hirst, 356 Stearn, 375 Stock & Stock, 380 Barlow, 388 Taylor, 633 Bridges, 390 Harries, 393 Kedward, 462 Richmond, 637 Nixon, 649 Clark, 768 Seaman, 794 Jones, 796 Bartlett, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 839 Griffiths, 840 Ratcliffe, 869 Doughty, 870 Bridges, 876 Blakemore, 928 Blakemore, 934 Kedwards, 988 Bonfante 988 Bonfante</p>	<p>Impact to residents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive aspects of being situated away from a settlement will be lost (no light pollution at night, low air pollution, low ambient noise, low crime and little/no antisocial behaviour). • Impact on quality of life. • Proposals will destroy a way of life for people in Warfield and surrounding areas. • Long-term impacts for the area are not considered in the strategy. • No benefit to existing residents of the area (for example, school places and healthcare are for new residents rather than existing residents). • Unclear what the benefits are for existing borough residents and their families in terms of providing suitable places to live. • 20 years construction work. • Disruption caused by increased numbers of heavy goods and construction vehicles, including overnight parking on agricultural land. • Disruption and inconvenience to residents. • Local needs and requirements will not be paramount to the foreign investors. • No commitment from Syngenta to alleviate the effect of proposals on the community. • The highly successful and lauded Landshare project that supports many charitable groups will have to relocate after years developing the site into the showcase it is now. This will disillusion the hundreds of helpers and volunteers that have worked hard to make this the success it is. • Warfield, Bray and White Waltham Parish Council's vote against the proposal show the lack of net benefit for the wider community. • Community would be better served by maintaining the Green Belt; protecting it from large scale development.
<p>228 Manoukian, 388 Taylor, 638 De Roy, 808 Manoukian</p>	<p>Encroachment into countryside (para 134 of NPPF). This is particularly the case with the proposal to build on the Eastern site of Ascot Road in proximity to Chawridge Bank SSSI.</p>
<p>Green Belt</p>	
<p>024 Scott, 577 Mullier</p>	<p>Exceptional circumstances are met to release Green Belt.</p>
<p>002 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 063 Silvester, 065 Sparkes, 067 Fernandez, 087 BeardsmoreGray, 108 Fernandez, 121 Cox, 140 Tillette de Clermont-Tonnerre, 147 Bowen, 149 Elmes, 154 Willatts, 156 Hill, 159 Claridge, 165 Gooder, 167 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 171 Sergent, 172 Ramsdale, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 188 Ehinger, 191 CPRE, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 221 Sinclair, 196 Mead, 233 Newnham, 253 Jerome, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 269 Westbury, 296 Payne, 302 Dove, 316 Devitt, 332 Dimpleby, 349 Hirst, 356 Stearn, 364 Griffiths, 376 Holburn, 191 CPRE, 378 Prior & Craig, 382 Carter, 390 Harries, 393 Kedward, 403 Browne, 404 Hurtado, 417 Murphy, 441 Lawrence, 442 Yates, 446 Brant, 463 Harris, 465 Warfield Environmental Group, 482 Home Farm, 597 Haylor, 636 A & B Brant, 638 De Roy, 646 Depledge, 769 Cole, 788 Blackburn, 796 Bartlett, 799 Saadetian, 810 Plumb, 820 Browne, 821 Browne, 831 Phillips, 836</p>	<p>Green Belt should not be developed (overarching comment).</p>

<p>Ehinger, 839 Griffiths, 840 Ratcliffe, 869 Doughty, 874 Boorman, 876 Blakemore, 925 Cope, 928 Blakemore, 934 Kedwards</p>	
--	--

<p>021 Leach, 022 Hunter, 024 Scott, 045 Holmes, 053 MacDonald, 057 Maidens Green Society, 072 Robinson, 081 Keys, 151 Kingston, 159 Claridge, 167 Kingston, 175 Bown, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 261 Scutt, 275 Painter, 300 Redman, 307 Brunander, 315 King, 322 Bonfante, 324 Hooker, 332 Dimpleby, 446 Brant, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 768 Seaman,</p>	<p>Green Belt should not be developed – it will set a precedence for further Green Belt release, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any future applications for development between Bracknell and Jealott’s Hill; and between Jealott’s Hill and Maidenhead will just be a formality.
<p>025 Fernandes, 046 Gale, 069 Gay, 088 Jones, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 314 Chambers, 388 Taylor, 808 Manoukian,</p>	<p>Site contributes to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt of openness and permanence (para 133 of NPPF).</p>

<p>002 & 322 Bonfante, 025 Fernandes, 085 Cope, 096 Hartley, 101 Bowler, 124 Kingston, 139 Fitzwilliams, 151 Kingston, 149 Elmes, 162 Midson, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 190 Elmes, 193 Sauven, 210 Woodbridge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 244 Gates, 250 Barnett, 267 Smith, 287 White, 291/294 Thorin, 301 Greenwood, 303 May, 314 Chambers, 323 Lumley, 331 Lumley, 367 Sheikh, 325 Bainborough, 349 Hirst, 367 Sheikh, 375 Stock & Stock, 385 CruzRimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 393 Kedward, 408 Robertson, 418 Murphy, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 440 Prendergast, 461 Knox-Johnston, 464 & 465 Warfield Environmental Group, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 482 Home Farm, 508 Cager, 543 Spendlove, 558 Sherrington, 582 Bell, 585 Martin, 620 S Peacey, 633 Bridges, 637 Nixon, 638 De Roy, 684 Sparkes, 739 Richardson, 639 Russell, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 767 Young, 769 Cole, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 836 Ehinger, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 876 Blakemore, 902 Wallen, 927 Fitzell, 928 Blakemore, 933 Glen, 934 Kedwards</p>	<p>Comments relating to exceptional circumstances, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not exist. • Lack of evidence to justify exceptional circumstances/evidence not available/not 'fully evidenced' and 'justified'. • 'National and international importance' is not quantified. • Lack of consideration of alternatives as required by NPPF para 136 (e.g. 65% of borough is not Green Belt; housing needs met; collaboration needs could be met in existing office space in the Borough; can collaborate with education providers from another site). Not evidenced in the plan. • The need for investment into a private company cannot constitute the meaning of exceptional circumstances under s136 of the NPPF. • It is not clear that section a), b), or c) of para 137 have been satisfied. • Unlikely to withstand legal challenge; will delay the plan overall. • Other options have not been considered; other SHELAA sites should be considered. • Ample case law shows these are not exceptional circumstances. <p><i>[Reference should also be made to the use of brownfield sites and underutilised land; economic development; housing need; and consideration of alternatives.]</i></p>
<p>057 Maidens Green Society, 067 Fernandez, 082 Jenkins, 088 Jones, 108 Fernandez, 127 Duncan, 151 Kingston, 191 CPRE, 314 Chambers, 367 Sheikh, 375 Stock & Stock, 388 Taylor, 417 Murphy, 465 and 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 636 A & B Brant, 638 De Roy, 808 Manoukian, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Site contributes to the five purposes of the Green Belt (para 134 of NPPF).</p> <p><i>[Reference should also be made to comments regarding urban sprawl, merger of neighbouring towns, countryside encroachment, historic towns, and the recycling of derelict and other urban land.]</i></p>

<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 329 Woodroffe, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 416 Murphy, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>None of the arguments offered as “exceptional circumstances” relating to “the national and international importance of the agricultural technology work carried out by Syngenta” are “fully evidenced” or “justified” as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reports quantifying the “national and international importance” of the private company’s output to Bracknell Forest shared. Question why a private, for-profit company’s agenda for releasing circa. £500m of liquidity from land assets for shareholder gain is the primary argument being used for the unjustifiable removal of Green Belt Land. • No plans have been shown by Council in event that Syngenta enters financial difficult/deems Jealott’s Hill site no longer profitable and withdraws from area (most recent financial filings indicate financial security unsure/operating income in decline (https://www.syngenta.com/~media/Files/S/Syngenta/2019/Financial%20Report%202018.pdf)) • No reports shared quantifying ‘national and international importance’ of the private company’s output to Bracknell Forest. • No guarantees from Council that the existing Syngenta site will be developed first prior to any new ground broken. • No evidence on the activities, type, extent of level of necessary development. Needs to be a business case.
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, , 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 416 Murphy, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 CrossTolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>None of the arguments offered as “exceptional circumstances” relating to “the proposed boost in housing supply” are “fully evidenced” or “justified” as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The required 1,877 homes to meet Local Housing Need have already been accounted for in the Draft Local Plan. The 4,000 additional proposed homes are surplus and unnecessary. • NPPF Para. 137 – strategic plan-making authority must demonstrate all other reasonable options for meeting identified need have been examined before concluding exceptional circumstances. Sufficient alternatives to meet housing need have been identified, therefore Plan is unjustified. • Council has a 5 year land supply and has no issue with maintaining a supply of housing land.
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 329 Woodroffe, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>None of the arguments offered as “exceptional circumstances” relating to “the proposed boost [in] employment” are “fully evidenced” or “justified” as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been no guarantees from Syngenta or the Council that any new job creation is secured and will definitely occur immediately after first phase completion/directly as a result of the development. • No guarantees from Council that the existing Syngenta site will be developed first prior to any new ground broken. • There have been no assessments shown by the Council of the number and type of jobs that will be created as a direct result of the development, or that the income from any new job creation will outweigh the loss of Green Belt land and environmental cost of the development. • Green Belt boundaries do not need to be removed to boost employment, as indicated by Syngenta’s intention to reduce the square meters it uses following completion whilst increasing number of jobs. • Development would suffer from brain drain/competitive pressure from larger employment market in Bracknell Town.

<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Proposed plans contravene purpose 1 of Green Belt land, safeguarding the countryside against encroachment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be classed as new settlement – 3+ miles from Bracknell existing settlement edge. • Dramatic increase in traffic would have an urbanising effect on the rural environment. Lack of rail links in walkable distance and limited bus service would mean, for reasonable movement, there would be an unreasonable increase in traffic on local infrastructure (estimates number of additional cars). • Limited details have been provided on the “upgrades” to Maidenhead Road and 3 access junctions. There appears to be no planned upgrades to the other roads through/entrances into the site (gives details).
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 Mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Proposed plans contravene purpose 2 of Green Belt land, restricting sprawl, as the proposals would see a 960% increase in the area of previously developed land.</p>
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 CrossTolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Proposed plans contravene purpose 3 of Green Belt land, preventing merging, as the proposals would merge Jealott’s Hill, Hawthorn Hill and Moss end; removing the rural setting of these historical settlements. Ultimate risk of merging entire area with Binfield.</p>

<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 CrossTolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Proposed plans contravene purpose 4 of Green Belt land, preserving the setting and character of historic towns, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological heritage assets are likely to be present across all areas of the site and would be disturbed and/or destroyed by development. • Jealott's Farm Listed Buildings would lose agricultural setting and suffer damage. • Listed Buildings (Cruchfield Manor, Nuptown House)/buildings proposed for Local Listing (Hawthorndale House) would lose agricultural/rural settings. • Hedgerows in site should be regarded as heritage assets due to age/natural development. • Warfield Street is a Unique Historic Setting recognised in the Domesday Book and designated an 'Area of Character' by BFC, indicating the Warfield area's rich heritage.
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Proposed plans contravene purpose 5 of Green Belt land, assisting urban regeneration, as the plan to build 130,000+ new square metres of science park is not reasonable while 1 million+ square feet of office space is unoccupied in Bracknell town centre.</p>
<p>189 Auster, 400 Mulroy, 934 Kedwards,</p>	<p>Existing development in Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precedent for building on Green Belt already exists - Woodhurst Park, Blue Mountain, Amen Corner). • Green Belt land already affected by ongoing residential development in Warfield and Binfield. • Over 30% of local green belt developed in the last year changing rural feel of area. • Nationally 8,143 homes built on Green Belt in 2017/18; this will thus unjustifiably equate to half the homes built on Green Belt a year.
<p>205 Singleton</p>	<p>Release of site from Green Belt would only be acceptable if overall area of Green Belt in Bracknell Forest remains the same; proposed mitigation is insufficient.</p>
<p>841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Site represents 6% of the Green Belt in the Borough – unactable reduction.</p>
<p>232 Mackenzie Dodds, 244 Gates, 301 Greenwood, 314 Chambers, 322 Bonfante, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston</p>	<p>The proposal does not meet the relevant criteria in the NPPF regarding the Green Belt (paras noted include 133, 134, 136, 137, 145 & 146).</p>
<p>267 Smith, 302 Dove, 543 Spendlove, 585 Martin, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Should protect the Green Belt for future generations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to 2010 Natural England and CPRE report, Green Belts: A greener future, which calls enhance Green Belt protection for future generations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present an exciting vision for the future of Syngenta instead: surrounded by thriving wildlife-friendly farmland – open and permanent Green Belt countryside for everyone.
418 Murphy	Noted that the Plan acknowledges site does not meet NPPF criteria for changing Green Belt boundaries.
349 Hirst	Development of a small town is inappropriate in the Green Belt.
375 Stock & Stock	Green Belt is countryside to be enjoyed by everyone and needs to be preserved for growing population of Bracknell. It is important for leisure, health & wellbeing, food production, wildlife and biodiversity. With climate emergency and biodiversity decline, Green Belt is more valuable than ever and must be preserved and protected.
806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges,	Contravenes BF stated Local Plan Green Belt Strategy (para 4.25).
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	
021 Leach	Proposed development too close to St Michael's parish church and residential buildings of significant value.
021 Leach	Proposed development too close to plague victims' burial grounds.
028 Manning	Sceptical of proposed consideration of 'historic environment' (should include Jealott's Farm) – development in area has already wiped out buildings of local/national interest; cultural/rural past being lost and must be protected.
028 Manning	Jealott's Farm should be put to good use – could be cultural centre.
090 Halfacre	Will cause increased traffic through Holyport Conservation Area.
101 Bowler, 149 Elmes, 151 Kingston, 307 Brunander, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges,	Warfield is an ancient settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book.
393 Kedward, 191 CPRE	Potential damage/loss to listed buildings/ significant and valuable rural and heritage assets.
191 CPRE	In absence of detailed proposals unable assess impact on heritage assets.
307 Brunander	Cruchfield Manor is Grade II listed dating back to 1100. Owners have included Henri I, Alan de Nuvill, Eleanor of Provence (wife to Henry III), Sir Reynold Bray and Peter Cadbury. Current owners have invested a large amount in professional fee to do anything at the property (e.g. one year's work for gates). Therefore, seems ludicrous to destroy the agricultural setting and surroundings. Economic impact to property. Proposal will destroy this part of history for the economic benefit of a foreign government, to the loss of their own taxpaying residents. Restoration of the property contributes to the local economy.
807 Jones, 809 Jones,	Setting of Grade II Listed Cruchfield Manor will be impacted significantly by junction alterations for roundabouts and accompanied lighting.
	<i>[Refer to further heritage comments in relation to purpose 5 of the Green Belt.]</i>
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	
Overarching	
063 Silvester, 069 Gay, 070 Richards, 079 Richards, 095 Young, 108 Fernandez, 124 Kingston, 137 Jones, 148 Graver, 164 Midson, 165 Gooder, 169 Robinson, 233 Newnham, 238 Beni, 322 Bonfante, 388 Taylor, 404 Hurtado, 461 Knox-Johnston, 462 Richmond, 799 Saadetian, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 819 Olivian, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 839 Griffiths, 870 Bridges, 925 Cope, 942 Barron, 988 Bonfante	<p>Proposals would damage the environment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in political direction regarding the environment towards much greater protection of our natural world, fuelled by growing public anger, hopeful that BFC will put itself ahead of the curve. Plan goes against every modern train of thought. Environment is under incredible stress. Need to make difficult decisions – do the right thing. Climate change is agreed upon by all political parties as the most critical issue to address – loss of c600 acres farmland and woodland will add to cumulative effect of climate change/cannot be justified. Current environmental crisis – should be planting trees. Do something positive with the site. Large scale damage will occur during construction even before homes are built.

021 Leach, 083 Cope, 124 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 177 Gates, 194 Etherington, 212 Gates, 251 Kennelly, 253 Jerome, 382 Carter, 393 Kedward, 636 A & B Brant, 417 Murphy, 446 Brant, 839 Griffiths, 934 Kedwards, 942 Barron	<p>Loss of agricultural land/farmland, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of huge area/200 hectares for arable farming. • The lungs of the area – air purification, carbon capture, drainage, conservation, wildlife. All will be reduced. • Top grade agricultural land which is mainly actively farmed arable land. • Impact on farming enterprise. • Poor use of high-grade farming land. • Land would have been used to grow food; where will this be produced now? • Land should be returned to agricultural use. • Irreplaceable. • Council agrees that housing development is a poor use of high-quality agricultural land. • Further study needed to determine whether best and most versatile agricultural land.
988 Bonfante	Hypocritical that Syngenta seeks to save land from degradation and enhance biodiversity, yet on the next breath they then seek to destroy the beautiful Green Belt fields at their largest global research and development site at Jealott's Hill.
988 Bonfante	Would be better to turn the site into a community farm.
053 MacDondald, 062 Smith, 065 Sparkes, 139 Fitzwilliams, 147 Bowen, 167 Kingston, 187 Collinson, 251 Kennelly, 254 Mauler, 256 Manning, 275 Painter, 375 Stock & Stock, 400 Mulroy, 838 Belie	<p>Green spaces should be kept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For its own sake. • For the safety and enjoyment of dog walkers and horse riders. • As we are running out of them. • Given mental and physical benefits of access. • For environmental reasons. • For the safety of already dispersed wildlife and habitats. • So many have already been built on.
079 Richards, 148 Graver, 256 Manning	Once land is removed it cannot be replaced.
073 Stroud	Indefensible to destroy environment for no pressing reason.
122 Cox, 124 Kingston, 191 CPRE, 261 Scutt, 324 Hooker, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 633 Bridges, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 902 Wallen	<p>Proposals would result in light pollution, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light pollution is currently very limited in the area. • Warfield Neighbourhood Plan includes a dark skies policy (WNP13). • Detrimental effect on wildlife, including nocturnal insects and mammals (e.g. tawny and barn owls, badgers, several bat species and a wide range of moths present in the area). • Residents pleaded not to have lighting at Watersplash Lane development – BFC overruled on safety ground. • Particularly harmful given prominence. • Original permission for current use, unlike proposals, presumably was given due to the lack of light pollution.
927 Fitzell	No environmental assessment of any kind has been considered on either the loss of the Green Belt or the works to be done in the resulting conurbation.
769 Cole	Site is directly under Heathrow flight path – impact of aircraft noise.
Biodiversity, designated sites, green infrastructure	
401 Donaldson	Serious consideration appears to have been given to the effect on local biodiversity.

<p>002 Bonfante & 322 Bonfante, 021 Leach, 053 MacDondald, 065 Sparkes, 068 Boyd, 069 Gay, 070 Richards, 073 Stroud, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 079 Richards, 081 Keys, 083 Money, 085 Cope, 088 Jones, 094 Barlow, 101 Bowler, 109 Hayden Kellard, 119 Vassor, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 124 Kingston, 137 Jones, 148 Graver, 151 Kingston, 165 Gooder, 167 Kingston, 169 Robinson, 172 Ramsdale, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 177 Gates, 188 Ehinger, 191 CPRE, 192 Parkinson, 193 Suaven, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 212 Gates, 214 Symes, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 228 Manoukian, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 233 Newnham, 251 Kennelly, 254 Mauler, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 261 Scutt, 265 Mackenzie, 267 Smith, 269 Westbury, 275 Painter, 276 Street & Street, 294 Thorin, 307 Brunander, 323 Lumley, 324 Hooker, 331 Lumley, 332 Dimbleby, 349 Hirst, 391 MacKenzie, 393 Kedward, 400 Mulroy, 402 Glover, 404 Hurtado, 408 Robertson, 440 Prendergast, 462 Richmond, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 469 Bottwood, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 633 Bridges, 637 Nixon, 649 Clark, 684 Sparkes, 745 Sandhu, 747 Sandhu, 767 Young, 768 Seaman, 769 Cole, 788 Blackburn, 794 Jones, 798 Bridges, 799 Saadetian, 806 Mcalister, 807 Jones, 808 Manoukian, 809 Jones, 810 Plumb, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 819 Olivian, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 836 Ehinger, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 902 Wallen, 925 Cope, 933 Glen, 934 Kedwards, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Impact of development on biodiversity (wildlife, habitats, eco-systems), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of well-established ecosystems given interdependence of species (cannot be replaced). • Loss of biodiversity; substantial reduction in flora on a large area of the site. • Substantial areas of native bluebells and ancient and/or well established hedges. • Jealott's Hill supports a wide range of wildlife including ground nesting birds, lapwings, migrating birds, red kites, barn owls, tawny owls, kestrels, sparrow hawks, larks, pheasants, bats, rabbits, foxes, badgers, hedgehogs, moths, newts and other amphibians, weasels, voles, stoats, hedgehogs, insects/pollinators (impact to wider area through loss of pollinators). • Great Crested Newts seen in the ford at Pendry's Lane in 2019. • Proximity to Chawridge Bank SSSI. • Ancient Woodland will be lost. Deforestation. • Loss of relatively undisturbed habitats around Syngenta. • Winding roads will need to be adapted for extra traffic – increased biodiversity loss (e.g. hedgerows across wider area). • Species are established; cannot be replaced by simply planting some trees in a different location. • Under previous management, ecology was well managed on site. • Protected BAP wildlife. • Amount of recent development in north of Bracknell Forest Council – cumulative impact on biodiversity. Wildlife has been pushed north. • Loss of amenity as a result of irretrievable damage to wildlife. • Proposal would contravene the Council's stated objective of conserving and enhancing biodiversity. • Should be planting 4000 trees, not houses. • If there is spare land at Syngenta, it should be retained for agriculture or nature reserve. • Hypocritical for a business that seeks to improve and enhance plant science and agriculture crops to rip up beautiful plant life and trees. • Original permission for current use, unlike proposals, presumably was given due to close integration into the local natural world with extensive biodiversity. • Biodiversity is not well documented so a proper survey should be undertaken. • Survey needed for Drown Boy Pond (newts), bats, other habitats. • Higher levels of air pollution can have a detrimental effect on species. • Will be hard to explain the loss of open spaces full of wildlife to future generations. • Climate change impact as a result of loss of plants.
<p>139 Fitzpatrick, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges</p>	<p>Impact on hedgerows specifically, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development as proposed of much of the current farm land will result in wholesale destruction of field hedgerows contrary to current legal constraints & stated BFC policy. • New planting cannot mitigate for the lost biodiversity inherent in ancient hedgerows, the shelter and safe passage they provide.

<p>148 Graver, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 307 Brunander, 388 Taylor, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 484 S Collings, 608 M Collings, 684 Sparkes, 794 Jones, 808 Manoukian, 934 Kedwards</p>	<p>Concerns relating to SANGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green space created for people to walk their dogs are not natural environments and the wildlife will be lost forever. • Recreation and improved biodiversity are incompatible. • Creating a small area of SANG on current greenfield site will result in loss of established habitats. • All SANGs to date have simply been grassland with limited value to wildlife because of its openness and volume of visitors. • Small areas densely used. Create issues with dog fouling, poor behaviour (especially illicit night time use). • SANG changes the nature of the area e.g. more cars visiting. Issues with car parking at Cabbage Hill. • Will attract people and traffic from a distance. • Creation of 2 SANGS will not compensate for loss of amenity to resident. • Horse riders cannot use SANGs; Natural England will not allow bridleways within a SANGs despite a lack of evidence to support this – horses do not pose any threat to wildlife. <p><i>[Refer also to comments on site concept plan]</i></p>
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 744 Sandwell, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 940 Cross-Tolley, 942 Barron</p>	<p>It is inappropriate to argue that the harm caused by the proposed excessive removal of habitats is clearly outweighed by other considerations as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is located inside the 7km SPA boundary. • The agri-habitats & hedgerows provide habitats, nesting sites and/or food supply for protected bird species (Skylarks, Red Kites); nesting sites/habitats would be directly removed by housing (includes details of designations). • High likelihood of protected species living in site (Badgers, Great Crested Newts, Bats, Stag Beetles – includes details of designations/offences) • Hedgehogs live in Moss End area (includes details of designations, recent decline and movements at night). Scale of housing development would remove key habitats and increase road deaths. • Site includes hedgerows, lowland woodland and ponds which constitute UK priority habitats. • Council's suggestion that single car width, lightly tarmacked country lanes without any further development within site can support 8,000 new cars in unreasonable. <p>Development would therefore require widening and the destruction of hedgerow habitats that line the full length of the lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaped man-made areas are not equal replacements for long standing and naturally occurring agri-habitats and hedgerow habitats.
<p>304 Greenwood</p>	<p>BFC has always had very dedicated Rangers who look so well after the land that is now under threat.</p>
<p>139 Fitzpatrick, 294 Thorin, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 942 Barron</p>	<p>Ecological value of Jealott's Hill Community Landshare, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed that the Jealott's Hill Community Landshare scheme should move from its current site. To do so would involve the destruction of an established/mature 450 tree orchard in total contradiction to both the spirit and the letter of the current BFC Biodiversity Action Plan (Woodland Objective I). It is one of, if not the biggest orchard in Berkshire supporting 77 varieties of flora. The orchard needs to be protected. • Orchards are a priority habitat in the current Bracknell Forest Biodiversity Action Plan
<p>338 BBOWT</p>	<p>Concerns about impact on nearby BBOWT nature reserve, SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>Land at Jealott's Hill is close to BBOWT's nature reserve Chawridge Bank, an area of old Berkshire grassland. It is part of Chawridge Bourne SSSI, designated as area of unimproved grassland, scrub and broadleaved woodland, stream & ancient parish boundary hedge. SSSI contains rare plants.</p>
<p>338 BBOWT</p>	<p>Several local wildlife sites close by including Hog Oak Lane and Woodland LWS and Woodland adjacent to Hog Oak Lane LWS, Fernygrove Copse LWS and Lordlands Wood LWS. Last three of these lie in RBWM but close to Jealott's Hill.</p>

338 BBOWT	Chawridge Bank nature reserve is open access with direct footpath from Jealott's Hill and likely to suffer direct & indirect impacts from increased population and recreational pressures. Impacts include: cat predation, possible fly-tipping, possible uncontrolled fires, trampling, disturbance and nutrient enrichment from dog fouling, damage through erosion from higher footfall. Increased population will increase car journeys / air pollution leading to nitrogen deposition which can affect species diversity, particularly on lownutrient habitats such as this SSSI grassland.
338 BBOWT	Chawridge Bank is SSSI so legal duty to prevent harm. Should require mitigation through S106 commitments within policy for this site. Also expect provision to avoid impacts from Jealott's Hill by designing the open space and SANG to accommodate dog walkers within site to discourage recreational use of the nature reserve and SSSI. Any mitigation / compensation habitat must be provided before development begins.
338 BBOWT	Site is allocated for 4,000 new homes 1,200 of which completed during plan period. Draft IDP says part of site is within 5-7km of TBH SPA and is required to provide bespoke on-site SANG. This is suggested to be 5.5 ha based on 1,200 dwellings (based on at least 2 hectares per 1,000 persons). But total number of new homes will be 4,000, so SANG should be based on this not 1,200. Area allocated for SANG appears very narrow in places to E & W of the site. Further information needed about habitats to be created.
525 Seville	The proposed green open spaces and parks that would promote biodiversity and an appreciation of the outdoors will benefit the Bracknell area.
CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABILITY	
228 Manoukian, 244 Gates, 301 Greenwood, 314 Chambers, 367 Sheikh, 385 CruzRimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 638 De Roy, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 808 Manoukian, 835 Taylor, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston	Contravenes NPPF regarding sustainable development (para 8), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 8a economic objective – site is neither the right type nor in the right place. Unsustainable location. Alternatives available. • Para 8c environmental objective – does not satisfy any of this objective
228 Manoukian, 244 Gates, 301 Greenwood, 314 Chambers, 367 Sheikh, 385 CruzRimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 582 Bell, 638 De Roy, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston	Contravenes NPPF para 148 and 149 – support transition to low carbon future and mitigating and adapting to climate change.
176 Stok, 178 Stok, 265 Mackenzie, 276 Street & Street, 798 Bridges, 841 Wallen, 806 Mcalister, 811 Bridge, 812 Bridge, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges, 902 Wallen	Fails to meet requirements of policies LP1 sustainable development principles and LP2 Sustainable locational principles (remote from major facilities).
244 Gates, 304 Greenwood, 325 Bainborough, 367 Sheikh, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston	Direct conflict with section 9.1 'Climate Change' and should be removed.

<p>244 Gates, 304 Greenwood, 311 Manoukian, 325 Bainborough, 367 Sheikh, 385 CruzRimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 W Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston</p>	<p>Direct conflict with section 9.2 'The Natural Environment' & LP15 Green Infrastructure and should be removed.</p>
<p>094 Barlow, 124 Kingston, 146 Bell, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 559 Coker, 928 Blakemore</p>	<p>Comments relating to carbon neutrality, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals would contravene Borough's stated aim of working towards carbon neutral emissions. • Must adhere to BFC's Climate Change Action Plan 2016. • Planned development needs to be carbon neutral. • The suggestion of carbon neutral is a sound bite which will not be the practical effect on residents. • Whilst the new development will be carbon-free there is no suggestion that construction will be. • Is there a carbon emission statement for construction of the development?
<p>228 Manoukian, 244 Gates, 304 Greenwood, 325 Bainborough, 367 Sheikh, 385 Cruz-Rimmer, 386 Rimmer, 388 Taylor, 389 Popplewell, 390 Harries, 582 Bell, 633 Bridges, 637 Nixon, 638 De Roy, 639 Russell, 798 Bridges, 802 Bhandal, 803 Squires, 806 Mcalister, 808 Manoukian, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 832 Manoukian, 833 Mcalister, 835 Taylor, 870 Bridges, 884 Manoukian, 923 de Roy, 937 Silverston</p>	<p>Should not be permitted under the Climate Change Act 2008 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (19(1A), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would not contribute to the mitigation of climate change and help meet the UK's requirements of significant emission reductions of at least 100% by 2050 ('net zero'). • Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires LPAs to include in their Local Plans 'policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change'. Evidence needed that this proposal meets requirements in this regard. • Green Belt land plays a major role in offsetting the damaging effects of climate change.
<p>253 Jerome</p>	<p>All new builds should be built to cope with climate change. All buildings should be insulated all over (walls, doors, ceilings, roofs). Solar panels should cover all roofs.</p>
<p>233 Newnham, 417 Murphy, 461 Knox-Johnston, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Farmland/soil contributes to carbon storage/sink and climate change mitigation.</p>
<p>417 Murphy, 466 Warfield Environmental Group, 684 Sparkes, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not meet sustainability criteria. • This site receives the lowest score in the Sustainability Appraisal, even after mitigation, so it cannot be considered as a suitable or viable site. Nothing has changed with respect to this site since the last Public Consultation. • The SA demonstrates that WAR3 is the poorest for sustainability, even mitigated, of any site, with three 'xx' scores and 3 'x' scores, just one other site has two 'xx' scores; three have one 'xx'. Adverse impacts of WAR 3 in terms of landscape, resource (farmland) use, poor access to services, travel and land use are all unchanged after mitigation: i.e. it is a poor choice of site and this cannot be mitigated. Its impacts over short to long term are negative for SA1 climate change ("isolated from settlements, routes to the site are physically restricted which may limit the potential to achieve sustainable transport improvements"), SA4a Landscape ("The most significant land impact as a result of the proposed site allocation"), SA7a Resources ("a 242 ha site largely in agricultural use"), and SA17 travel choice ("Transport is a key issue ... isolated from other settlements, especially Bracknell Town Centre and other larger centres beyond the Borough boundary. Routes to the site are physically restricted which may limit the potential to achieve sustainable transport improvements"). Overall, allocation of this site will impede meeting SA objectives and policy related to addressing climate change. [Also summarised under SA] • SA acknowledges wastewater treatment has been overlooked.

794 Jones	Shouldn't be trying to damage and ruin a protected area of land that younger generations are trying to save when young climate activists such as Greta Thunberg are protesting to stop climate change. Younger generations do not want to fix mistakes based in greed made now by those, including the Council, who will not experience the consequences.
Pollution and hazards	
057 Maidens Green Society, 069 Gay, 079 Richards, 109 Hayden Kellard, 112 Mitchell, 124 Kingston, 148 Graver, 149 Elmes, 151 Kingston, 190 Elmes, 251 Kennelly, 254 Mauler, 294 Thorin, 324 Hooker, 374 Oakley Green & Fifield Residents Association, 382 Carter, 402 Glover, 462 Richmond, 841 Wallen, 869 Doughty, 901 Wallen, 925 Cope	Impact upon air quality, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution will be high given proposed concentration of 4,000 homes leading to more traffic. • Cumulative impact with new third runway increasing flights and therefore pollution over the area. • No traffic/air quality mitigation is proposed. • Air quality can a detrimental impact to species. • Original permission for current use, unlike proposals, presumably was given due to the very low levels of air pollution. • Pollution already over accepted levels. • Recent studies show that anyone living within 50 metres of a busy road is most at risk to suffer any of 13 health complaints including lung cancer, bronchitis, asthma, heart disease etc. • PM2.5 limits are currently more than double WHO guidelines. Children and unborn children are the most vulnerable, particles can invade the placenta. Great increase in children suffering asthma in the Bracknell area.
068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 226 Kennedy, 227 Kennedy, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 323 Lumley, 329 Woodroffe, 331 Lumley, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 767 Young, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 942 Barron	Site is in Groundwater Protection Zone 3 – removal of trees and hedgerows, which reduce surface water, will increase risk of mineral and chemical pollution.
375 Stock & Stock	How environmentally safe is the R&D of herbicides, fungicides, insecticides and crop enhancing chemicals, which kill and pollute?
Flood risk	
079 Richards, 081 Keys, 120 Sparkes, 121 Cox, 124 Kingston, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 217 Proddow, 6ss Bridges, 260 Sharpe, 380 Barlow, 461 Knox-Johnston, 508 Cager, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 814 Mcalister, 815 Barlow, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 841 Wallen, 870 Bridges, 902 Wallen	Flood risk, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a large green area, the site currently prevents further flooding to surrounding lower areas which already suffer from excess flooding/drainage is barely adequate; proposals would reduce this functionality. • Flooding already occurs at the bottom of Hogoak Lane in Lupton and on A330 towards Maidens Green. • Increased flood risk due to additional roads/housing and loss of trees/hedgerows. • Site is in Flood Zone 1 so has a high risk of flooding in some areas. May become worse with climate change. Cannot be assessed until Environment Agency remodel The Cut watercourse that is close to site. • Has any assessment been offered on the above issues?
Land potentially affected by contamination	
021 Leach	Land is contaminated with GM products.
FIGURE 6 ILLUSTRATIVE CONCEPT PLAN	

<p>021 Leach, 250 Barnett, 466 and 477 Warfield Environmental Group, 794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen</p>	<p>Issues with the location/layout of features, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SANG inappropriately located: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ not enough SANG through centre of proposed development/around existing housing. ○ SANG pushed to narrow strips round the perimeter. ○ No N-S or E-W greenways, animal corridors etc. • School located next to Syngenta workplace is not appropriate for drop off to school. • Primary school at main entrance to site is inappropriate – close to active chemistry research laboratories and close to A3095. • Development too close to sewage works/works don't have capacity for development. • Site is bisected by two busy roads with fast moving traffic. • Does not show the copse to the east of Wellers Lane – shown as a new housing area which is contrary to the LSA Addendum for WAR3c. • What will happen with the recycling centre east of Wellers Lane? Ideally be removed and expand the copse. Assessment needed. Not mentioned in policy or supporting documents. • Site is dissected by two main busy roads – site not suitable. • Orchard area on Jealott's Hill Community Landshare site should be shown and protected. • Concept Plan shows the area of a woodland copse (Wellers Copse) to the east of Wellers Lane as a new housing. This copse must be protected. Failing to do this is contrary to the LSA Addendum for WAR3c that recommends: "Ensure development does not result in the loss or fragmentation of the existing woodland copse and reinstate appropriate woodland management;" May be other copses that are not currently identified and which need to be retained.
<p>085 Cope, 349 Hirst, 769 Cole</p>	<p>Concerns regarding land to the north of A330 at Nuptown, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its allocation is contrary to existing Green Belt policy that states that boundaries should be readily recognisable, and likely to be permanent. Development of this field would contribute to a general sprawl. • Would be remote from the proposed community centre, separated by busy main road.
<p>021 Leach, 028 Manning, 085 Cope, 558 Sherrington, 769 Cole</p>	<p>Suggested amendments to presentation/style of Concept Plan, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translucent style map overlaid over a base map. • Show Jealott's Hill Farm/heritage. • Define boundary of existing major developed site so difficult to ascertain the extent of the proposed excursion into the Green Belt. • Make the plan clearer by adding well known features (road names, Frost Folly car park, Moss End Garden Centre, The Shepard House PH, New Leathern Bottle PH etc). • Include changes RBWM are proposing. • Inadequate provision made for upgrading of roads & transport infrastructure & urbanisation of Green Belt and is therefore misleading.
<p>068 Boyd, 076 Rothwell-Boyd, 086 Young, 093 Barnes, 095 Young, 098 Baldwin, 099 Menon, 100 Baldwin, 161 Menon, 192 Parkinson, 196 mead, 197 Parkinson, 201 Deplodge, 232 Mackenzie Dodds, 329 Woodroffe, 345 Woodroffe, 406 Whitfield, 436 Ketley, 439 Moss, 444 Moss, 479 Tillbrook, 744 Sandwell, 770 Bateman, 805 Charlwood, 822 Charlwood, 823 Jordan, 824 Noor, 825 Hodson, 834 Oxenham, 875 Noor, 877 Noor, 885 Noor, 924 Thompson, 938 Jordan, 942 Barron</p>	<p>No guarantees from Council that phases of development will progress outward, starting from existing Syngenta site, in order to minimise disruption and ensure Green Belt land is only destroyed when development begins and not in advance.</p>
<p>189 Auster</p>	<p>Proposals only increase Syngenta's footprint by a small percentage: approx. 9% to 15%.</p>

PLAN MAKING	
422 Murphy	The proposal for the 4000 home settlement at Jealott's Hill detracts from, and overwhelms, an otherwise largely excellent Plan.
149 Elmes, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 190 Elmes, 265 Mackenzie, 276 Street & Street, 322 Bonfante	Goes against BFC Planning Strategy of 'protect the Green Belt' to build unneeded homes and boost the share price of a Chinese owned company.
091 Rimmer	Trust that the Secretary of State will not allow the removal of the Green Belt.
441 Lawrence	Is there no authority above BFC whose permission must be sought for the repurposing of the Green Belt? The new housing seems to have been simply 'bolted onto' the already-agreed Local Strategic Plan.
001 Moore	The Plan is misleading in suggesting that Jealott's Hill is needed to deliver government target.
002 & 322 Bonfante, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 176 Stok, 178 Stok, 265 Mackenzie, 276 Street & Street, 287 White, 349 Hirst, 391 MacKenzie, 769 Cole, 798 Bridges, 806 Mcalister, 811 Bridge, 812 Bridge, 814 Mcalister, 828 Strange, 829 Mcalister, 833 Mcalister, 870 Bridges	<p>Conflict with Warfield Neighbourhood Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warfield NDP supports limited infilling on the site. • Warfield NDP respects the Green Belt. • Warfield NDP supports development within settlement boundaries. • BFC should not be allowed to bulldoze through Warfield's thoughtfully constructed long term plan. • Jealott's Hill and Hayley Green are close by one another and situated such that development on both sides of Warfield would will affect traffic and the current community. • The Warfield NDP should not be acted upon in terms of housing until the Plan for Jealott's Hill is determined. • It is inappropriate and inconsistent to Warfield to adopt NDP that does not include the conclusion for the plan for Jealott's Hill. • Contradicts para 1.8 to 1.11 stating close cooperation.
876 Blakemore, 928 Blakemore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict with Spatial Strategy 'to maintain the identity and integrity of the smaller settlements whilst providing smaller scale development' – the proposal is not small scale. • Conflict with 4.13 'best use will be made of sites which are centrally located in view of their sustainable location and encouragement given to look at high density development around public transport hubs'. • Furthermore, it indicates that other potential mixed-use sites could be made available within the Town Centre.
088 Jones, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 137 Jones, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 174 Kingston, 175 Bown, 190 Elmes, 393 Kedward, 217 Mackenzie Dodds, 261 Scutt, 267 Smith, 273 Waddington & Waddington, 276 Street & Street, 307 Brunander, 402 Glover, 794 Jones, 803 Squires, 807 Jones, 809 Jones, 815 Barlow, 835 Taylor, 841 Wallen, 902 Wallen, 923 de Roy, 934 Kedwards, 937 Silverston, 988 Bonfante	<p>BFC rejected the site once, what has changed since then/ nothing has changed since it was rejected. Reasons included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport (what has changed in the region since then?). • Unjustified removal of Green Belt, harm to open nature. • Harm to biodiversity. • Unsustainable site as it previously did not include a secondary school – 4000 houses appears to be the magic number needed to support a new secondary school (yet houses not needed). • How it can now be judged sustainable especially as its now 4,000 house rather than 1,200 in the SHELAA submission?
841 Wallen, 902 Wallen	<p>Plan is premature as sufficient surveys and appraisals have not been done to form the justification for inclusion in the plan, especially impact on biodiversity and transport infrastructure. Failure to demonstrate a robust analysis of the site's suitability. The following require thorough appraisal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater facility • 450 tree orchard within the Jealott's Hill Community Landshare site • Weller's Copse and other yet unidentified copses • Recycling site in Weller's Copse • Drown Boy Pond opposite Syngenta Weller's Lane entrance (newt survey required) • Bat survey of existing buildings etc • Other environmental/habitat surveys

558 Sherrington	The site is outside of the Local Plan as it is strategic – strategic to whom? If the UK Government, are they contributing to local infrastructure?
558 Sherrington, 807 Jones, 809 Jones	Duty to co-operate issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No cohesive and joined up infrastructure plans/must work with adjoining authorities (particularly RBWM) and government to deliver a road network suitable for greater traffic flows and safe pedestrian and cycle routes concomitant with the rate of housing delivery. Large site on the edge of Bracknell – coordination needed with neighbouring authorities.
748 British Horse Society	It is of utmost importance that BFC engages with the community over the design of this development. A design team or company that regularly consults with the community, holds forums where residents are listened to and considers their design ideas. This is the only way this development will be accepted by the local community. Example: Arborfield Green.
Decision Making Process	

139 Fitzwilliam	By insisting that this development is included in the revised Local Plan, Bracknell Forest Councillors have placed the planning team in a very invidious position of having to support a proposal that is currently unsupportable. The proposal should only have been put forward once the Developers had convinced the Planning Department that the issues of sustainability could be overcome. One is led to the conclusion both from the written documents and the verbal explanations that the proposed 4000 new homes is driven by the attraction of a new secondary school, the opportunity to optimise the provision of amenities and primarily by the desire of developers and owners to maximise the financial return on land no longer relevant to its commercial activity. Traffic planning, services infrastructure, social cohesion, environmental and biodiversity protection and other community centred issues seem to have been given little weight in the decision to include the proposal in the Local Plan.
128 Norton, 140 Tillette de ClermontTonnerre, 190 Elmes, 201 Depledge, 258 Poole & Banbridge, 314 Chambers 322 Bonfante, 988 Bonfante	Concerns that decision making is biased/don't represent local electorate, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that strategic planning decisions are being made by limited members of the Council's Executive; such decisions should be made by a full Council. Concerned that decision-makers are often members of Parish Councils and there is therefore a conflict of interest. Are members of BFC benefitting financially from this proposal? Whoever on the council has advanced, attempted to justify and voted through these plans ought to be ashamed of themselves. Whilst they do not represent local opinion they are ultimately answerable to your electorate. Surprised that Syngenta has succeeded in bribing the Council into financing their commercial interest at the expense of a large area of Green Belt land. Not clear why Bracknell Forest Council is so lenient as to consider the release of Green Belt where other neighbouring councils like the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead have been much more stringent in similar circumstances. An investigation should be carried out to find out why BFC planners are so lenient. BFC should hold a referendum on this huge site.
322 Bonfante, 147 Bowen, 375 Stock	BFC need to listen to local residents/residents are ignored.
177 Gates, 212 Gates, 307 Brunander	Proposals go against Warfield Councillors pledge to enhance, protect and preserve Warfield environment.
108 Fernandez, 110 Norman, 111 Norman, 121 Cox, 122 Cox, 151 Kingston, 167 Kingston, 307 Brunander	Wrong for Council to surrender Green Belt land to a Chinese state-owned company. Not morally right for Council to fund a Chinese owned multinational company's expansion and regeneration and provide profits by building over Green Belt land.
927 Fitzell	Have not seen a plan with such a scale of intent with no clear articulation of the opportunities and the challenges or pros/cons, no assessment of the impact, and no assessment of the current gaps that need fixing in BFC for current residents.
091 Rimmer	Farcical and hypocritical that BFC refuse nearly 200 homes at Home Farm, Warfield (also in the Green Belt) yet support 4000 homes at Syngenta.
269 Westbury	BFC should put residents' health and wellbeing first, rather than profits of private companies.
136 Duncan	This plan to create a new town is the product of sheer greed or utter indifference.
322 Bonfante	Goal posts keep changing and policies are ignored; fears this will be similar to Blue Mountain development where covenants were ignored.
794 Jones	Staggering that the Council is accepting and endorsing this with so many accepted unknowns.
Consultation issues	
045 Holmes	Not enough consultation on this proposal.

794 Jones, 807 Jones, 809 Jones	<p>BFC presented misleading information – appears to have been done on purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pie chart showing “Proportion of new homes built by parish” has 62% for Bracknell and 13% for Warfield. Add in the figures for Syngenta and Hayley Green and that becomes 45% Bracknell and 40% Warfield. Very significant message. The pie chart “Proportion of new homes proposed within existing settlement and in the countryside” has countryside at 37% and existing settlement at 63%. Again add in Syngenta and Hayley Green and that becomes countryside 60% and existing settlement 40%.
149 Elmes, 840 Ratcliffe	<p>BFC did not notify enough residents of the proposals, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFC did not notify resident within a quarter of a mile of the development. BFC did not notify resident 1.2km from the site. Why do people have to advertise extensions but BFC have done nothing to advertise the proposal to build 4000 homes to those most effected? All local people should be kept informed by Council to whom they pay tax and whose interests they serve.
	<i>[Refer also to comments above regarding insufficient information on transport improvements]</i>
Other	
927 Fitzell	Town centre redevelopment is an example of positive development, redeveloping and enhancing existing facilities.
057 Maidens Green Society	Proposals appear to be driven by ease of construction and simplicity for all concerned.
375 Stock & Stock	<p>Concerns about Syngenta as a company:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there potential threats to our personal/national security, given Syngenta is owned by China? How much control would local/nation government have over a China State-owned company? Why has ChemChina chosen to conduct its chemicals development business here in the UK, when labour is far cheaper in its homeland, China? Could Syngenta/ChemChina become like Bayer in Leverkusen, Bracknell’s twin town, in starting off as a seemingly harmless firm and ending up producing pesticides, causing massive pollution, and producing warfare gas and gas masks during wars?
868 Jerome	Are the Chinese to be trusted? Will they respect the Green Belt?
650 Sparkes	Impact to horse industry: large horse population and livery business in the area.
962 Stunt	Implications to surrounding house prices; reviewing if compensation should be pursued.
DEVELOPERS / PROMOTERS OF SITES	
PROMOTERS OF SITE	

667, 678, 675, 688, Barton Willmore on behalf of Syngenta

Support the inclusion of land at Jealott's Hill (and associated Policies Map changes in relation to amending the settlement boundary/Green Belt). Proposal would follow Garden Village principles, with provision of essential infrastructure, including increased frequency public transport services. Would provide up to 4,000 new homes (including 1,400 affordable), and other infrastructure such as provision of land for education (primary and secondary schools). Reference made to 'Core Submission Document' (accompanying representations), which has been made on behalf of Syngenta, CEG and Taylor Wimpey.

Development would provide a mix of housing sizes and tenure (including affordable) for those working at Syngenta and those within the Science and innovation park at very life stages for 'graduates/professionals/families'. Would meet the draft delivery target of 35% affordable (1,400 homes).

To remove land from the Green Belt, NPPF clear that exceptions circumstances should be fully evidenced and justified. Points out that there is no definition of what composes exceptional circumstances within the NPPF. Council needs to reach a sound planning judgments (reference made to Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)).

The following Exceptional Circumstances for accommodating Syngenta in the Green Belt provided:

- Global demand for food and there is an environmental and economic opportunity for companies to generate environmental benefits and generate significant returns from research
- There will be pressure to increase the productivity of available agricultural land and therefore it is important to ensure food is produced with a greater level of efficiency and in an environmentally way.
- Strategic/Business Need:
- International significance
- Govt support for agri-tech sector
- Only major commercial investor in agri crop research
- Proposal would match Govt 'Clean Growth' agenda

Need to be at Jealott's Hill:

- Only major commercial investor in crop agriculture research in the UK.
- Internationally significant, 20% of global market share.
- Values and ambitions match the Clean Growth agenda in Government's industry Strategy.
- Only major global R & D site for agrochemical research.
- International recognition as major centre of excellence for agriculture. Proximity enables continued relationship with university institutes.
- Support from Berkshire Local Industrial Strategy (BLIS) to drive the 'knowledge economy'.
- Established site and inability to replicate existing operations on another site given specialist nature of operations
- Existing facilities are aging and require significant investment. Relocation would be costly and disrupt research and lead to loss of knowledge
- Investment 'at scale' is required and this will be enabled through housing
- Job creation i.e. 2000 jobs plus related industries

Case for new garden (live/work) community:

- Development is necessary/justified outside the existing site to enable investment in the business (i.e. enabling argument);
- The delivery of housing i.e. 1,400 affordable homes
- Housing would attract skilled employees through the provision of affordable housing and right types and mix of housing;
- Site would deliver social infrastructure including schools; neighbourhood centre etc;
- It has the critical mass to improve transport links

- It would provide publicly accessible green spaces on a site which is currently private and provide a 48HA SANG

Consider that the site makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt (in terms of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt):

- Check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas: development of the site would not represent an outward extension of an urban area, or form a physical connection between urban areas. Releasing the site would provide the opportunity to create a strong and defensible settlement boundary, created by clearly defined physical features.
- Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: would not result in the merging of towns or coalescence of settlements. Will have the opportunity to create strong defensible landscape buffers. Areas of SANG would contribute to maintain permanent area of undeveloped land between northern edge of Bracknell town and the site.
- Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: site is contained by obvious natural boundaries formed by tree belts lining bridleways. The landscape strategy would create a strong defensible boundary. Whilst the development would result in the loss of countryside, further encroachment would be limited to and contained by robust settlement boundaries.
- Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: the site is not located adjacent to any historic town.
- Assist in urban regeneration: whilst part of the site is already developed, there is no derelict or urban land or similar scale to the site.

Reasons provided for proposal being sustainable development:

- New accommodation that would be flexible to meet changing business needs.
- Employees would be able to live close to place of work.
- Employees and residents have sustainable access (walk/cycle) to facilities on site i.e. high level of internal trips.
- Those who need to travel outside can do so by bus – increase in service.
- The scale of the development will create the opportunity to deliver a high- quality environment
- The delivery of open space and SANG will reduce the need to travel and protect the SPA
- The development of new R & D floorspace will facilitate research into environmentally efficient food production
- The development would use sustainable construction techniques

Comments on transport infrastructure:

- Will include the direct provision of pedestrian and cycle connection from the site to Bracknell Town and Railway Station as well as other key facilities and educational establishments.
- Various options that can be delivered within the highway have been considered i.e. o Shared footway/cycleway in Weller's Lane; Westhatch Lane and Osborne Lane; o Improvements to existing rights of way and footways on Forest Road and Warfield Street
- No. 53 bus route would be improved i.e., it would be re-routed through the development and provide a service of up to 4 buses/hour.
- Internalisation of trips would reduce impact on highway network.
- Junction improvements are likely to be required at a number of off-site junctions due to the volume of north/south traffic using key junctions on route to Bracknell Town Centre. There are no reason why proportional improvements could not be made to mitigate the impact of traffic.
- Within site description Bowyers Lane is listed as site access, whilst access along Maidenhead Road north of Gough's Barn Lane is omitted. Proposals is to remove vehicle access to site via Bowyer's Lane. An additional access is proposed along Maidenhead Road north of Gough's Barn Lane.
- The Strategic Transport Assessment states financial contributions will be required to the Maidenhead Road/Ascot Road junction. A review conducted by SYSTRA indicates this junction will not be significantly impacted.
- Assessability Assessment refers to improvements to bus 53, SYSTA proposes rerouting this bus through the site and increasing frequency.
- Sustainability Appraisal summary states that public transport, highways and other infrastructure across the site will need to be upgraded significantly. The development proposes improvements to public transport, pedestrian and cycle links as well as mitigation at a number of surrounding junctions.

Comments on green infrastructure:

- The proposed development would provide the opportunity to combine landscape elements to create a significant improvement to the character of the area that connects the areas and corridors of landscape assets that have habitat value and offer public accessibility to enable the site to accommodate the type of development proposed
- Structural landscape would provide containment and create strong boundaries and a rational extend for the development.

Comments on landscape:

A Landscape and Visual Appraisal has been undertaken which is supported by a Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy. Site has a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. Whilst the consolidation of the existing development in the central core and the introduction of additional development and landscape enhancements within the currently undeveloped agricultural areas of the site would result in the loss of agricultural land, a broad swathe of clay farmland landscape would remain. Existing trees, hedges and woodland on the site would be retained to form the basis of the landscape framework, which would be substantially enhanced, providing a setting within which to accommodate the sensitively sited proposed development and associated open space. Proposals will provide opportunity for strategic landscape enhancements and benefits, extensive open space, extensive tree planning, enhancement of existing hedgerow and restoration /enhancement of inherent landscape features such as the 'valued features' set out on the LUC Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal of the site.

Comments on flood risk:

The Council's level 2 SFRA identifies surface water flow across the site, areas of ponding and flooding across some access routes. As set out in the Core Document, it has been concluded that the proposed development will provide positive improvements to overland flow, with surface water being intercepted. Existing ditches will be upgraded.

Comments on Agricultural Land Quality:

See comments below on requirements for site.

Comments on Minerals:

See comments below on requirements for site.

Comments on wording of LP7:

- Reference to 1,200 homes (420 affordable) and 36,800sqm of floorscape within the plan period to 2036 (assuming completions from 2027/28) is considered excessively cautious. Timescale relates to submission of an application after Local Plan adoption in 2021, granted by 2022 enabling commencement by 2023 with first completions/occupation by 2024. Therefore, consider the policy wording should state "**at least**" 1,200 homes....

- In relation to SANG can provide examples whether single landowner has been involved, thereby early delivery has been possible, prior to first occupation (e.g. Prince Philip Park, Bordon). The actual required provision of SANG (2ha per 1,000 population) should be quantified in the Policy to reflect the IDP.
- In relation to 5% serviced plots, whilst supportive of provision, consider 5% is a high proportion of the development, equating to 200 dwellings. Also supported by the fact only 53 on the register (August 2019). Therefore following wording suggested:
- **“Up to 5% of dwellings as serviced plots for sale to custom builders subject to market demand”**
- Bullet 11 refers zero net carbon. However, there is no clear definition of zero net carbon. Seek clarification on the definition and application of zero or low carbon policy.
- LP7 refers to establishment of Public Right of Way. Support the objective to protect, enhance and create new footways. However, they may not be necessary in terms of formal designation, and is a matter for the planning application stage. Therefore, suggest inclusion of works **“where appropriate”** should be included in the Policy.
- In relation to Master Plan and design code, are supportive of the benefits as a matter of principle on major sites, however unclear why such matters are required as a prerequisite of a planning application. The applicant has the statutory right to make an application without either. Design code acts as a link between outline permission and detailed design associated with reserved matters, therefore premature and inappropriate for this to be prepared ahead of submission of a planning application. Having a masterplan framework in place will ensure that overall development delivers at a consistently high level. Council needs to be define what it intends in terms of form and details of both a masterplan and design code. Policy and para. 6.51 should be amended to clarify requirements.
- Figure 6 – requires minor changes to extent of site boundary. Red line boundary plan provided with representation. Figure 6 does not include a new access from Maidenhead Road to serve the Science and Innovation Park. Extent of land covered by built housing appears greater than the reality on Figure 6, which doesn't take account for other nonbuilt development assessment such as open space. Suggest the Key for the plan clarifies that the areas identified also include areas of undeveloped open space and landscaping,
- Para 6.53 appears incomplete.

Comments on requirements for site (Appendix 4):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of units and economic floor space within the plan period overly cautious (see comments on timetable set out under LP7, above). Should include reference to ‘at least’. • 5% self build is a high proportion, and should be subject to market demand. • SANG requirement should be quantified in the policy wording. • Clarification needed on the definition and application of zero or low carbon policy. • Public rights of way should be considered at the planning application stage, wording “where appropriate” should be added. • Clarification needed in relation to requirements to submit master plan and design code. • RPS Planning and Development has produced a Mineral Resource Assessment of the site. The site is located in a Preferred Area for extraction of sharp sand or gravel; under Policy 8 of the Minerals Plan. It is located upon safeguarded mineral resources that require consideration under draft Mineral Policy M2 , but is not identified as an area for sand and gravel extracted under draft Policy M4. Available data suggests that the mineral resource may be economically unviable owing to limited resource available and potentially high processing/sorting costs associated with its development. • Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd (RAC) has undertaken an investigation of the Agricultural Land Classification and soil resources of the site. The site contains 191.6ha of Grade 3b agricultural land quality. Therefore, the development will not result in the loss of any Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. <p>Various comments also made on evidence base (including Housing Background Paper and Sustainability Appraisal, which are summarised under Evidence Base – Draft Local Plan Part 1, Appendix 1).</p>
656 Simmons and Sons	<p>Consider that field (forming triangle of land south of Lordland’s Farm, north of Ascot Road) should be included as part of the allocation for either housing, infrastructure or leisure. (Plan provided with representation).</p> <p>(Also summarised under omission sites).</p>
141 Mines	<p>Our property is highlighted (yellow) as “part” of the “allocated area” and to lift the greenbelt. We enclose the “Land Registry” of our property proving the ownership. We do not object to the proposal in as much as we own our property.</p>
PROMOTERS OF OTHER SITES	
298 Bracknell Land Ltd and Tingdene Parks Ltd	<p>Proposed allocation conflicts with NPPF (2019) - para 135: There is no evidence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BFC has examined all other reasonable options for meeting development need 2. The strategy makes as much use as possible of underutilised land 3. The strategy has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development. <p>BFC view is that housing needs are met without Jealott’s Hill 1,200 homes proposed in the period are not required.</p> <p>No justification for removing this site from the green belt, and the requirements of paragraph 135 have not been met.</p>
298 Bracknell Land Ltd and Tingdene Parks Ltd	<p>If the council wishes to plan beyond 2036, then should extend plan period to avoid pre-judging post 2036 development. 2,800 homes beyond plan period equals 4.5 yrs supply on current requirement, meaning BFC is actually planning to 2040.</p>

298 Bracknell Land Ltd and Tingdene Parks Ltd	<p>If GB release actually necessary having exhausted the options in NPPF para 135 of the NPPF, para 138 of NPPF states: <i>“Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport”.</i></p> <p>There is no GB study assessing relative merits for release of GB land.</p> <p>Some of Jealott’s Hill is previously developed, but vast majority is greenfield, as is part of the Hideout, which is not in GB.</p> <p>Sustainability appraisal shows Jealott’s Hill site is one of worst performing sites for access to public transport and land at the Hideout performs better.</p>
298 Bracknell Land Ltd and Tingdene Parks Ltd	More sites need allocating, but non-GB sites (particularly the Hideout) are better located.
360 Schyde Investments Ltd.	<p>Written Statement does not make economic justification sufficiently clear or understandable. Jealott’s Hill development should not duplicate the retailing elements at Moss End Garden Village.</p>
362 Schyde Investments Ltd.	<p>Company’s ownership covers Garden Village at Moss End, and land on north of Bowyer’s Lane which adjoins SW edge of area for new settlement.</p> <p>The component of the masterplan running towards Bowyer’s Lane is described as “Area WAR3b”. With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The masterplan; • The linked Housing Background Paper, 2019; • The LUC Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal, August 2019. <p>None of these documents gives any reason why Schyde land is not incorporated, despite being adjoining proposed new settlement and scope for consolidating this with existing small settlement at Bowyer’s Lane.</p> <p>Landscape / sensitivity appraisals show no reason to exclude Schyde land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WAR3a, has Medium to High landscape sensitivity where area alongside the Schyde site (WAR3b) is Low to Medium sensitivity in the LUC Report. • WAR3d, sub area has Medium to High landscape sensitivity (LUC). <p>In terms of landscape merits of WAR3a and WAR3d, it makes no sense to exclude the lower landscape sensitivity Schyde land from the new settlement. Its inclusion would consolidate spatial coherence of the built-up settlement pattern and bridge the Moss End Garden Village with the Jealott’s Hill development.</p>
398 The Crown Estate	The Council has identified sufficient land to meet housing need to 2036 without use of Green Belt (GB) land, and therefore there is no justification for release of Green Belt land in the BFLP and no ‘identified need for development’ on GB land. Not clear that Council has fully examined other reasonable options before concluding exceptional circumstances exist.
398 The Crown Estate	Council’s GB Belt Review (2016), concluded all land in GB contributes to purposes of GB. Evidence base identifies significant constraints to development at Jealott’s Hill. These include med-high landscape sensitivity, medium potential effect on heritage, safeguarding for minerals and waste, surface water flood risk, and upgrades required to infrastructure / limited local facilities.
398 The Crown Estate	Exceptional circumstances for allocation of Jealott’s Hill not fully evidenced / justified, therefore the approach is unsound / contrary to para 35 of NPPF 2019.
398 The Crown Estate	‘other reasonable options’ for meeting development needs have not been considered, as required by para 137 of NPPF 2019, e.g. securing investment at Syngenta by alternative means or considering sustainable non-Green Belt sites such as Bracknell East to meet future development needs.

<p>565 Turley on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd</p>	<p>Not aware of any viability evidence which demonstrates 4,000 houses are needed to deliver improvements. This is essential to ensure soundness of allocation, the quantum and justification for consideration of reasonable alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No trigger points for implemented Syngenta investment works. Prudent that they proceed ahead of housing development to ensure that the test of the exceptional circumstances are met. <p>Significant infrastructure works are required including improvements to junctions including Maidenhead Road (A3095)/Ascot Road (A330) and Three Legged Cross which are to be determined at planning application stage. Should be determined through plan making process.</p> <p>As site delivery extends into next plan period likely to predetermine the next Local Plan (notes Hart District Local Plan Inspector's recent conclusions at Winchfield, resulting in that site being removed from the Plan).</p> <p>Delivery unlikely to start in 2027/28 (report Start to Finish (NLP, 2016) average planning approval period of schemes of 2,000+ dwellings was 7 years to the completion of the first dwelling). Believe sites will not commence until 2028/29.</p>
<p>566 Nexus Planning on behalf of Kingacre Estates</p>	<p>The Council's Review of the Green Belt concludes that all Green Belt land within Bracknell Forest contributes in one way or another towards the Green Belt purposes. Object to proposed allocation on the basis that 'enabling development' is unjustified as the exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt do not exist, and the site is not required to meet housing needs. This is unreasonable and unsound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syngenta is private commercial enterprise a subsidiary of ChemChina a Chinese state owned company. The Syngenta Financial Report (provided as a document with representations indicates a net income of \$1,438 million. As with any other private business in the UK, if it needs to invest in a site, it should do so privately. It is unnecessary, inappropriate and potentially unlawful for the Council to release land from the Green Belt to enable a private company to pay for investment on a private site. The Council has failed to provide evidence to demonstrate the existing site is unviable in its current form. No information on cost of the proposed development at the site, nor an estimate of net profit derived from the proposed 4,000 dwellings, employment floorspace and other elements of the scheme are provided. It would seem certain that the profit from the development of the scale proposed would be far in excess of that required to refurbish and redevelop the existing site. To be accepted as enabling development, the profit yielded should be no more than required to fund redevelopment, and benefits should be weighed against harm. Also, there cannot be a guarantee that if the scheme were approved, that Syngenta would remain active on the site in the long-term. It is clear that housing from the site is not required to meet local housing needs. Exceptional circumstances do not exist. In order to meet housing requirements appropriate, the Council should first look at brownfield sites in the urban area, followed by previously developed sites in sustainable locations outside of settlement boundaries such as Forest Farm (see separate summarised comments under 'non-allocated sites' for comments relating to Forest Farm).
<p>572 Warfield Park Homes - Woolf Bond, 591 JPP Land – Woolf Bond, 698 JPP Land (White Gates) – Woolf Bond</p>	<p>Object to allocation as better alternatives exist and exceptional circumstances are not present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a shortage of housing land supply can amount to exceptional circumstances, but here there are clear opportunities to deliver the necessary growth without resorting to the Borough's Green Belt. The employment need of the Borough can likewise be met without the need for land releases from the Green Belt as indicated by the Employment Needs Study. The study does not indicate the need for a Science and Innovation Park, with one being delivered in the vicinity of M4 J11. <p>As the Joint Green Belt Review has not been updated, there remains no clear assessment of the nature and harm to the Green Belt which would arise through this proposal. There is also no evidence of how impact associated with the removal of the site can be ameliorated or reduced to its lowest reasonably practicable extent. This Joint Review did not consider that the parcels relating to the draft allocation at Jealott's Hill should be removed from the designation. In addition, the Council's own Review confirms that the site contributes towards strong Green Belt purposes.</p>

	<p>Whilst Green Belt amendments are a matter of planning judgement, the Council cannot therefore make such a judgement as this would be not consistent with their statutory duty (section 39(2)) and the revised NPPF.</p>
591 JPP Land – Woolf Bond, 698 JPP Land (White Gates) – Woolf Bond	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges the lack of housing or employment need to release land from the Green Belt, yet it assumes the draft proposal is acceptable. This is a flawed assessment; it is comparable to that of the Vale of White Horse who had a similar proposal to for removing land from the Green Belt to meet both current and longer-term development needs. The Inspector found that the alteration to the Green Belt was not justified given the lack of satisfactory evidence supporting the proposals.</p>
623 BRP	<p>Whilst support inclusion of Local Centre consider there's a need to specify maximum quantum of floorspace so that the scale of retail provision is commensurate with local needs to prevent risk of main foodstore being delivered and potentially drawing trade away from the town centre</p>
634 St William	<p>The Council should seek to maximise potential of remaining SALP sites before considering Green Belt land. Refers to para 137 of the NPPF.</p>
655 Spitfire Homes	<p>Site is within the Green Belt.</p> <p>BFC are relying on 1,200 of the 4,000 homes being delivered within this plan period (by 2036).</p> <p>Lack of existing infrastructure - there is a need to provide significant infrastructure to deliver such an allocation. This includes 4 schools, a bespoke SANG, Community Facilities, a Healthcare facility, employment space and highways infrastructure to mitigate 4,000 homes. This level of infrastructure will be costly and may require additional funding sources, rather than CIL and S106 contributions.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the infrastructure will be delivered early enough to allow all anticipated 1,200 homes to be brought forwards by 2036.</p> <p>Figures assumed by BFC would mean that 200 dwellings would need to be delivered each year to achieve 1,200 dwellings by the end of the plan period. Developers on average deliver c. 50 dwellings per year per site. 200 per year would mean that 4 developers would need to be involved. Multiple developers delivering at one time leads to either multiple applications (which require a significant resource to manage) or a consortium approach, which can often be delayed as a result of conflicting processes and standards. Strategic developments of this scale are likely to deliver much later in the plan period than is generally anticipated.</p>
656 Lightwood Strategic	<p>Establishment of a new settlement in the absence of evidence of need is highly controversial.</p> <p>Note exceptional need is based on enabling funding that this would provided for investment in Syngenta. Consider that evidence is needed that Syngenta (a multi-national company cannot borrow to invest like other companies. ChemChina is also 100% Chinese state owned, and in 2018 was ranked 167th out of 500 companies. Whilst no doubt that they would prefer to make use of capital assets 9land), there is no exceptional reason why the Green Belt needs to be utilised for enabling development.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is also not accompanied by background evidence such as viability and highways.</p> <p>Consultation at this stage in ineffective regarding matters than exceptional circumstances.</p>

	Under key evidence only the NPPF and SHELAA are listed.
781 W J Channing & Sons; Minstead Ltd and Markfield Ltd – Boyer Ltd	<p>There is not sufficient evidence that infrastructure will be delivered early enough to allow all anticipated 1,200 homes to be brought forwards by 2036.</p> <p>Figures assumed by BFC would mean 200 dwellings would need to be delivered each year to achieve 1,200 dwellings during the plan period. Developers on average deliver c. 50 dwellings per year per site. Alternative would thus be to have 4 developing building out at all times, but this would lead to multiple applications requiring significant resources to manage, or a consortium approach likely leading to delays due to conflicting processes and standards. Thus homes likely to be delivered later than expected, meaning sufficient sites to deliver homes required.</p> <p>WINK30 is a good alternative site to Jealott's Hill – can deliver housing in the short term, is in a sustainable location and should be released from Green Belt given exceptional circumstances given Bracknell Forest's housing need.</p>
887 Bloor Homes - Boyer	<p>Issues with BFC relying on 1,200 homes being delivered during the plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significant infrastructure required will be costly to deliver and may require additional funding sources (instead of just S106 and CIL contributions). • No sufficient evidence that the required infrastructure can be delivered early enough for the 1,200 homes by 2036. • Timescale for delivery of Jealott's Hill is overly ambitious. Developers on average deliver c. 50 dwellings per year per site, so to achieve timescales for Jealott's Hill 4 developers would need to be building out at all times. This would require multiple applications and significant resource to manage, or a consortium approach, often delayed due to conflicting processes and standards. Delivery rates would also naturally slow down, given the high number of units delivered in a short period impacting sales and viability. Also, strategic sites are generally delivered later in the plan period than anticipated.
892 Persimmon/Souter	<p>Major departure from Green Belt Policy –the existing built up campus only covers 25ha whilst the proposal would spread across 240ha. Economic justification is not clear or understandable. The Council should not sanction a so-called “enabling development” without an environmental justification (derelict land, etc) or boost to local job opportunities (Bracknell has one of the most successful economies in the South East).</p> <p>In the absence of any reasoned justification there is land that is better related to Bracknell town e.g. WAR4 and WAR5.</p>
OTHER ORGANISATIONS WITH RELATED INTERESTS	
Collaborators with Syngenta: 049 Rothamsted Research, 052 University of Oxford, 078 CBRE, 118 MoA Technology, 126 Imperial College London, 330 BT Group, 908 Activate Learning (B&W College)	Strongly support plans. Seek further collaborations (includes examples of possible collaboration methods).
049 Rothamsted Research, 126 Imperial College London	Plans provide a strong signal to the UK government of the continued commitment of Syngenta to play a leading role in the transformation of UK agriculture.
052 University of Oxford, 126 Imperial College London	Jealott's Hill is currently the only major commercial R&D centre for agrochemical and agricultural technology research and already plays a vital role in UK research, UK scientific and regional economies.
052 University of Oxford	Proposed expansion/redevelopment would ensure long term sustainability and global competitiveness of UK agriculture.
078 CBRE	Proposals will bring many benefits to the local community, including new local career openings through supply partners delivering a multitude of services (gives examples)
078 CBRE	R&D campus sites and workplace environment play important role in retaining best talent and attracting future generations of scientific expertise.

078 CBRE	Proposals give CBRE unique opportunity to be involved in project involving latest building technology, industry leading laboratory and workplace design, providing advanced training and development opportunities for workforce. Will enhance employees' careers.
078 CBRE	Proposals will represent advancement to agrochemical industry and local environment.
118 MoA Technology	MoA Technology is a biotechnology business carrying out crop protection R&D that is potentially interested in moving from their current incubator facility to planned development at the site.
118 MoA Technology	In the near term Jealott's Hill science park would be an attractive location due to the components on offer including: office, laboratories, greenhouses, analytical devices and broader supporting services/expertise.
118 MoA Technology	Staff will find the site amenities, including restaurant, gym and recreation club, attractive.
118 MoA Technology	Over the long term the planned science and innovation park would be a vehicle with the flexibility and capacity to support future growth plans
118 MoA Technology	The plans are exciting, looks forward to future dialogue with Syngenta.
219 Skyx Solutions	Plans will help Skyx, an early-stage AgTech company, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • engage with other companies – extremely valuable as it is challenging to do so • Develop innovation on a farm.
255 FungiAlert	Jealott's Hill is an internationally important site, with a global reputation for excellent science and innovation. Continued investment critical to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure sustainable agricultural practices can be found • continue to safeguard soil health • benefit wider agricultural sector.
255 FungiAlert	A larger Science and Innovation Park would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide greater collaboration opportunities with the industry and across industries • Catapult innovation within the agricultural sector which it'll be exciting to be a part of • Bring in further investment to the agricultural sector • Provide facilities that would be valuable to start-ups • Cluster science businesses together around themes • Encourage skill-sharing • Provide education and employment opportunities, giving a positive impact across many sectors (students to local businesses).
330 BT Group, London & South East	Writing in support of proposal to develop site at Jealott's Hill, Warfield. Development aligns with BT's mission to promote digital skills, and Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) in the UK and to serve local communities. BT employs more than 80,000 people across UK and almost 1,000 in Berks, many of whom come from STEM backgrounds. These employees contribute towards a total GVA of £1.3bn in the county. Have been a strategic IT partner to Syngenta for 19 years and currently upgrading site's wireless comms to enable greater collaborative working & new data gathering methods for scientists and researchers. The proposals constitute an exciting opportunity for the local area and wider UK economy. The UK has highest share of GDP generated by the digital economy in the G20, yet face an alarming digital skills gap. This risks widening social divides and has an estimated £63bn annual impact on the UK's competitiveness. Initiatives like the development plan for the Syngenta site can play an important part in addressing this challenge, while also investing in Bracknell Forest and helping UK to take advantage of possibilities in an increasingly connected world.
379 Blue Frog Scientific Ltd	There are benefits of the proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support work at Jealott's Hill - research and development of technology which can sustain the need to produce food for the world's population • Support growth and innovation in UK chemicals and research sectors • Provide state of the art research facilities for agri-tech, life sciences, environmental management, clean energy, digital and materials science • Protect and create highly skilled UK jobs

392 Scymaris (Stephen Derrington)	<p>Scymaris is an environmental laboratory business providing scientific support and laboratory based testing services to global agrochemical, pharmaceutical and chemical companies to assist them with their Research, Development and Regulatory Product Management needs. Believe the creation of a Science and Innovation Park at Jealott's Hill presents exciting opportunity to build, and potentially cluster, related scientific activities and companies.</p> <p>The Park would not only provide close proximity to Syngenta, a world leading agrochemical company, but also foster and support innovation, best practices and leading edge science to help sustain the UK's position as a global leader in the life sciences sector.</p> <p>Jealott's Hill also provides an excellent location in SE UK with good road, rail and airport connectivity. The inclusion of affordable housing would be a very positive factor in attracting and retaining skilled scientists and related staff.</p> <p>Hope that BFC supports this important scheme and interested to learn more about the potential for the Science Park to provide an additional base of operations for Scymaris</p>
460 McManus	<p>Support Syngenta's plan to develop land around the Jealott's Hill site. Concept Life Sciences provide services for companies developing science based products, much of our major market is UK based research companies. Last decade has seen significant change and largely reduction in the UK market as major sites have closed or been significantly impacted by relocation of research capability out of the UK. To see any major development maintaining and bringing high quality science jobs to the UK through provision of additional research capacity and new incubator and accelerator space can only be good for that local area and the UK science base overall. This should support the ability to attract new entrepreneurial start-ups and to attract companies from across the UK looking to grow and be co located with companies in related industries and talent pools for employment.</p> <p>Collocated housing will assist to support a major new research site to attract the talent needed by providing sustainable development in area with limited availability and high cost housing.</p> <p>Syngenta as a major global company through their business to focused on improving the production capacity of the global farming industry, by continuing to develop new products that are safer and more environmentally friendly, help address the issues of feeding a growing population. This business provides high quality science and technology driven employment opportunities. Supporting development of their local research capability in the UK will see growth of these important roles in the UK rather than options in other territories.</p>
564 City Farms Systems	<p>Historical importance, was once ICI facility, now a major part of international business. Company operates in same sector as Syngenta, considers Thames Valley should be doing more to support early part of the food chain. ICI was important to agrochemicals, and work has been continued by Syngenta with a larger global resources and knowledge base.</p> <p>Proposed facilities at Jealott's Hill offer an attractive location for agricultural related businesses. An internationally recognised location with good transport links and accommodation for workers/visitors makes good business sense.</p> <p>City Farm works (such as automated greenhouses on roofs) can help with carbon reduction – welcome the opportunity to work with Bracknell Forest and Syngenta to showcase how a community can lead the way in how a smart city can reduce carbon footprint.</p>
742 University of Nottingham	<p>Fully support the proposal for a new Science and Innovation Park at Jealott's Hill as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a successful partnership with Syngenta delivering Young Entrepreneurs Scheme (YES) for 9 years hosted at Jealott's Hill. This competition offers postgraduate students and early career researchers from diverse backgrounds a practical insight into how to commercialise research and recognise the benefits of industrial collaboration, assisting their career development. Thus. it is a valuable opportunity for students. The project has been successful due to genuine partnerships with academia, government and industry. • It is critical that we continue to invest in agricultural technology and related sectors in the UK to retain our pre-eminence in research led innovation given how they attract our leading early career researchers to work in this area (addressing challenges faced by farmers). • Through the hosting of YES we have seen directly the positive impact of clustering science businesses together and how the new proposed facilities will be hugely beneficial to a wide range of businesses of different scales. • The co-location of businesses will also increase the chances of successfully bringing innovations to market and growing businesses as witnessed at the Ingenuity Lab.

773 Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	<p>Support potential re-investment in Syngenta. Proposal align with emerging Berkshire Local Industrial Strategy (BLIS) as it strengthens the role of an anchor institution to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support commercialisation of knowledge. • build productive links between SMEs and major players across Berkshire. • act as a catalyst for encouraging even greater investment in R&D. • address the “hollowing out” of higher value/higher knowledge content functions in Berkshire (with some companies operating administrative functions in Berkshire and undertaking their R&D elsewhere), by providing a sector-specific Innovation Space, providing incubator and accelerator space for entrepreneurial start-ups and modern flexible workspace • build vibrant places and a supportive infrastructure, accelerating a shift to more sustainable transport modes and promoting the sub-region to international audiences • deliver a critical mass of expertise and facilities to foster collaboration across agri-tech, life sciences, environmental management, clean energy, digital and materials science, resulting in exportable products and technologies. This would support the BLIS priority to encourage international trade, collaborations and investments through the implementation of sector deals for AI and Life Sciences.
773 Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	<p>Plans for a garden village of some 4,000 homes, 35% of which will be affordable, correlates strongly with the aspirations set out in our emerging BLIS, as housing pressures are substantial and for economic potential to be realised housing numbers set out in emerging plans must be realised. This will make Berkshire an inclusive area where aspirations can be realised.</p>
773 Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	<p>Retention and creation of skilled jobs is supported, as Berkshire growth needs to not just be about quantity but also quality and output. Financial projections for the site highlight the development’s significance to local economy.</p>
773 Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	<p>Proposals support Government’s Clean Growth Agenda in a number of ways. A focus on the Clean Growth Industrial Strategy Grand Challenge will ensure that economic growth contributes positively to Berkshire’s environmental performance, responding to the climate crisis.</p>
773 Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	<p>Support the proposed schools and additional linkages that could bring to Syngenta scientists providing exciting education opportunities for a STEM focus, increasing the supply of people with higher-level skills to sustain productivity levels and attraction/retention of leading international firms post-Brexit. Would support the LEP’s STEAM strategy.</p>
827 Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce	<p>Support the proposals to retain and grow facilities at Jealott’s Hill as an international and significant R&D facility in the sub-region because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility is of significant economic importance for Bracknell, Thames Valley and UK: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Its retention and capacity to grow will help retain 850 jobs, create 2,000 new jobs. ○ It will help deliver more than £50m in business rates and between £6.4 - £7.1 billion in GVA over the 20 years following completion • Proposals would support the Government’s Industrial Strategy proposals and Thames Valley Berkshire Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) aims. • Research at Jealott’s Hill is world leading and is developing future technology to feed a growing population efficiently and in an environmentally friendly way • The mixed use development will provide opportunity to maximise wider benefit for community and wider area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New schools providing educational opportunities linking Syngenta scientists in driving STEM projects. ○ Additional housing including affordable ○ Extensive, new and accessible green spaces ○ Opportunity to explore innovative technologies and future proof design(s) to provide exemplar environmentally friendly development, with reduced energy and water consumption and carbon given scale of the development • Will help deliver many of our Business Manifesto’s aims and objectives, including business-led approach to deliver sustained economic growth, infrastructure investment and resilience in Thames Valley.

837 Drone Ag Limited	<p>Syngenta's support and expertise is a huge benefit to what we and other small UK start-ups are trying to achieve and look forward to further collaboration if proposals go ahead.</p> <p>Jealott's Hill has excellent track record for R&D in agritech sector, with large impacts on UK and worldwide. UK is becoming an agritech world leader. Agritech is extremely important in seeking to feed the world sustainably. Continued investment in UK agritech companies/R&D facilities will ensure UK remains world leader in field.</p> <p>Proposals are therefore exciting news, especially Science and Innovation Park. Will create great location for collaboration and innovation between UK companies like ours, Syngenta and others. Collaboration the only way to solve some issues facing agriculture, hence we are creating innovation centre in the North.</p>
908 Activate Learning (B&W College)	<p>Syngenta works with Activate learning in many ways including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student science project-based learning, enhancing learning experiences and providing a route into work, apprenticeships and further study at Jealotts Hill. • Member of advisory board that shapes education to ensure there is a pipeline of talent for local businesses. • Supporting new initiatives and development, such as the development of a new science lab.
908 Activate Learning (B&W College)	<p>Proposals would grow the number of science roles to the benefit of the local economy and students at Activate colleges. Syngenta has a key part to play in this, and are engaged with all levels of education in the area as well as the community, inspiring young people to have science-based careers with prospects. Concerned about the impact on students if Syngenta had to move elsewhere to deliver a project such as this.</p>
908 Activate Learning (B&W College)	<p>Proposals would allow the far-reaching work the business to expand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact the development of local young people and adults than is currently possible through new relationships with other employers at the new Science and Innovation Park. • Greater potential for work experiences, industry placements and university graduate placements. • Opportunity to expand volume of apprenticeships and on-site vocational training/skills development. • Creation of additional career routes not currently offered on-site, in secots such as construction and wider STEM sectors. • Raising career aspirations for Berkshire students.
908 Activate Learning (B&W College)	<p>Proposed development is a key component for the future economy and community of the area.</p>