PLANNING REF : 262189
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Arkwright Drive
:
: RG42 1FX
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs S R
DATE SUBMITTED : 21/09/2026

COMMENTS:
location.
This is not simply a proposal to replace an existing dwelling. It would introduce a new residential community together with roads, vehicles, lighting, hardstanding, drainage infrastructure, gardens and recreational activity.

The resulting change in land use would have a significant effect on the character of the area.

The Council's recently adopted Masterplans Supplementary Planning Document states that larger, complex or sensitive developments should be considered comprehensively, taking account of the site's context, topography, constraints, opportunities, access and movement, land use, built form and green infrastructure.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

I therefore consider that the Council should not determine the acceptability of the proposal merely on the basis that individual matters can supposedly be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

The fundamental question is whether a development of up to 160 homes is appropriate on this site at all, given its environmental and frastructure constraints.

3. Serious concerns regarding school capacity
A development of up to 160 dwellings will inevitably generate additional demand for local schools.
This is not a minor infrastructure issue. The proposal could result in a significant number of additional primary and secondary-age children requiring school places.

I am concerned that the application does not adequately demonstrate that the necessary school capacity exists or can be delivered at the appropriate time.

The Council itself identifies the School Places Plan 2023-2028 as one of its key strategic plans.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The Council should therefore require clear evidence of:

the number of additional primary-age pupils expected from 160 dwellings;
the number of additional secondary-age pupils;

the capacity of existing nearby schools;
existing and committed developments already placing pressure on those
schools;
the availability of additional classroom capacity;

the ability to expand schools where necessary;
SEND provision;

nursery and early-years provision; and
the funding and delivery mechanism for any required expansion. It is not sufficient to say that a financial contribution towards education can be secured through a planning obligation.
A contribution is not the same thing as a school place.

If suitable school capacity cannot be delivered when these homes are occupied, the development would place additional pressure on existing schools and local families.

The Council should not permit the development to proceed on the assumption that education problems can somehow be resolved after the houses have been built.

4. Traffic generation and highway safety
The proposed development would introduce up to 160 additional households and consequently a substantial number of additional vehicle movements.
The proposed new vehicular access onto Murrell Hill Lane is therefore a critical issue.

The traffic impact must be assessed against the existing characteristics and capacity of Murrell Hill Lane and the surrounding network, rather than simply considering whether vehicles can
physically enter and leave the site.

The assessment should address:

existing traffic flows;
peak morning and evening traffic;
PLANNING REF : 262189
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Arkwright Drive
:
: RG42 1FX
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs S R
DATE SUBMITTED : 21/09/2026

COMMENTS:
Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to register my strong objection to this outline planning application for up to 160 new dwellings at Murrell Hill Grange.

The scale of this proposal represents a substantial change to the character and function of this part of Binfield. I consider that the application raises serious and unresolved concerns relating to loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity, inadequate school infrastructure, highway safety and traffic generation, and the cumulative impact of development in the wider Binfield area.

The fact that the application is in outline form should not result in these fundamental matters being deferred. The principle of developing this site and the acceptability of the proposed access need to be properly established before the Council gives permission.

1. Significant loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat
The proposed development would transform an existing relatively undeveloped site into a residential development of up to 160 homes, with roads, driveways, gardens, lighting, pedestrian routes, drainage infrastructure, construction activity and associated human disturbance.
This would inevitably alter and fragment existing habitat.

The ecological impact must not be assessed simply by identifying individual protected species. Wildlife depends upon a wider network of habitats for feeding, breeding, shelter and movement. The loss of established vegetation, hedgerows, trees, grassland and other habitat can therefore have consequences extending beyond the application boundary.

The Council's own evidence demonstrates the importance of biodiversity improvements and habitat at Murrell Hill Lane, including ditch/pond planting, de-silting, grassland improvements and wildlife-related
measures.
C
consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk

This makes it particularly important that the ecological relationship between this application site and the surrounding landscape is properly understood.

I am concerned that the proposed provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) could be presented as compensation for the loss of habitat when newly created recreational greenspace is not necessarily equivalent to established habitat that has developed over many years.

SANG is primarily intended to manage recreational pressure. It should not be treated as a substitute for protecting existing biodiversity and ecological connectivity.

I therefore ask the Council to require a robust assessment of:

all existing habitats within and immediately surrounding the site;
hedgerows, mature trees, ponds, ditches and grassland;
nesting and breeding birds;
bats and other protected species;
mammals and other species using the site for feeding or movement;
ecological corridors and connectivity;
the impact of artificial lighting;
construction noise and disturbance;

increased domestic pets and recreational activity;
surface-water drainage and its effect on existing habitats; and the cumulative biodiversity impact of development throughout
Binfield.
The Council should be satisfied that there will be no unacceptable loss of biodiversity or ecological connectivity before allowing the principle of development to be established.
2. The scale of development is inappropriate for the site and its surroundings
Up to 160 houses represents a substantial urbanisation of this

additional vehicle movements generated by 160 homes;
junction capacity;

visibility at the proposed access;
pedestrian safety;
cycling safety;
school-related traffic;
congestion;
parking;
deliveries;
refuse collection;
emergency access;
construction traffic; and
cumulative traffic from other development in Binfield.
The cumulative impact is particularly important.

Murrell Hill Lane and the surrounding roads should not be assessed as though this proposal were the only development taking place in the area. The Council's own housing monitoring information records substantial existing and projected housing commitments across the borough.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The additional traffic generated by this proposal must therefore be considered alongside existing, approved and proposed development.

5. Concern about the proposed access onto Murrell Hill Lane

The creation of a new vehicular access is itself a significant change to the road environment.
The Council should require compelling evidence that the access can operate safely for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, rather than simply accepting that an engineering solution can be designed.

In particular, the Council should scrutinise:

sight lines;
road width;
vehicle speeds;
pedestrian movements;
cyclist movements;
the location of the access relative to existing accesses and junctions;
visibility during poor weather and darkness;
construction traffic;
refuse and service vehicles; and
the cumulative effect of additional junction movements.
If there is insufficient evidence to establish that the access would be safe and suitable, the application should be refused.

6. Impact on walking and cycling, including journeys to school
The provision of a pedestrian access does not automatically make a development sustainable.
The Council should establish whether residents would actually have safe, convenient and continuous walking and cycling routes to local schools, shops, services and public transport.

This is particularly important where children would be expected to travel to school.

A development which creates additional car journeys because walking, cycling or public transport is impractical would exacerbate the very traffic problems that the transport assessment is supposed to address.

The Council's transport strategy includes objectives relating to sustainable transport and safer routes, and its current strategic plans include the Local Transport Plan, Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan and School Places Plan.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The proposal should therefore be assessed against the real-world acces sibility of the site, rather than simply the theoretical availability of pedestrian or cycle connections.

7. Cumulative impact on Binfield
This application must not be considered in isolation.
Binfield has already experienced significant development and continues to face further development pressure.

The Council's Development Plan includes both the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2024 and the Binfield Neighbourhood Plan, and these documents form part of the framework against which this application must be determined.

B
Bracknell Forest Council
+1

The cumulative effect of development on:

wildlife;
green infrastructure;
roads;
schools;
drainage;
pedestrian routes;
public transport;
local services; and
the character of Binfield
must be properly considered.
Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to register my strong objection to this outline planning application for up to 160 new dwellings at Murrell Hill Grange.

The scale of this proposal represents a substantial change to the character and function of this part of Binfield. I consider that the application raises serious and unresolved concerns relating to loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity, inadequate school infrastructure, highway safety and traffic generation, and the cumulative impact of development in the wider Binfield area.

The fact that the application is in outline form should not result in these fundamental matters being deferred. The principle of developing this site and the acceptability of the proposed access need to be properly established before the Council gives permission.

1. Significant loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat
The proposed development would transform an existing relatively undeveloped site into a residential development of up to 160 homes, with roads, driveways, gardens, lighting, pedestrian routes, drainage infrastructure, construction activity and associated human disturbance.
This would inevitably alter and fragment existing habitat.

The ecological impact must not be assessed simply by identifying individual protected species. Wildlife depends upon a wider network of habitats for feeding, breeding, shelter and movement. The loss of established vegetation, hedgerows, trees, grassland and other habitat can therefore have consequences extending beyond the application boundary.

The Council's own evidence demonstrates the importance of biodiversity improvements and habitat at Murrell Hill Lane, including ditch/pond planting, de-silting, grassland improvements and wildlife-related
measures.
C
consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk

This makes it particularly important that the ecological relationship between this application site and the surrounding landscape is properly understood.

I am concerned that the proposed provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) could be presented as compensation for the loss of habitat when newly created recreational greenspace is not necessarily equivalent to established habitat that has developed over many years.

SANG is primarily intended to manage recreational pressure. It should not be treated as a substitute for protecting existing biodiversity and ecological connectivity.

I therefore ask the Council to require a robust assessment of:

all existing habitats within and immediately surrounding the site;
hedgerows, mature trees, ponds, ditches and grassland;
nesting and breeding birds;
bats and other protected species;
mammals and other species using the site for feeding or movement;
ecological corridors and connectivity;
the impact of artificial lighting;
construction noise and disturbance;

increased domestic pets and recreational activity;
surface-water drainage and its effect on existing habitats; and the cumulative biodiversity impact of development throughout
Binfield.
The Council should be satisfied that there will be no unacceptable loss of biodiversity or ecological connectivity before allowing the principle of development to be established.
2. The scale of development is inappropriate for the site and its surroundings

Up to 160 houses represents a substantial urbanisation of this location.
This is not simply a proposal to replace an existing dwelling. It would introduce a new residential community together with roads,
It would be inadequate to examine each development independently and conclude that individual impacts can be mitigated in isolation.

8. Outline permission should not be granted where fundamental matters remain unresolved
This is an application for up to 160 dwellings, while most matters other than access are reserved.
That makes it especially important that the Council is satisfied that the site is capable of accommodating the proposed development without unacceptable environmental, infrastructure or highway consequences.

The Council's Masterplans SPD specifically recognises the importance of comprehensive consideration of larger and more sensitive developments before detailed design is finalised.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

I therefore strongly object to any approach whereby the fundamental problems identified above are simply deferred to reserved matters or future planning obligations.

If the principle of development is unacceptable because of highway, environmental or infrastructure constraints, those issues should be addressed now, not after outline permission has established the principle of development.

9. Requested action
For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that Bracknell Forest Council REFUSE this application.
In particular, I ask the Council to conclude that the proposal has not adequately demonstrated that:

the loss and fragmentation of existing wildlife habitat can be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated;
the ecological connectivity of the site and surrounding landscape can be maintained;
the proposed SANG genuinely addresses the impacts of the development rather than simply providing recreational mitigation;
sufficient school capacity exists, or can be delivered at the necessary time, to accommodate the children generated by the development;
the proposed access onto Murrell Hill Lane is safe and appropriate;
the surrounding road network can accommodate the additional traffic;
walking and cycling routes provide safe and realistic alternatives to car travel;
construction traffic can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts;
the cumulative effects of this proposal and other development in Binfield have been adequately assessed; and
the proposal complies with the relevant provisions of the adopted Development Plan.
The proposal should not be allowed to proceed simply because individual impacts may potentially be capable of mitigation through future conditions or financial contributions. The Council must first

be satisfied that a development of this scale is appropriate in this location and that the necessary environmental, educational and transport infrastructure can actually be delivered.
For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and request that the application be refused.
vehicles, lighting, hardstanding, drainage infrastructure, gardens and recreational activity.

The resulting change in land use would have a significant effect on the character of the area.

The Council's recently adopted Masterplans Supplementary Planning Document states that larger, complex or sensitive developments should be considered comprehensively, taking account of the site's context, topography, constraints, opportunities, access and movement, land use, built form and green infrastructure.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

I therefore consider that the Council should not determine the acceptability of the proposal merely on the basis that individual matters can supposedly be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

The fundamental question is whether a development of up to 160 homes is appropriate on this site at all, given its environmental and frastructure constraints.

3. Serious concerns regarding school capacity
A development of up to 160 dwellings will inevitably generate additional demand for local schools.
This is not a minor infrastructure issue. The proposal could result in a significant number of additional primary and secondary-age children requiring school places.

I am concerned that the application does not adequately demonstrate that the necessary school capacity exists or can be delivered at the appropriate time.

The Council itself identifies the School Places Plan 2023-2028 as one of its key strategic plans.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The Council should therefore require clear evidence of:

the number of additional primary-age pupils expected from 160 dwellings;
the number of additional secondary-age pupils;

the capacity of existing nearby schools;
existing and committed developments already placing pressure on those
schools;
the availability of additional classroom capacity;
the ability to expand schools where necessary;
SEND provision;

nursery and early-years provision; and
the funding and delivery mechanism for any required expansion. It is not sufficient to say that a financial contribution towards

education can be secured through a planning obligation.
A contribution is not the same thing as a school place.

If suitable school capacity cannot be delivered when these homes are occupied, the development would place additional pressure on existing schools and local families.

The Council should not permit the development to proceed on the assumption that education problems can somehow be resolved after the houses have been built.

4. Traffic generation and highway safety
The proposed development would introduce up to 160 additional households and consequently a substantial number of additional vehicle movements.
The proposed new vehicular access onto Murrell Hill Lane is therefore a critical issue.

The traffic impact must be assessed against the existing characteristics and capacity of Murrell Hill Lane and the surrounding network, rather than simply considering whether vehicles can
physically enter and leave the site.

The assessment should address:

existing traffic flows;
peak morning and evening traffic;
additional vehicle movements generated by 160 homes;
junction capacity;

visibility at the proposed access;
pedestrian safety;
cycling safety;
school-related traffic;
congestion;
parking;
deliveries;
refuse collection;
emergency access;
construction traffic; and
cumulative traffic from other development in Binfield.
The cumulative impact is particularly important.

Murrell Hill Lane and the surrounding roads should not be assessed as though this proposal were the only development taking place in the area. The Council's own housing monitoring information records substantial existing and projected housing commitments across the borough.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The additional traffic generated by this proposal must therefore be considered alongside existing, approved and proposed development.

5. Concern about the proposed access onto Murrell Hill Lane

The creation of a new vehicular access is itself a significant change to the road environment.
The Council should require compelling evidence that the access can

operate safely for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, rather than simply accepting that an engineering solution can be designed.

In particular, the Council should scrutinise:

sight lines;
road width;
vehicle speeds;
pedestrian movements;
cyclist movements;
the location of the access relative to existing accesses and junctions;
visibility during poor weather and darkness;
construction traffic;
refuse and service vehicles; and
the cumulative effect of additional junction movements.
If there is insufficient evidence to establish that the access would be safe and suitable, the application should be refused.

6. Impact on walking and cycling, including journeys to school
The provision of a pedestrian access does not automatically make a development sustainable.
The Council should establish whether residents would actually have safe, convenient and continuous walking and cycling routes to local schools, shops, services and public transport.

This is particularly important where children would be expected to travel to school.

A development which creates additional car journeys because walking, cycling or public transport is impractical would exacerbate the very traffic problems that the transport assessment is supposed to address.

The Council's transport strategy includes objectives relating to sustainable transport and safer routes, and its current strategic plans include the Local Transport Plan, Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan and School Places Plan.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

The proposal should therefore be assessed against the real-world acces sibility of the site, rather than simply the theoretical availability of pedestrian or cycle connections.

7. Cumulative impact on Binfield
This application must not be considered in isolation.
Binfield has already experienced significant development and continues to face further development pressure.

The Council's Development Plan includes both the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2024 and the Binfield Neighbourhood Plan, and these documents form part of the framework against which this application must be determined.

B
Bracknell Forest Council
+1

The cumulative effect of development on:

wildlife;
green infrastructure;
roads;
schools;
drainage;
pedestrian routes;
public transport;
local services; and
the character of Binfield
must be properly considered.
It would be inadequate to examine each development independently and conclude that individual impacts can be mitigated in isolation.

8. Outline permission should not be granted where fundamental matters remain unresolved
This is an application for up to 160 dwellings, while most matters other than access are reserved.
That makes it especially important that the Council is satisfied that the site is capable of accommodating the proposed development without unacceptable environmental, infrastructure or highway consequences.

The Council's Masterplans SPD specifically recognises the importance of comprehensive consideration of larger and more sensitive developments before detailed design is finalised.
B
Bracknell Forest Council

I therefore strongly object to any approach whereby the fundamental problems identified above are simply deferred to reserved matters or future planning obligations.

If the principle of development is unacceptable because of highway, environmental or infrastructure constraints, those issues should be addressed now, not after outline permission has established the principle of development.

9. Requested action
For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that Bracknell Forest Council REFUSE this application.
In particular, I ask the Council to conclude that the proposal has not adequately demonstrated that:

the loss and fragmentation of existing wildlife habitat can be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated;
the ecological connectivity of the site and surrounding landscape can be maintained;
the proposed SANG genuinely addresses the impacts of the development rather than simply providing recreational mitigation;
sufficient school capacity exists, or can be delivered at the necessary time, to accommodate the children generated by the development;
the proposed access onto Murrell Hill Lane is safe and appropriate;
the surrounding road network can accommodate the additional traffic;
walking and cycling routes provide safe and realistic alternatives to car travel;
construction traffic can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts;

the cumulative effects of this proposal and other development in Binfield have been adequately assessed; and
the proposal complies with the relevant provisions of the adopted Development Plan.
The proposal should not be allowed to proceed simply because individual impacts may potentially be capable of mitigation through future conditions or financial contributions. The Council must first be satisfied that a development of this scale is appropriate in this location and that the necessary environmental, educational and transport infrastructure can actually be delivered.
For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development and request that the application be refused.